

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 2a

### CHAPTER I

MISHNAH. THE CARRYINGS OUT<sup>1</sup> OF THE SABBATH<sup>2</sup> ARE TWO WHICH ARE FOUR WITHIN, AND TWO WHICH ARE FOUR WITHOUT.<sup>3</sup> HOW SO? THE POOR MAN STANDS WITHOUT AND THE MASTER OF THE HOUSE WITHIN: [i] IF THE POOR MAN STRETCHES HIS HAND WITHIN AND PLACES [AN ARTICLE] INTO THE HAND OF THE MASTER OF THE HOUSE, OR [ii] IF HE TAKES [AN ARTICLE] FROM IT AND CARRIES IT OUT, THE POOR MAN IS LIABLE,<sup>4</sup> AND THE MASTER OF THE HOUSE IS EXEMPT.<sup>5</sup> [AGAIN] [i] IF THE MASTER OF THE HOUSE STRETCHES HIS HAND WITHOUT AND PLACES [AN OBJECT] IN THE POOR MAN'S HAND, OR [ii] TAKES [AN OBJECT] THEREFROM AND CARRIES IT IN, THE MASTER IS LIABLE, WHILE THE POOR MAN IS EXEMPT.<sup>6</sup> [iii] IF THE POOR MAN STRETCHES HIS HAND WITHIN AND THE MASTER TAKES [AN OBJECT] FROM IT, OR PLACES [AN OBJECT] THEREIN AND HE CARRIES IT OUT, BOTH ARE EXEMPT; [iv] 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.<sup>7</sup>

GEMARA, We learnt elsewhere:<sup>8</sup> [False] oaths are two which are four:<sup>9</sup>

---

(1) Lit., 'outgoings'.

(2) i.e., the acts of transporting objects from private to public ground or vice versa, which are forbidden on the Sabbath, Tosaf. observes that the phraseology, 'outgoings, **צִיּוּת**' instead of the more usual 'carrying out' **הוצאות** is based on Ex. XVI, 29: let no man go out of his place on the seventh day.

(3) I.e., by Biblical law two acts of carrying out are interdicted to the person standing in a private domain ('within') and two to the person standing in public ground ('without'); to each two the Rabbis added another two, thus making 'TWO WHICH ARE FOUR.' Tosaf. is much exercised with the question why this is taught at the beginning of the Tractate, instead of in the seventh chapter, where all the principal forbidden acts of the Sabbath, including this, are enumerated, and offers various answers. L. Blau in MGWJ., 1934 (Festschrift), P. 124f maintains that this was originally part of the Mishnah of Shebu. I, 1, which is quoted at the beginning of the Gemara (infra), where a number of subjects, having no inner connection, are grouped together by the catch phrase 'two which are four.' As an aid to the memory each subject was then put at the head of the Tractate to which it refers.

(4) For desecrating the Sabbath.

(5) Because the poor man performs the two acts which together constitute 'carrying out' in the Biblical sense, viz., he removes an object from one domain and replaces it in another. (When he withdraws the object into the street, holding it in his hand, he is regarded as having deposited it in the street.) The master, on the other hand, is quite passive, performing no action at all.

(6) In both cases here the master performs the two acts, the poor man being passive. Thus there are two Biblically forbidden acts for each.-'Liable' means to a sin-offering, if the acts are committed unwittingly, or to death (in theory, hardly in practice) if committed knowingly, and can apply here only to a Biblical interdict.

(7) In iii and iv each performs one act only, either removing from one domain or depositing in another. This is Rabbinically forbidden, and involves no liability. (When the master places an object into the poor man's outstretched hand, which is already in the house, he, and not the poor man, is regarded as having removed it from the private domain.)

(8) Shebu. I, 1.

(9) In Lev. V, 4-7 (q.v.) a variable sacrifice (vv. 6-7) is imposed for taking a false oath (v. 4 is so explained). 'To do evil, or to do good,' is interpreted as meaning that one swears, 'I will eat,' or 'I will not eat,' which are the two referred to, viz., a positive or a negative oath relating to the future. These are further increased to four by including similar oaths relating to the past: 'I ate', or 'I did not eat.'

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 2b

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 2b

the forms of consciousness of uncleanness are two which are four;<sup>1</sup> the appearances of leprosy are two, which are four;<sup>2</sup> the carryings out of the Sabbath are two which are four.<sup>3</sup> Now, why is it taught here, TWO WHICH ARE FOUR WITHIN, AND TWO WHICH ARE FOUR WITHOUT; whereas there it is [simply] stated, 'two which are four,' and nothing else? — Here, since the Sabbath is the main theme, [both] principal [forms of labour] and derivatives are taught;<sup>4</sup> but there, since the main theme is not the Sabbath, principal labours only are taught, but not derivatives. What are the principal labours? — carryings out! But the carryings out are only two?<sup>5</sup> And should you answer, some of these involve liability, and some do not involve liability<sup>6</sup> — surely it is taught on a par with the appearances of leprosy: just as there all involve liability,<sup>7</sup> so here too all involve liability?—Rather said R. Papa: here that the Sabbath is the main theme, acts of liability and non-liability are taught;<sup>8</sup> there, since the Sabbath is not the main theme, only acts of liability are taught, but not of exemptions.<sup>9</sup> Now, what are the cases of liability-carryings out? But the carryings out are [only] two?<sup>10</sup> — There are two forms of carrying out and two of carrying in. But 'carry ings out' are taught?—Said R. Ashi: The Tanna designates carrying in' too as 'carrying out.'<sup>11</sup> How do you know it? — Because we learnt: If one carries out [an object] from one domain to another, he is liable. Does this not mean even if he carries [it] in from the public to a private domain, and yet it is called 'carrying out.' And what is the reason? — Every removal of an article from its place the Tanna designates 'carrying out.' Rabina said: Our Mishnah too proves it, because CARRYINGS OUT are taught, yet straightway a definition of carrying in is given; this proves it. Raba said: He [the Tanna] teaches [the number of] domains; the domains of the Sabbath are two.<sup>12</sup>

R. Mattenah objected to Abaye: Are there eight?<sup>13</sup> but there are twelve!<sup>14</sup> — But according to your reasoning, there are sixteen!<sup>15</sup> Said he to him, That is no difficulty: as for the first clause, it is well:

---

(1) In Lev. V, 2f, 5-7 a variable sacrifice is also decreed for transgressing through uncleanness. According to the Talmud (Shebu. 7b) this refers to the eating of holy food, e.g., the flesh of sacrifices, and entering the Temple while unclean. Further, liability is contracted only if one was originally aware of his uncleanness, forgot it, and ate sacred food or entered the Temple, and then became conscious of it again. Thus there are two, viz., forgetfulness of uncleanness when eating sacred food, and same when entering the Temple. To these another two are added: forgetfulness of the sacred nature of the food and forgetfulness of the sanctity of the Temple while being aware of one's uncleanness.

(2) The two are 'a rising' and 'a bright spot' (Lev. XIII, 2), which, in order to be unclean, must be snowy white and white as wool respectively. To these the Rabbis added, by exegesis, the whiteness of the plaster of the Temple and the whiteness of the white of an egg respectively—in each case a darker shade.

(3) Bah, on the basis of the text in Shebu. I, 1, reverses the order of the last two.

(4) Labours forbidden on the Sabbath are of two classes: (i) principal labours (aboth, lit., 'fathers') and (ii) derivatives (toledoth, lit., 'offsprings'), which are prohibited as partaking of the nature of the principal labours. Both are regarded as Biblical. Carrying out from private into public ground is a principal labour, while the reverse is a derivative thereof (infra 96b).

(5) Viz., that of the poor man who takes an article from the houseowner's hand, and that of the master of the house who puts an article into the poor man's hand. Where then are the 'two which are four?'

(6) I.e., two carryings out impose liability, as in preceding note, and another two are forbidden yet do not involve liability. Viz., if the poor man stretches his hand within, receives an article, and withdraws it; likewise, if the master of the house puts forth his hand with an object which the other takes, as explained on p. 1, n. 5 on the Mishnah. — Thus there are 'two which are four,' all referring to carrying out.

(7) To the purificatory sacrifices of a leper (Lev. XIV).

(8) V. notes on Mishnah.

(9) Two instances of carrying out, and two of carrying in, as explained in the Mishnah.

(10) Though there is liability for carrying in, the Mishnah in Shebu. speaks only of 'carryings out.'

(11) Employing 'carrying out' in the wider sense of transporting between private and public ground.

(12) I.e., in respect of the Sabbath we recognize two domains, public and private, carrying between which is prohibited.

On account of these two four acts are forbidden to a person standing within and four to a person standing without, and that is the meaning of 'TWO WHICH ARE FOUR,' both here and in Shebu. (Rashi). Riba explains it differently. — Actually four domains are distinguished (infra 6a), but these are the principal two.

(13) 'TWO WHICH ARE FOUR WITHIN, AND TWO WHICH ARE FOUR WITHOUT.'

(14) In addition to the four acts which involve liability, there are eight which do not. Viz., two acts of removal by the poor man without depositing, i.e., if he stretches his hand into the house and the master takes an object from him, or the master puts his hand without and the poor man places an object in it. Reversing these, we have two acts of depositing by the poor man without removal. These four, again, are also to be viewed from the standpoint of the master of the house, which gives eight in all.

(15) For the two actions which involve liability for the poor man are likewise to be regarded from the standpoint of the master of the house, and vice versa, which yield another four.

### Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 3a

he does not teach what involves no liability and is [also] permitted.<sup>1</sup> But the last clause, where no liability is involved, yet it is forbidden, is indeed difficult.<sup>2</sup> (But is there in the whole [of the laws relating to] Sabbath [an action described as involving] no liability [yet] permitted: did not Samuel say: Everything [taught as] involving no liability on the Sabbath, involves [indeed] no liability, yet it is forbidden, save these three, which involve no liability and are [also] permitted: [viz.,] the capture of a deer,<sup>3</sup> the capture of a snake, and the manipulation of an abscess?<sup>4</sup> — Samuel desires to say this only of exemptions where an act is performed; but as for exemptions where no act [at all] is done, [of such] there are many?)

Yet still there are twelve? — Non-liaible acts whereby one can come to the liability of a sin-offering are counted; those whereby one cannot come to the liability of a sin-offering are not counted.<sup>5</sup>

'BOTH ARE EXEMPT?' But between them a [complete] action is performed! — It was taught: [And if anyone] of the common people sin unwittingly, in doing [any of the things etc.]:<sup>6</sup> only he who performs the whole of it [a forbidden action], but not he who performs a portion thereof. [Hence] if a single person performs it, he is liable; if two perform it, they are exempt. It was stated likewise: R. Hiyya b. Gamada said: It emanated<sup>7</sup> from the mouth of the company<sup>8</sup> and they said: 'In doing': if a single person performs it, he is liable: if two perform it, they are exempt.

Rab asked Rabbi: If one's neighbour loads him with food and drink, and he carries them without, what is the law? Is the removing<sup>9</sup> of one's body like the removing of an article from its place, and so he is liable; or perhaps it is not so? He replied: He is liable, and it is not like his hand.<sup>10</sup> What is the reason? — His body is at rest<sup>11</sup> whereas his hand is not at rest.<sup>12</sup>

---

(1) E.g., if the man without extends his hand and places an article into the hand of the man within, the latter commits no action at all, being passive throughout, and, as far as the Sabbath is concerned, he does nothing forbidden.

(2) Why these are not counted as separate actions, as explained in n. 4.

(3) V. infra 106b end and 107a.

(4) V. infra 107a.

(5) Stretching out one's hand with an article from a private to a public domain or vice versa may involve a sin-offering, viz., by depositing the said article in the new domain. But acceptance can never lead to this (Riba).

(6) Lev. IV, 27.

(7) Lit., 'it was cast forth'.

(8) Of scholars — i.e., it was generally ruled.

(9) Lit., 'uprooting'.

(10) For, as stated in the Mishnah, if an article is placed in one's hand and he withdraws it, he is exempt.

(11) Hence the article upon his body is likewise at rest, and he effects its removal,

(12) On the ground: hence he does not actually remove the article from its place.

### Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 3b

Said R. Hiyya to Rab: Son of illustrious ancestors! Have I not told you that when Rabbi is engaged on one Tractate you must not question him about another, lest he be not conversant with it. For if Rabbi were not a great man, you would have put him to shame, for he might have answered you incorrectly.<sup>1</sup> Still, he has now answered you correctly, for it was taught: If one was laden with food and drink while it was yet day,<sup>2</sup> and he carries them out after dark, he is culpable, because it is not like his hand.<sup>3</sup>

Abaye said: I am certain that a man's hand is neither like a public nor like a private domain:<sup>4</sup> it is not like a public domain [this follows] from the poor man's hand;<sup>5</sup> it is not like a private domain — [this follows] from the hand of the master of the house.<sup>6</sup> Abaye propounded: Can a man's hand become as a karmelith:<sup>7</sup> did the Rabbis penalize him not to draw it back to himself, or not? — Come and hear: If one's hand is filled with fruit and he stretches it without — one [Baraitha] taught: He may not draw it back; another taught: He may draw it back. Surely they differ in this: one Master holds that it [the hand] is like a karmelith, and the other holds that it is not? [No.] All agree that it is like a karmelith, yet there is no difficulty: the one [refers to a case where it is] below ten [handbreadths], and the other [where it is] above ten [handbreadths].<sup>8</sup> Alternatively, both [Baraithas refer] to [a hand) below ten, and [hold that] it is not like a karmelith, yet there is no difficulty: one [speaks of a case] while it is yet day; the other, when it is already dark [the Sabbath has commenced]. [If he stretches out his hand] while it is yet day, the Rabbis did not punish him;<sup>9</sup> if after sunset, the Rabbis punished it. On the contrary, the logic is the reverse: [if he stretches out his hand] by day, so that if he throws it [the article] away he does not come to the liability of a sin-offering,<sup>10</sup> let the Rabbis penalize him; but if [he does it] after nightfall, so that if he throws it away he incurs the liability of a sin-offering, the Rabbis should not punish him. Now, since we do not answer thus,<sup>11</sup> you may solve R. Bibi b. Abaye's [problem]. For R. Bibi b. Abaye asked: If a person places a loaf in an oven,<sup>12</sup> do the Rabbis permit him to remove it before he incurs the liability of a sin-offering, or not?<sup>13</sup> Now you may deduce that they do not permit it!<sup>14</sup> That is no difficulty, and indeed solves it! Alternatively, you cannot solve it, after all: [and reply thus],<sup>15</sup> The one Baraitha refers to an unwitting, the other to a deliberate act. Where it is unwitting, the Rabbis did not punish him<sup>16</sup> for it; where it is deliberate, they punished.<sup>17</sup> Another alternative: both [Baraithas] refer to an unwitting act, but here they differ as to whether they [the Rabbis] punished an unwitting [offender] on account of a deliberate one: one Master holds that they did punish an unwitting [offender] on account of a deliberate one; the other, that they did not punish an unwitting [offender] on account of a deliberate one. Another alternative: after all, they did not punish [the one on account of the other], yet there is no difficulty. The one [Baraitha] means into the same courtyard; [

---

(1) Lit., 'he would have given you an answer which is not an answer.'

(2) I.e., before sunset on Friday.

(3) As explained above.

(4) If a man stands in one and stretches out his hand into the other, the hand is not accounted the same as his body, to have the legal status of the domain in which the body is.

(5) For the Mishnah states that if the Master takes an article from the poor man's hand stretched within he is exempt.

(6) If the poor man takes an object from it, he is not liable.

(7) V. infra 6a. A karmelith is part of a public domain which is but little frequented, therefore regarded as neither public nor private ground; by Rabbinical law one may not carry from a karmelith to a public or a private domain, or vice versa. Now, as we have seen, when one stretches out his hand into another domain, it does not enjoy the body's status. Yet does it occupy the intermediate status of a karmelith, and since it holds an object, its owner shall be forbidden to withdraw it until the termination of the Sabbath?

(8) V. infra 100a. If the hand is within ten handbreadths from the ground it is in a public domain, and therefore the

Rabbis ordered that he must not withdraw it. But if it is above, it is in a place of non-liability; hence he is not penalized.

(9) Lit. 'it' sc. his hand. They did not compel him to keep his hands stretched out till the termination of the Sabbath.

(10) Since he does not perform a complete forbidden act on the Sabbath.

(11) This reversed answer.

(12) Lit., 'sticks a loaf to (the wall of) an oven.'

(13) If it remains in the oven until baked he incurs a sin-offering for baking on the Sabbath. On the other hand, it is Rabbinically forbidden to remove bread from the oven on the Sabbath. How is it here?

(14) Since the reverse answer is not given, we see that the Rabbis do not abrogate their interdict even when it leads to a liability to a sin-offering.

(15) To reconcile the two Baraitas.

(16) V.n.1.

(17) Thus this has no bearing on R. Bibi b. Abaye's problem.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 4a

the other, into a different courtyard.<sup>1</sup> Even as Raba asked R. Nahman: If a person holds a handful of produce in his hand and he extends it without,<sup>2</sup> may he withdraw it into the same courtyard? He replied, It is permitted. And what about another courtyard? Said he to him, It is forbidden. And what is the difference? — When you measure out a measure of salt for it!<sup>3</sup> There his intention is not carried out; here his intention is carried out.<sup>4</sup>

[To revert to] the main text: 'R. Bibi b. Abaye propounded: If one places a loaf of bread in an oven, do they permit him to remove it before he incurs the liability of a sin-offering or not?' R. Aha b. Abaye said to Rabina: What are the circumstances? Shall we say [that he did it] unwittingly and he did remind himself,<sup>5</sup> then whom are they to permit?<sup>6</sup> Hence it must surely mean that he did afterwards become aware thereof,<sup>7</sup> but then would he be liable? Surely we learnt: All who are liable to sin-offerings are liable only if the beginning and end [of the forbidden action] are unwitting. On the other hand, if his problem refers to a deliberate action, he should have asked [whether he may remove it] before he comes to an interdict involving stoning!<sup>8</sup> -R. Shila said: After all, it means unwittingly; and [as to the question] 'whom are they to permit?', [the reply is], Others. R. Shesheth demurred: Is then a person told, 'Sin, in order that your neighbour may gain thereby?'<sup>9</sup> Rather, said R. Ashi, after all it refers to a deliberate act; but say [in the problem], before he comes to an interdict involving stoning.<sup>10</sup> R. Aba son of Raba recited it explicitly: R. Bibi b. Abaye said: If one places a loaf in an oven, he is permitted to remove it before he comes to an interdict involving stoning.

IF THE POOR MAN STRETCHES OUT HIS HAND. Why is he liable? Surely removal and depositing must be from [and into] a place four [handbreadths] square,<sup>11</sup> which is absent here?<sup>12</sup> — Said Rabbah: The author of this [Mishnah], is R. Akiba, who maintains: We do not require a place four by four. For we learnt: If one throws [an article] from one private domain to another and public ground lies between: R. Akiba holds him liable; but the Sages hold him not liable. R. Akiba holds: We say, An object intercepted by [air] is as though it rested there;<sup>13</sup> While the Rabbis maintain: We do not say, An object intercepted by [air] is as though it rested there. Shall we say that Rabbah is certain that they differ as to whether an object intercepted is considered at rest,

---

(1) When one stands in a courtyard, which is private ground, and stretches his laden hand into the street, he may withdraw it into the same courtyard, but not into an adjoining one and drop the article there.

(2) I.e., into the street.

(3) A jesting remark: then I will tell you the difference.

(4) If he stretches out his hand into the street he wants to remove the produce from that courtyard. Hence he may draw it back into the same, when his intention remains unfulfilled, but not into an adjoining courtyard, whereby his intention would be carried out.

(5) Before it was completely baked, that it was the Sabbath, or that baking on the Sabbath is forbidden.

- (6) Being unaware of anything wrong, he does not come to ask.
- (7) Before it was baked.
- (8) Which is the penalty for the deliberate desecration of the Sabbath, and not 'before he incurs the liability of a sin-offering'?
- (9) Can one be told to infringe the minor injunction of removing bread from an oven in order to save his neighbour from the greater transgression of baking on the Sabbath?
- (10) From this it is obvious that R. Bibi's original question was merely whether he is permitted to remove it or not. 'Before he incurs etc.,' was a later addition, which R. Ashi emends. The same assumption must be made in similar cases. V. Kaplan, Redaction of the Talmud, Ch. XIII.
- (11) Removal from one domain and depositing in the other necessitates in each case that the object shall rest upon a place four handbreadths square.
- (12) A person's hand does not fulfil this condition.
- (13) Hence when it crosses public ground it is as though it rested there, and so liability is incurred.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 4b

and when it [crosses the public domain] within ten handbreadths [of the ground]?<sup>1</sup> But surely Rabbah asked a question thereon. For Rabbah propounded: Do they disagree when it is below ten, and they differ in this: R. Akiba holds, An object intercepted is as though it rested, while the Rabbis hold that it is not as though it rested; but above ten all agree that he is not liable, all holding that we do not derive throwing from reaching across?<sup>2</sup> Or perhaps they disagree when it is above ten, and they differ in this: R. Akiba holds, We derive throwing from reaching across, while the Rabbis hold, We do not learn throwing from reaching across; but below ten all agree that he is liable. What is the reason? We say that an object intercepted is as though it rested?—That is no difficulty: after propounding, he solved it that R. Akiba holds that an object intercepted is as though it rested.<sup>3</sup>

But perhaps he [R. Akiba] does not require depositing [on a place four handbreadths square], yet he may require removal [from such a place]?<sup>4</sup> Rather, said R. Joseph, the author of this [Mishnah] is Rabbi. Which [ruling of] Rabbi [intimates this]? Shall we say, This [ruling of] Rabbi: If one throws [an object]<sup>5</sup> and it comes to rest upon a projection,<sup>6</sup> of a small size,<sup>7</sup> Rabbi holds him liable; the Sages exempt him? [But] surely there, as we will state below, it is in accordance with Abaye. For Abaye said: The reference here is to a tree standing in private ground while its branch inclines to the street, and one throws [an article] and it comes to rest upon the branch,<sup>8</sup> Rabbi holding, We say, cast the branch after its trunk;<sup>9</sup> but the Rabbis maintain; We do not rule, Cast the branch after its stock? — Rather it is this [ruling of] Rabbi. For it was taught: If one throws [an article] from public to public ground, and private ground lies between: Rabbi holds him liable; but the Sages exempt him. Now, Rab Judah said in Samuel's name: Rabbi imposed a twofold liability, one on account of carrying out and one on account of carrying in:<sup>10</sup> this proves that neither removal nor depositing requires a place four by four. But surely it was stated thereon, Rab and Samuel both assert,

- 
- (1) For the space above ten does not rank as public ground.
- (2) If one reaches over an object from private to private ground across public ground, even if it is above ten handbreadths, he is liable.
- (3) Var. lec.:... he solved it. Granted that R. Akiba holds, An object intercepted is as at rest, yet perhaps (etc., continuing text as in next paragraph).
- (4) This objection reverts to Rabbah's answer that our Mishnah agrees with R. Akiba.
- (5) In the street.
- (6) A bracket moulding, or anything which projects from the wall of a house; both the house and the projection are private ground.
- (7) Lit., 'whatever (size) it is'. I.e., very small, less than four square.
- (8) Which is a projection of the tree.
- (9) Hence it is private ground, and therefore liability is incurred. — The tree as a whole is regarded, and so we have 'a

place four by four.’

(10) When the object enters the air space in a private domain, there is ‘carrying in’ from public to private ground; when it leaves it and re-enters the public domain, there is ‘carrying out’ from private to public ground. Since the man’s act has caused both, he is liable twice over.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 5a

Rabbi imposed liability only in the case of a covered-in private domain, for we say that a house is as though it were full,<sup>1</sup> but not in one which is uncovered. And should you answer, Here too [in our Mishnah it speaks of] it as covered, [I might retort] that is well of a covered private ground, but is one liable for a covered public ground? Did not R. Samuel b. Judah say in the name of R. Abba in the name of R. Huna in Rab’s name: If one carries an article four cubits in covered public ground, he is not liable, because it is not like the banners of the wilderness?<sup>2</sup> — Rather, said R. Zera, the authority of this is the ‘others.’<sup>3</sup> For it was taught: Others say: If he stands still in his place and catches it, he [the thrower] is liable; if he moves from his place and catches it, he [the thrower] is exempt.<sup>4</sup> [Now it states], ‘If he stands in his place and catches it, he [the thrower] is liable’, — but surely there must be depositing on an area four [handbreadths square], which is absent! Hence this proves that we [i.e., ‘others’] do not require a place four by four. Yet perhaps only depositing [on such an area] is not required, but removal [from such] may be necessary? And even in respect to depositing too: perhaps it means that he spread out his garment and caught it, so that there is also depositing [on such an area]? — Said R. Zera: Our Mishnah also means that he removes it [the article] from a basket and places it in a basket, so that there is depositing too [in a place four square]. But HIS HAND is stated? — Learn: a basket in HIS HAND. Now, that is well of a basket in a private domain; but a basket in public ground ranks as a private domain?<sup>5</sup> Must we then say that it does not agree with R. Jose son of R. Judah? For it was taught: R. Jose son of R. Judah said: If one fixes a rod in the street, at the top of which is a basket, [and] throws [an article] and it comes to rest upon it, he is liable.<sup>6</sup> , For if it agrees with R. Jose son of R. Judah, WHERE THE MASTER OF THE HOUSE STRETCHES HIS HAND WITHOUT AND PLACES [AN OBJECT] IN THE POOR MAN’S HAND, why is he LIABLE? Surely he [merely] carries it from private ground to private ground! — You may even say [that it agrees with] R. Jose son of R. Judah: There it is above ten [handbreadths];<sup>7</sup> here it is below ten.<sup>8</sup> This<sup>9</sup> presented a difficulty to R. Abbahu: Is then ‘a basket in his hand’ taught: surely HIS HAND [alone] is stated! Rather, said R. Abbahu, it means that he lowered his hand to within three handbreadths [of the ground] and accepted it.<sup>10</sup> But HE STANDS is taught!<sup>11</sup> — It refers to one who bends down. Alternatively, [he is standing] in a pit; another alternative: this refers to a dwarf. Raba demurred: Does the Tanna trouble to inform us of all these!<sup>12</sup> Rather, said Raba, A man’s hand is accounted to him as [an area] four by four. And thus too, when Rabin came,<sup>13</sup> he said in R. Johanan’s name: A man’s hand is accounted to him as [an area] four by four.

R. Abin said in the name of R. Elai in R. Johanan’s name: If one throws an article and it alights on his neighbour’s hand, he is liable. What does he inform us? [that] a man’s hand is accounted to him as [an area] four by four! But surely R. Johanan already stated it once? — You might argue. That is only when he himself accounts his hand such,<sup>14</sup> but where he does not account his hand as such,<sup>15</sup> I might say [that it is] not [so]. Therefore we are informed [otherwise].

R. Abin said in R. Elai’s name in the name of R. Johanan: If he [the recipient stands still in his place and catches it, [the thrower] is liable; if he moves from his place and catches it, he [the thrower] is exempt. It was taught likewise: Others say: If he stands still in his place and catches it, he [the thrower] is liable; if he moves from his place and catches it, he [the thrower] is exempt.<sup>16</sup> R. Johanan propounded: What if he throws an article and himself moves from his place, and catches it? What is his problem?<sup>17</sup> — Said R. Ada b. Ahaba: His problem concerns two forces in the same man: are two forces in the same man accounted as the action of one man, hence he is liable, or perhaps

they count as the action of two men?<sup>18</sup> The question stands over.

R. Abin said in R. Johanan's name: If he puts his hand into his neighbour's courtyard and receives [some] rain, and then withdraws it, he is liable. R. Zera demurred: What does it matter whether his neighbour loads him<sup>19</sup> or Heaven loads him; he himself did not effect removal? — Do not say, he [passively] receives rain, but, he catches it up.<sup>20</sup> But removal must be from a place four [square], which is absent? — Said R. Hiyya son of R. Huna: E.g., he catches it up [as it rebounds] from the wall. But even on the wall, it does not rest there?<sup>21</sup> — It is as Raba<sup>22</sup> said [elsewhere], It refers to a sloping wall; so here too it refers to a sloping wall. Now, where was Raba's [dictum] said? — In connection with the following. For we learnt:

---

(1) Of articles — i.e., it is accounted as though lacking air space entirely, and immediately an object enters therein, we regard it as lying on the ground.

(2) It is stated infra 49b and 96b that the definition of what constitutes forbidden work on the Sabbath is dependent on the work that was done in connection with the Tabernacle in the wilderness. Carrying was necessary, and so carrying an article four cubits is work. But there it was done under the open sky; hence Rab's dictum, and the same applies here. By 'banners of the wilderness' is meant the whole disposition and encampment of the Israelites, and they did not have any covered-in public ground.

(3) In Hor. 13b 'others' is identified with R. Meir.

(4) If A throws an article in the street to B, and B catches it while standing in his place, A is liable, because he is regarded as having both removed and deposited it. But if B moves away and catches it, A did not effect its deposit, since it does not lie where it would have done on account of his throw.

(5) Why then should he be liable in respect of carrying out?

(6) For it ranks as private ground, v. infra 101a.

(7) Then it ranks as private ground.

(8) Then it is public ground.

(9) Explanation of R. Abba.

(10) Everything within three handbreadths is regarded as the ground itself on the principle of labud (v. Glos), and thus the hand becomes a place four square.

(11) And he would have to be sitting for his hand to be so low.

(12) Surely he does not state a law which requires all these conditions. He should rather have taught: If the poor man spreads out his garment, etc.

(13) From Palestine to Babylon. Rabin and R. Dimi were two Palestinian amoraim who travelled between the Palestinian and the Babylonian academies to transmit the teachings of one to the other.

(14) If one intentionally deposits an article in his neighbour's hand, or takes an article into his own, in each case he accounts the hand as a resting place, i.e., an area four square.

(15) I.e., when it merely chances to alight on a man's hand.

(16) V. supra 5a notes.

(17) On what grounds should he be exempted: did he not remove it from one place and deposit it in another?

(18) The throw is one manifestation of his force: the catch arrests that force and is in the nature of a counter act; hence they may be regarded as performed by two people, which involves no liability.

(19) In which case the Mishnah declares him exempt.

(20) Actively. This is assumed to mean that he intercepts the flow of rain, beating it with one hand into the other.

(21) The side of a wall — it being assumed that an ordinary vertical one is meant — affords no resting place for the rain, whereas removal must be from a place where it can stay.

(22) Rashal reads: Rabbah.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 5b

If he is reading a scroll on a threshold, and it rolls out of his hand,<sup>1</sup> he may rewind it to himself.<sup>2</sup> If one is reading on the top of a roof,<sup>3</sup> and the scroll rolls out of his hand, — before it comes within ten handbreadths [of the ground] he may wind it back himself;<sup>4</sup> if it comes within ten handbreadths, he

must turn the written side inwards.<sup>5</sup> Now, we pondered thereon: why must he turn the written side inwards, surely it did not come to rest?<sup>6</sup> and Raba answered: This refers to a sloping wall.<sup>7</sup> Yet may it not be urged that Raba said this [only] of a scroll, whose nature it is to rest [where it falls]; but is it the nature of water to rest?<sup>8</sup> Rather, said Raba, [R. Johanan spoke of a case] where he collected [the rain] from the top of a [water] hole. 'A hole'! But then it is obvious? — You might argue, Water upon water is not at rest;<sup>9</sup> [therefore] he [R. Johanan] informs us [that it is].

Now Raba follows his opinion. For Raba said: Water [lying] upon water, that is its [natural] rest; a nut upon water, that is not its [natural] rest.<sup>10</sup> Raba propounded: If a nut [lies] in a vessel, and the vessel floats on water,<sup>11</sup> do we regard the nut, which is at rest,<sup>12</sup> or the vessel, which is not at rest, since it is unstable? 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<sup>13</sup> and a tebul yom<sup>14</sup> touches the oil, he disqualifies the oil only. R. Johanan b. Nuri said: Both are attached to each other.<sup>15</sup>

R. Abin said in R. Elai's name in the name of R. Johanan: If one is laden with food and drink and goes in and out all day,<sup>16</sup> he is liable only when he stands still.<sup>17</sup> Said Abaye: Providing that he stands still to rest.<sup>18</sup> How do you know it? — Because a Master said: Within four cubits, if he stops to rest, he is exempt; to shoulder his burden, he is liable. Beyond four cubits, if he stops to rest, he is liable; to rearrange his burden, he is exempt.<sup>19</sup> What does he [R. Johanan] inform us — that the original removal was not for this purpose?<sup>20</sup> But R. Johanan stated it once. For R. Safra said in R. Ammi's name in R. Johanan's name: If one is carrying articles from corner to corner [in private ground] and then changes his mind and carries them out, he is exempt, because his original removal was not for this purpose? — It is dependent on Amoraim: one stated it in the former version; the other stated it in the latter version.<sup>21</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: If one carries [an article] from a shop to an open space via a colonnade,<sup>22</sup> he is liable; but Ben 'Azzai holds him not liable. As for Ben 'Azzai, it is well: he holds that walking is like standing.<sup>23</sup> But according to the Rabbis, granted that they hold that walking is not like standing, yet where do we find liability for such a case?<sup>24</sup> — Said R. Safra in the name of R. Ammi in R. Johanan's name:

- 
- (1) Into a public domain skirting it.
  - (2) This refers, e.g., to a threshold three handbreadths above the ground and four handbreadths square, This constitutes a karmelith (v. p. 6, n. 7), and even if it entirely falls out of his hand it is only Rabbinically prohibited to carry it back; hence here that he retains one end there is not even that.
  - (3) Which is a private domain. In the East all roofs were flat and put to use; T.A.I, p. 33.
  - (4) Because only the first ten handbreadths above the street surface count as public ground.
  - (5) He must not draw it back, since it has entered public ground, so he reverses it, because it is degrading for a scroll to lie open with its writing upward.
  - (6) Hence he should be permitted to roll it back.
  - (7) V.'Er., Sonc. ed., p. 697 and notes.
  - (8) It does not stay even on a sloping wall.
  - (9) The article must be removed from a place where it may be regarded as naturally at rest, e.g., a stone lying on the ground.
  - (10) And if one picks it up and carries it without, he is not liable.
  - (11) And he lifts up both and carries them out.
  - (12) In the vessel.
  - (13) Both of terumah.
  - (14) V. Glos. He renders terumah (q.v. Glos.) unfit for food.
  - (15) And both become unfit. Thus in respect to the Sabbath too: the Rabbis hold that the oil is not at rest upon the wine,

whereas R. Johanan b. Nuri holds that the oil is at rest upon the wine. The same applies to oil floating upon water: wine is mentioned on account of the quotation, as there is no *terumah* of water.

(16) From private to public ground.

(17) And then goes in or out; this alone constitutes removal. He was laden in the first place to carry the stuff from one part of a private domain to another, and if he goes out instead it is not removal, since when the food was moved at first there was no intention of carrying from a private to a public domain; v. *supra* 3a.

(18) But if he stops merely to rearrange the burden, it is all part of his walking.

(19) One is liable for carrying an article four cubits over public ground, providing that he himself removes it from the first spot and deposits it on the other. Now, if he stops to rest within the four cubits, that constitutes depositing, and when he restarts there is a fresh removal; consequently, the article was carried four cubits with a single removal and deposit, and so he is exempt. But if he stops to rearrange the burden, it is still part of the first removal; therefore he is liable. Hence if he stops to rest after walking four cubits, he is regarded as depositing the article there, and is liable. But if he stops to rearrange his burden, he is still engaged in walking, and should another relieve him of it before he stops to rest, both are exempt.

(20) *Viz.*, to carry it without, and so he is not liable.

(21) R. Johanan did not teach both, but amoraim reporting his words gave different versions of what he did state.

(22) The shop is private ground, the open space is public ground, and the colonnade ranks as a *karmelith*, being occupied by stall holders and not frequented as a public thoroughfare.

(23) When he walks through the colonnade it is as though he stood there. Hence he performs two separate actions: (i) carrying an object from private ground to a *karmelith*; (ii) carrying an object from a *karmelith* to public ground. Neither of these imposes liability.

(24) In Scripture, by analogy with the Tabernacle (v. p. 11, n. 2) we find liability only for direct transference from private to public ground.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 6a

Compare it to one who carries an article in the street: there, surely, though he is not liable as long as he holds it and proceeds, yet when he lays it down he is liable; so here too, it is not different. How compare! there, wherever he puts it down it is a place of liability; but here, if he deposits it in the colonnade, it is a place of non-liability? Rather compare it to one who carries an article [in the street] exactly four [cubits].<sup>1</sup> There, surely, though he is exempt if he deposits it within the four cubits, yet when he deposits it at the end of the four cubits he is liable; so here too, it is not different. How compare? There it is a place of exemption [only] as far as this man is concerned, but to all others<sup>2</sup> it is a place of liability; but here it is a place of exemption for all? Rather compare it to one who carries [an object] from private to public ground through the sides of the street:<sup>3</sup> there, surely, though he is exempt if he lays it down in the sides of the street, yet when he lays it down in the street [itself] he is liable; so here too it is not different.

R. Papa demurred thereto: that is well according to the Rabbis, who maintain that the sides of the street are not regarded as the street; but according to R. Eliezer [b. Jacob],<sup>4</sup> who rules that the sides of the street are regarded as the street, what can be said? — Said R. Aha son of R. Ika to him: Granted that you know R. Eliezer [b. Jacob] to rule that the sides of the street are regarded as the street where there is no fencing;<sup>5</sup> but do you know him [to rule thus] where there is fencing?<sup>6</sup> Hence it<sup>7</sup> is analogous to this.

R. Johanan said: Yet Ben 'Azzai agrees in the case of one who throws.<sup>8</sup> It was taught likewise: If one carries [an object] from a shop to an open place through a colonnade, he is liable, whether he carries [it] out or carries [it] in; or whether he reaches it across or throws it. Ben 'Azzai said: If he carries it out or in, he is exempt; if he reaches it across or throws it, he is liable.

Our Rabbis taught: There are four domains in respect to the Sabbath; private ground, public ground, *karmelith*, and a place of non-liability. And what is private ground? A trench ten

[handbreadths] deep and four wide, and likewise a wall ten [handbreadths] high and four broad, — that is absolute private ground.<sup>9</sup> And what is public ground? A highroad,<sup>10</sup> a great public square,<sup>11</sup> and open alleys,<sup>12</sup> — that is absolute public ground. One may not carry out from this private to this public ground, nor carry in from this public to this private ground; and if one does carry out or in, unwitting, he is liable to a sin-offering; if deliberately, he is punished by kareth<sup>13</sup> or stoned.<sup>14</sup> But the sea, a plain, a colonnade, or a karmelith, ranks neither as public nor as private ground:<sup>15</sup> one must not carry [objects] about<sup>16</sup> within it and if he does, he is liable; and one must not carry out [an object] thence into public ground or from the public ground into it, nor carry [an object] from it into private ground or from the private ground into it; yet if he does carry out or in, he is not liable. As to courtyards with many owners<sup>17</sup> and blind alleys,<sup>18</sup> if an ‘erub is made, they are permitted; if an ‘erub is not made, they are forbidden.<sup>19</sup> A man standing on a threshold<sup>20</sup> may take [an object] from the master of the house, or give [it] to him, and may take [an object] from the poor man or give [it] to him; providing however that he does not take from the master of the house and give to the poor man or from the poor man and give it to the master of the house;<sup>21</sup> and if he does take and give, the three are exempt. Others state, A threshold serves as two domains: if the door is open, it is as within; if shut, it is as without. But if the threshold is ten [handbreadths] high and four broad, it is a separate domain.<sup>22</sup> The Master said: ‘That is [absolute] private ground.’ What does this exclude?<sup>23</sup> — It excludes the following [view] of R. Judah. For it was taught: Even more than this did R. Judah say: If one owns two houses on the opposite sides of the street,<sup>24</sup> he can place

---

(1) Lit., ‘from the beginning of four to the end of four’.

(2) To whom the limit of four cubits terminates at this particular spot.

(3) E.g., if the wall of a private courtyard fronting on the street is broken through, the place of the wall is called the sides of the street. In ‘Er. 94b (quoted below) it is disputed whether this is private or public ground; yet when one carries an object into the street through the breach he is certainly liable.

(4) b. Jacob is omitted in ‘Er. 94b and Keth. 31a.

(5) Rashi: stakes against which vehicles rub to protect the wall.

(6) And yet if one carries through the breach into the street he is liable.

(7) The case of the colonnade.

(8) From a shop to an open place through a colonnade: he is then liable.

(9) Even if they are in a public thoroughfare. A house, of course, is also private ground.

(10) Jast.: a camp.

(11) Or, an open place.

(12) i.e., open at both ends into streets.

(13) If he was not formally warned.

(14) If formally warned.

(15) The former, because they are not for the general passage of the multitude; the latter, because they are not enclosed. It should be observed that ‘public ground’ does not mean any ground that is open to the public, but that which is actually frequented by the masses.

(16) Lit., ‘carry and give,’ across a distance of four or more cubits.

(17) I.e., a courtyard into which many houses open and which itself abuts on the street. The inhabitants of these houses own the courtyard in common and must pass through it into the street.

(18) These too are provided with courtyards through which the inhabitants pass into the streets.

(19) For ‘erub v. Glos. If the separate householders make an ‘erub, e.g., each contributing a little flour for baking a large loaf, all the houses and the courtyard into which they open are counted as one domain, and carrying between them is permitted. Again, if all the courtyards are thus joined by an ‘erub, carrying is permitted between the courtyards themselves and between them and the blind alley on which they abut.

(20) This is less than four handbreadths square, and is a place of non-liability, i.e., not a separate domain at all, but counted with public or private ground indifferently.

(21) This is a Rabbinical measure, lest one treat the Sabbath lightly and carry direct between public or private ground.

(22) Like the trench or wall mentioned above. it is private ground, yet not part of the house, and carrying between the two is prohibited.

(23) The emphasis suggests that only that is private ground.

(24) Facing each other.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 6b

a board or a beam at each side<sup>1</sup> and carry between them.<sup>2</sup> Said they to him: A street cannot be made fit [for carrying] by an 'erub in this way.<sup>3</sup> And why is it called 'absolute' [public ground]? — You might argue, The Rabbis differ from R. Judah, [maintaining] that it is not private ground only in respect of carrying [therein]:<sup>4</sup> but in respect of throwing<sup>5</sup> they agree with R. Judah:<sup>6</sup> hence we are informed [otherwise].

The Master said: 'That is [absolute] public ground.' What does this exclude? — It excludes R. Judah's other [ruling]. For we learnt: R. Judah said: If the public thoroughfare interposes between them, it must be removed to the side; but the Sages maintain: It is unnecessary.<sup>7</sup> And why is it called 'absolute?' — Because the first clause states 'absolute', the second does likewise. Now, let the desert too be enumerated, for it was taught: What is public ground? A high-road, a great open space, open alleys and the desert?—Said Abaye, There is no difficulty: The latter means when the Israelites dwelt in the desert; the former refers to our own days.<sup>8</sup>

The Master said: 'If one carries out or in, unwittingly, he is liable to a sin-offering; if deliberately, he is punished by kareth or stoned.' 'Unwittingly, he is liable to a sin-offering': but it is obvious? — It is necessary [to state] 'If deliberately, he is punished by kareth or stoned.' But that too is obvious? — We are informed the following, in agreement with Rab. For Rab said, I found a secret scroll of the school of R. Hiyya<sup>9</sup> wherein it is written, Issi b. Judah said: There are thirty-nine principal labours, but one is liable only [for] one. Yet that is not so? for we learnt: The principal labours are forty less one: and we pondered thereon, Why state the number?<sup>10</sup> And R. Johanan answered: [To teach] that if one performs all of them in one state of unawareness,<sup>11</sup> he is liable for each separately! Rather, say thus: for one of these he is not liable; and so we are informed here that this one [sc. carrying] is of those about which there is no doubt.

The Master said: 'But the sea, a plain, a colonnade, and a karmelith rank neither as public nor as private ground.' But is a plain neither private nor public ground? Surely we learnt: A plain: in summer it is private ground in respect to the Sabbath and public ground in respect to uncleanness;<sup>12</sup> in winter it is private ground in both respects!<sup>13</sup> — Said 'Ulla: After all it is a karmelith; yet why is it called private ground? Because it is not public ground.<sup>14</sup> R. Ashi said:

---

(1) Of one of the houses.

(2) R. Judah holds that two partitions facing each other render the space between private ground by Biblical law. The outside walls of the houses are two such partitions, while the two are added to mark out this particular space and distinguish it from the rest of the street.

(3) V. 'Er., Sonc. ed., p. 32 notes.

(4) Forbidding it as a precautionary measure, lest one carry in public ground too.

(5) An object from other public ground into this.

(6) That liability is incurred, because by Biblical law two partitions constitute private ground,

(7) A well ten handbreadths deep and four broad in a public highway is private ground, as stated above; consequently, if one draws water and places it at the side, he desecrates the Sabbath. Therefore the Rabbis enacted that it should be surrounded by boards, even at some distance, and placed at intervals, providing that there is not a gap of more than ten cubits between any two; this renders the whole private ground, as though it were entirely enclosed. But R. Judah maintains that if the actual road taken by travellers lies between these boards, it destroys its character as private ground and makes it public ground in spite of the boards, and therefore it must be diverted. The emphasis in our Baraita — that is public ground — is to reject this view of R. Judah.

(8) When it is not frequented.

(9) **מגלת סתרים** Rashi: When a scholar heard a new law which had no authoritative tradition behind it and was thus rejected by the schools, he committed it to writing for fear that he might forget it, and kept it secret. Weiss, Dor, II, 189 thinks that the scroll contained views which R. Juda ha-Nasi had desired to exclude from his authoritative compilation, and therefore it was kept concealed. — On these lines a very considerable portion of the Baraita would have had to be kept secret! Kaplan, Redaction of the Talmud, p. 277 suggests that the concealed scroll contained laws which were unsuited for unrestricted publicity. He also suggests that the phrase may not mean 'concealed' but written in a 'concealed', i.e. esoteric style. But there is nothing particularly esoteric about the style of the law quoted here. V. also Levi, Worterbuch s.v.

(10) Since they are all stated separately,

(11) I.e., he is unaware throughout that these are forbidden on the Sabbath.

(12) In summer it is not sown, hence a few may pass through it, yet not many will trouble to leave the highway. Hence carrying therein is permitted. With respect to uncleanness, it is a general principle that if a doubt arises in a strictly private place, a stringent ruling is given, and the article or person concerned is unclean; if it arises in a public i.e., not a strictly private place, we are lenient. Hence, since the plain is not strictly private, it ranks as public ground.

(13) Since it is sown, no stranger enters therein.

(14) And as the main purpose of that Mishnah is to draw a distinction between the Sabbath and uncleanness, that is sufficient, without pointing out that it is a karmelith.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 7a

E.g., when it has barriers,<sup>1</sup> and [this is] in accordance with the following dictum of 'Ulla in R. Johanan's name: An enclosure more than two se'ahs [in area]<sup>2</sup> which is not enclosed in attachment to a dwelling place,<sup>3</sup> even if it is a kor or two kor [in area],<sup>4</sup> if one throws [an article] therein [from public ground] he is liable. What is the reason? It is a partitioned area, but it lacks inhabitants.<sup>5</sup> Now, as for R. Ashi, it is well that he does not explain it as 'Ulla,<sup>6</sup> but why does 'Ulla not explain it in accordance with his own dictum? — He answers you: if it has barriers, is it called a plain: [surely] it is an enclosure! And R. Ashi?<sup>7</sup> - 'Private ground' is taught.<sup>8</sup>

'And a karmelith.' Are then all these [sea, plain and colonnade] too not karmelith? — When R. Dimi came,<sup>9</sup> he said in the name of R. Johanan: This is necessary only in respect of a corner near a street<sup>10</sup> : though the masses sometimes press and overflow therein,<sup>11</sup> yet since it is inconvenient for [general] use, it ranks as a karmelith.

When R. Dimi came, he said in R. Johanan's name: [The place] between the pillars<sup>12</sup> is treated as a karmelith. What is the reason? Though the general public walk through there, since they cannot proceed with ease,<sup>13</sup> it is as a karmelith. R. Zera said in Rab Judah's name: The balcony in front of the pillars is treated as a karmelith. Now, he who stated thus of [the ground] between the pillars, — how much more so the balcony!<sup>14</sup> But he who mentions the balcony-only the balcony [ranks as a karmelith], because it is inconvenient for [general] use, but not [the ground] between the pillars, which is convenient for [general] use.<sup>15</sup> Another version: but [the place] between the pillars, through which the public occasionally walk, is as public ground.

Rabbah b. Shila said in R. Hisda's name: If a brick is standing upright in the street, and one throws [an article]<sup>16</sup> and it adheres to its side, he is liable; on top, he is not liable.<sup>17</sup> Abaye and Raba both state: Providing that it is three handbreadths high, so that the public do not step on it;<sup>18</sup> but thorns and shrubs, even if not three [handbreadths] high.<sup>19</sup> Hiyya b. Rab maintained: Even thorns and shrubs, but not dung.<sup>20</sup> R. Ashi ruled: Even dung.

Rabbah, of the school of R. Shila, said: When R. Dimi came,<sup>21</sup> he said in the name of R. Johanan: No karmelith can be less than four [handbreadths square].<sup>22</sup> And R. Shesheth said: And it extends<sup>23</sup> up to ten. What is meant by, 'and it extends up to ten?' Shall we say that only if there is a partition ten [handbreadths high] is it a karmelith, not otherwise;<sup>24</sup> but is it not? Surely R. Gidal said in the

name of R. Hiyya b. Joseph in Rab's name: In the case of a house, the inside of which is not ten [hand breadths in height] but its covering makes it up to ten, it is permitted to carry on the roof over the whole [area];<sup>25</sup> but within, one may carry only four cubits!<sup>26</sup> But what is meant by 'and it extends up to ten?' That only up to ten is it a karmelith, but not higher.<sup>27</sup> And even as Samuel said to Rab Judah, Keen scholar!<sup>28</sup> In matters concerning the Sabbath do not consider<sup>29</sup> aught above ten. In what respect? Shall we say, that there is no private ground above ten? Surely R. Hisda said: If one fixes a rod in private ground<sup>30</sup> and throws [an article from the street] and it alights on the top, even if it is a hundred cubits high, he is liable, because private ground extends up to heaven!

(1) i.e., it is enclosed by a fence, wall, etc. Though the Rabbis treat it as a karmelith in so far that carrying therein is forbidden, it is nevertheless private ground by Biblical law, and carrying between it and public ground involves liability. It is in that sense that the Mishnah designates it a private domain.

(2) Se'ah is primarily a measure of capacity; by transference it is used as a surface measure on the basis that two se'ahs' seed require an area of five thousand square cubits.

(3) V. Rashi: Aliter: which is not enclosed for living purposes.

(4) 1 kor = 6 se'ahs.

(5) An enclosed place is private ground by Biblical law, whatever its size. Now, if it is attached to a dwelling (or enclosed for living purposes), e.g., a house stood in a field and then the field, upon which one of the doors of the house opens, was enclosed, it remains private ground by Rabbinical law too. But if it is not connected with a house, it is private ground only up to the area of two se'ahs; beyond that one may not carry therein by Rabbinical law. Since, however, it is private ground by Biblical law, if one throws an article into it from public ground he is liable, and to this the Mishnah quoted refers when it states that a plain is private ground.

(6) Viz., that the Mishnah means that it is a karmelith, because he prefers to explain it in accordance with 'Ulla's other dictum.

(7) That being so, why does he not accept 'Ulla's explanation?

(8) Which is definitely not a karmelith.

(9) V. p. 12, n. 9.

(10) At which stood a house the front of which the owner had thrown open to the public.

(11) When the street is very crowded.

(12) Pillars were erected in public squares or markets, upon which traders hung their wares.

(13) Lit., 'directly'. On account of the numerous pillars, which were not always in a straight line.

(14) Which is even less convenient. — The balcony was used as a stand for traders' stalls.

(15) In his opinion.

(16) Across a distance of at least four cubits.

(17) When an article lies in the street and is less than ten handbreadths high and four square it is a place of non-liability; but that is only in respect of what can be put to a well-defined, natural use; e.g., the top of a low wall or of a brick, upon which articles may be placed. But the side of a wall or a brick can only give accidental service, as in the example, and in that case everything less than ten handbreadths high is as the street itself, and so when one throws an article and after traversing four cubits it cleaves to the side of the brick, it is as though it fell in the street, and he is liable. But the top, which, as explained by Abaye and Raba, is three handbreadths high, constitutes a separate domain — a place of non-liability.

(18) Then it is not part of the street; v. preceding note. [Whether the surface area of the brick has to be four square handbreadths v. Tosaf. a.l.].

(19) Rank as a separate domain, because people avoid stepping on them.

(20) People wearing thick shoes may step upon the former; but dung is avoided.

(21) V. P. 12, n. 9.

(22) If it is, it is not a karmelith but a place of non-liability.

(23) Lit., 'takes hold'.

(24) I.e., an enclosed space less than two se'ahs in area and not attached to a house (v. p. 21, n. 7) is a karmelith only if its fencing is ten handbreadths high.

(25) The roof is ten high, and therefore private ground.

(26) Since it is unfit for a dwelling, its walls are disregarded and it ranks not as a private domain but as a karmelith (R.

Han.). This is the reverse of our hypothesis.

(27) If its top is more than ten handbreadths above ground level it is not a karmelith.

(28) Or, man of long teeth.

(29) Lit., 'be'.

(30) A rod is generally less than four handbreadths square.

## **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 7b**

But [if it means] that there is no public ground above ten,<sup>1</sup> it is our Mishnah! For 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;<sup>2</sup> if below ten, it is as though he throws it on to the ground.<sup>3</sup> Hence he must refer to a karmelith, [teaching] that there is no karmelith above ten. And [R. Dimi and R. Shesheth inform us that] the Rabbis treated it with the leniencies of both private and public ground. 'With the leniencies of private ground': that only if [it measures] four [handbreadths square] is it a karmelith, but if not it is simply a place of non-liability. 'With the leniencies of public ground': only up to ten is it a karmelith, but above ten it is not a karmelith.

[To revert to] the main text: 'R. Gidal said in the name of R. Hiyya b. Joseph in Rab's name: In the case of a house, the inside of which is not ten [handbreadths in height] but its covering makes it up to ten, it is permitted to carry on the roof thereof over the whole [area]; but within, one may carry only four cubits.' Said Abaye: But if one digs out four square [handbreadths]<sup>4</sup> and makes it up to ten, carrying over the whole is permitted. What is the reason? [The rest] is [as] cavities of a private domain, and such are [themselves] a private domain.<sup>5</sup> For it was stated: The cavities of a private domain constitute private ground. As to the cavities of a public domain,<sup>6</sup> — Abaye said: They are as public ground; Raba said: They are not as public ground.<sup>7</sup> Said Raba to Abaye: According to you who maintains that the cavities of public ground are as public ground, wherein does it differ from what R. Dimi, when he came, said in the name of R. Johanan: 'This is necessary only in respect of a corner near to the street',<sup>8</sup> — yet let it be as cavities of a public domain? — There the use thereof is inconvenient; here the use thereof is convenient.

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; if below ten, it is as though he throws it on to the ground.<sup>9</sup> Now we discussed this: why 'as though he throws it on to the ground'; surely it does not rest [there]?<sup>10</sup> And R. Johanan answered: This refers to a juicy cake of figs.<sup>11</sup> But if you maintain that the cavities of public ground are as public ground, why relate it to a juicy cake of figs; relate it to a splinter or any article and it is a case where it alighted in a cavity?—Sometimes he answered him, A splinter or any other article are different, because they fall back;<sup>12</sup> sometimes he answered him: The reference must be to a wall not possessing a cavity. — How do you know it? — Because the first clause states: If one throws above ten handbreadths, it is as though he throws it into the air. Now if you imagine that this refers to a wall with a cavity, why is it as though he throws it into the air; surely it came to rest in the cavity?<sup>13</sup> And should you answer, Our Mishnah [refers to a cavity] that is not four square, — surely did not Rab Judah say in R. Hiyya's name: If one throws [an article] above ten handbreadths and it goes and alights in a cavity of any size,<sup>14</sup> we come to a controversy of R. Meir and the Rabbis, R. Meir holding, We [imaginarily] hollow it out to complete it,<sup>15</sup> while the Rabbis maintain, We do not hollow it out to complete it.<sup>16</sup> Hence it surely follows that the reference is to a wall without a cavity. This proves it.

[To revert to] the main text: R. Hisda said: If one fixes a rod in private ground and throws [an article from the street] and it alights on the top, even if it is a hundred cubits high, he is liable, because private ground extends up to heaven'. Shall we say that R. Hisda holds with Rabbi?<sup>17</sup> For it was taught: If one throws [an object] and it alights upon a projection of whatever size; Rabbi holds him liable; the Sages exempt him!

- 
- (1) I.e., anything above ten handbreadths from ground level is not treated as public ground.
  - (2) He is not liable.
  - (3) And since it traverses four cubits, he is liable. — Why then need Samuel state it?
  - (4) I.e., he lowers the level of four square handbreadths of the ground.
  - (5) Cavities in a wall bounding private ground rank as private ground. Here, the lowered portion is true private ground, and the rest is regarded as cavities in an imaginary wall surrounding it.
  - (6) I.e., in a wall fronting a street.
  - (7) But constitute a separate domain. If four handbreadths square, they are a karmelith; if less, a place of non-liability.
  - (8) V- supra 7a, notes, it is there accounted as a karmelith.
  - (9) Mishnah, infra 100a.
  - (10) Since it must rebound at least slightly, the final distance is less than the four cubits that is the least for which a penalty is incurred.
  - (11) Which sticks.
  - (12) Lit., 'come again'. Even if they do not rebound.
  - (13) Which, if four handbreadths square, is private ground.
  - (14) I.e., less than four square.
  - (15) Where the wall is thick enough, we regard the small cavity as enlarged to four square, and liability is incurred.
  - (16) And since the Mishnah under discussion is anonymous, it reflects R. Meir's view; v. Sanh. 86a.
  - (17) That depositing upon a place four handbreadths square is not required.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 8a

— Said Abaye: In the case of private ground none differ, agreeing with R. Hisda. But here the reference is to a tree standing in private ground, while a branch inclines to the street, and one throws [an article] and it alights on the branch: Rabbi holds, We say, Cast the branch after its trunk; but the Rabbis maintain, We do not say, Cast the branch after its trunk.<sup>1</sup>

Abaye said: If one throws a bin<sup>2</sup> into the street, [even] if it is ten [handbreadths] high but not six broad, he is liable; if six broad, he is exempt.<sup>3</sup> Raba said: Even if it is not six broad, he is [still] exempt. What is the reason? It is impossible for a piece of cane not to project above ten.<sup>4</sup> If he overturns it,<sup>5</sup> mouth downwards, [and throws it], then if it is a shade more than seven [in height] he is liable; if seven and a half, he is exempt.<sup>6</sup> R. Ashi said: Even if it is seven and a half, he is liable. What is the reason? The walls are made for their contents.<sup>7</sup>

'Ulla said: If there is a column nine [handbreadths high] in the street, and the public rest and rearrange their burdens thereon,<sup>8</sup> and one throws [an object] and it alights upon it, he is liable. What is the reason? If it is less than three, the multitude step upon it;<sup>9</sup> from three to nine, they neither walk upon it nor arrange their burdens upon it;<sup>10</sup> nine, they certainly re-arrange their burdens upon it.<sup>11</sup> Abaye asked R. Joseph: What of a pit?<sup>12</sup> — He replied: The same holds good of a pit. Raba said: It does not hold good of a pit. What is the reason? Service through difficulty is not designated service.<sup>13</sup>

R. Adda b. Mattenah raised an objection before Raba: If one's basket is lying in the street, ten [handbreadths] high and four broad,<sup>14</sup> one may not move an object] from it into the street or from the street into it; but if less, one may carry; and the same applies to a pit. Surely that refers to the second clause?<sup>15</sup> — No: to the first clause.

He raised an objection:

- 
- (1) V. supra 4b for notes.
  - (2) Jast.: a large round vessel, receptacle of grain, water, etc.

- (3) A circle with a diameter of six is the least (roughly) in which a square of four can be inscribed. Now, as stated above (6a), an object four square is a separate domain itself, and no liability is incurred for throwing one domain into another.
- (4) Since it is ten handbreadths high, it is impossible that the top and bottom canes of the circumference shall be absolutely even and straight, and so something must project above ten from ground level, which is a place of non-liability, not public ground. But in order to incur liability the whole of the article thrown must rest in public ground.
- (5) Where it was less than six handbreadths broad (Rashi).
- (6) It is a principle that the walls of an object are regarded as extending beyond its opening down to the ground itself as soon as that opening comes within a shade less than three handbreadths from the ground. V. Glos. s.v. labud. Hence, when this overturned bin, which is a shade more than seven in height (and certainly if less), enters within just under three handbreadths from the ground and is regarded as already resting on the ground, the whole is within ten from the ground, and therefore he is liable. But if it is slightly taller than this it is partly above ten; hence there is no liability.
- (7) I.e., to enable it to be used as a receptacle, and not to create an imaginary extension downwards.
- (8) it being of the exact height to facilitate this.
- (9) And it is therefore part of the street.
- (10) It is too low for the latter purpose.
- (11) And since it is thus put to public use, it is part of the thoroughfare.
- (12) Nine deep.
- (13) It can only be used with difficulty; therefore it is not part of the street.
- (14) As such it is private ground; v. supra fol. 6a.
- (15) sc. o n nine handbreadths.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 8b

If one intends to take up his Sabbath abode in a public ground, and places his 'erub<sup>1</sup> in a pit above ten handbreadths, it is a valid 'erub; if below ten handbreadths, it is not a valid 'erub.<sup>2</sup> How is this meant? Shall we say, [he placed it] in a pit ten [handbreadths] in depth, and 'above' means that he raised [the bottom] and set it [the 'erub] there;<sup>3</sup> and 'below' means that he lowered it<sup>4</sup> and set it there: what is the difference between above and below? He is in one place and his erub in another!<sup>5</sup> Hence it must surely refer to a pit not ten deep,<sup>6</sup> and it is taught, it is a valid 'erub, which proves that use with difficulty is regarded as use?<sup>7</sup> Sometimes he answered him: Both he and his 'erub were in a karmelith,<sup>8</sup> and why is it called public ground? Because it is not private ground.<sup>9</sup> And sometimes he answered him: He was on public ground while his 'erub was in a karmelith, this agreeing with Rabbi, who maintained: Whatever is [interdicted] as a shebuth<sup>10</sup> was not forbidden at twilight.<sup>11</sup> And do not think that I am merely putting you off, but I say it to you with exactitude.<sup>12</sup> For we learnt: If there is a water pool and a public road traverses it, if one throws [an object] four cubits therein, he is liable. And what depth constitutes a pool? Less than ten handbreadths. And if there is a pool of water traversed by a public road, and one throws [an object] four cubits therein,<sup>13</sup> he is liable. Now, as for mentioning this pool twice, it is well; one refers to summer and the other to winter, and both are necessary. For if we were informed [this about] summer, [it might be said the reason] is because it is the practice of people to cool themselves;<sup>14</sup> but in winter I would say [that it is] not [so]. And if we were informed this of winter, [it might be id the reason] is because becoming mud-stained<sup>15</sup> it may happen that he goes down [into the water]; but in summer [I would say that it is] not [so]; thus both are necessary. But why mention traversing, twice? Hence. it must surely follow that a passage under difficulties<sup>16</sup> is regarded as a [public] passage, whereas use under difficulties is not regarded as [public] use.<sup>17</sup> This proves it. Rab Judah said: In the case of a bundle of canes: if one repeatedly throws it down and raises it,<sup>18</sup> he is not liable unless he lifts it up.<sup>19</sup>

The Master said: 'A man standing on a threshold may take [an object] from or give [it] to the master of the house, and may take an object] from or give [it] to the poor man.' What is this threshold? Shall we say, a threshold of a public road?<sup>20</sup> [How state that] he 'may take [an object] from the master of the house'? Surely he [thereby] carries [it] from private to public ground! Again, if it is a threshold of a private domain-[how state that] 'he may take [an object] from the poor man'?

Surely he [thereby] carries [it] from public to private ground? Or again if it is a threshold of a karmelith,<sup>21</sup> — [how state that] ‘he may take or give’ [implying] even at the very outset? But after all, the prohibition does exist.<sup>22</sup> Rather it must mean a threshold which is merely a place of non-liability, e.g., if it is not four [handbreadths] square. And [it is] even as what R. Dimi, when he came,<sup>23</sup> said in the name of R. Johanan: A place which is less than four square, the denizens both of public and private ground may rearrange their burdens upon it, provided that they do not exchange.<sup>24</sup>

The Master said: ‘Providing that he does not take from the master of the house and give to the poor man or the reverse, and if he does take and give [from one to the other], the three are exempt.’ Shall we say that this refutes Raba? For Raba said: if one carries an object full four cubits<sup>25</sup> in the street, even if he carries it

---

(1) V. Glos.

(2) Lit., ‘his ‘erub is an ‘erub ... his ‘erub is not an ‘erub.’ On the Sabbath one may not go more than two thousand cubits out of the town. This, however, may be extended by placing some food (called an ‘erub) at any spot within the two thousand cubits on Friday; by a legal fiction that spot becomes the Sabbath abode, since he can now eat his meal there, and from there he is permitted to walk a further two thousand cubits in any direction. This food must so be placed that it is permissible to take it on the Sabbath.

(3) E.g., he placed a small board on the bottom and the food upon it.

(4) E.g., by removing some of the earth at the bottom.

(5) The whole of that pit being ten deep, it is private ground (supra 6a), and no object in it, even if raised to the very edge, may be taken out into the thoroughfare. Hence the ‘erub is inaccessible, and therefore invalid.—‘He is in one place’ — sc. in public ground, ‘and his ‘erub in another,’-in private ground.

(6) ‘Above’ and ‘below’ referring to the bottom of the pit.

(7) For otherwise it would not be regarded as public ground.

(8) E.g., the pit was in a plain; supra fol. 6a.

(9) Cf. supra 6b.

(10) V. Glos. This includes carrying between public ground and a karmelith.

(11) On Friday, because it is doubtful whether twilight belongs to the day (Friday) or night (the Sabbath), while a shebuth itself is not a stringent prohibition. Hence he could have taken out his food at twilight, which is just the time when the ‘erub acquires that spot for him as his resting place for the Sabbath,

(12) Viz., that service with difficulty is not regarded as public use.

(13) I.e., it travels four cubits before it alights.

(14) Hence it is open for public use.

(15) Through travelling.

(16) As when the public road traverses a pool.

(17) This is deduced from the emphasis on ‘traversing’.

(18) Thus moving it: yet he does not actually lift it entirely from the ground at any moment.

(19) Lit., ‘removes it’ completely from the ground.

(20) Rashi: e.g., one leading to an alley.

(21) Being four handbreadths square but less than ten high, so that it does not rank as private ground.

(22) Of carrying between a karmelith and public or private ground, though its infringement is not punishable.

(23) V. p. 12, n. 9.

(24) Using it as a means of transport between public and private ground.

(25) Lit., ‘from the beginning of four to the end of four.’

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 9a

across [or, over] himself,<sup>1</sup> he is liable.<sup>2</sup> -There it does not come to rest [in the place of non-liability], whereas here it does.<sup>3</sup>

‘Others state, A threshold serves as two domains: if the door is open, it is as within; if the door is

shut, it is as without.<sup>4</sup> Even if it has no stake?<sup>5</sup> But R. Hama b. Goria said in Rab's name: That which lies within the opening requires another stake to permit it.<sup>6</sup> And should you answer that [the reference is to a threshold which] is not four square: surely R. Hama b. Goria said in Rab's name: That which lies within the opening, even if less than four square, requires another stake to permit it!-Said Rab Judah in Rab's name: The reference here is to the threshold of an alley, half of which [threshold] is covered and half uncovered, the covering being toward the inner side: [hence] if the door is open, it is as within; if the door is shut, it is as without.<sup>7</sup> R. Ashi said: After all, it refers to the threshold of a house, and e.g., where it is covered over with two beams, neither being four [handbreadths wide], and there are less than three [handbreadths] between them, while the door is in the middle: if the entrance is open, it is as within, if shut, it is as without.<sup>8</sup>

‘But if the threshold is ten [handbreadths] high and four broad, it is a separate domain.’ This supports R. Isaac b. Abdimi. For R. Isaac b. Abdimi said, R. Meir<sup>9</sup> used to teach: Wherever you find two domains which are really one, e.g., a pillar in private ground ten high and four broad, one may not re-arrange a burden thereon, for fear of a mound in a public domain.<sup>10</sup>

---

(1) Rashi: above his hand; i.e., through space more than ten handbreadths from the ground, which is a place of non-liability. R. Han. and Tosaf.: from the right to the left hand, i.e., across his body.

(2) On Rashi's interpretation the difficulty is obvious: carrying an object via a place of non-liability is the same as transferring it from public to private ground by way of a threshold, which is a similar place, yet Raba rules that the former imposes liability, whereas the Baraita states that the three are exempt. According to R. Han. and Tosaf. the difficulty appears to be this: when a person passes an object from one hand to another, his own body not moving, he is in a similar position to this man who stands on the threshold and takes the one and gives to the other, himself not moving, and its passing his stationary body in the former case is the same as when in the latter case it is laid down on the threshold; so, at least, one might argue. (Tosaf. a.l. s.v. **לִימָא** and in ‘Er. 98a s.v. **וְהֵאמָר**)

(3) Hence in the case posited by Raba we disregard the method of its passage and condemn him for carrying an object four cubits in the street.

(4) Rashi: this is now assumed to refer to a threshold lying at the opening of a blind alley between it and the public road. An alley was made fit for carrying by planting a stake at the side of the opening, which by a legal fiction was regarded as a complete partition stretching right across, and it is understood that this threshold is excluded from the partitioning influence of a stake, which was fixed at the inner side of the threshold. Tosaf. explains it somewhat differently.

(5) On the outer side; v. preceding note.

(6) ‘That which ... opening’ is understood to mean the threshold, it being assumed that the stake is fixed on its inner side, so that the threshold does not come within its influence and therefore it must be enclosed, as it were, and converted into private ground before carrying therein is permitted. This contradicts the Baraita.

(7) This alley was rendered fit for carrying not by a stake but by a beam across its front (v. ‘Er. 11b); and it was also furnished with a door or gate at its opening. Now, the threshold referred to here lies in front of the door, while the beam overhead covers the inner half of the threshold. If the door is open (it opened inwards) the whole threshold is counted as part of the alley, and so it is permitted; if it is closed, the threshold is shut out, and even the portion under the beam is forbidden.

(8) The entrance was covered over from above; if the cover was a single beam four handbreadths wide, everything beneath it, including the threshold, is permitted, as imaginary partitions are assumed to descend from the sides of the beam parallel to the house and enclose the entrance. But this assumption is not made when the beam is less than four in width. Again, when two beams are less than three handbreadths apart, the whole, including the space, is regarded as one, on the principle of *labud*, providing that there is nothing between them to break their imaginary unity. Now, the reference here is to a threshold in the middle of which the door is set. If this entrance is open, nothing breaks the unity above, and since the width of the two beams plus the space between is four cubits, the threshold is permitted. But if it is shut, the door coming between the two beams above forbids the assumption that they are united, and by corollary, the imaginary existence of partitions; hence the threshold remains forbidden.

(9) Who is the ‘others’ mentioned as authors of this teaching, v. *supra* p. 11, n. 3.

(10) Of the same size; since such constitutes private ground, one may not move an article from it into the street, and so even when situated in private ground it is also forbidden, lest one lead to the other.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 9b

MISHNAH. ONE MUST NOT SIT DOWN BEFORE A BARBER NEAR MINHAH<sup>1</sup> UNTIL, HE HAS PRAYED: NOR MAY HE ENTER THE BATHS OR A TANNERY, NOR TO EAT NOR FOR A LAWSUIT,<sup>2</sup> YET IF THEY BEGAN, THEY NEED NOT BREAK OFF.<sup>3</sup> ONE MUST BREAK OFF FOR THE READING OF THE SHEMA', BUT NOT FOR PRAYER.<sup>4</sup>

GEMARA. Near what minhah?<sup>5</sup> Shall we say, near the major minhah? But why not, seeing that there is yet plenty of time in the day? But if near the minor Minhah: YET IF THEY BEGAN THEY NEED NOT BREAK OFF? Shall we say that this is a refutation of R. Joshua b. Levi? For R. Joshua b. Levi said: As soon as it is time for the minhah service one may not eat<sup>6</sup> anything before he has recited the minhah service. — No. After all [it means] near the major minhah, but the reference is to a hair-cut in the fashion of Ben' Elasa.<sup>7</sup> [Similarly.] [NOR MAY HE ENTER] THE BATHS [means] for the complete process of the baths; NOR A TANNERY, for tanning on a large scale; NOR EAT at a long meal [of many courses]:<sup>8</sup> NOR FOR A LAWSUIT, at the beginning of the trial.

R. Aha b. Jacob said: After all, it refers to our mode of hair cutting and why must he not sit down [for it] at the very outset? For fear lest the scissors be broken.<sup>9</sup> [Similarly] NOR TO THE BATHS [means] merely for sweating; [and] why not [do this] in the first place? For fear lest he faint [there].<sup>10</sup> NOR A TANNERY, merely to inspect it:<sup>11</sup> [and] why not at the very outset? Lest he see his wares being spoilt, which will trouble him.<sup>12</sup> NOR TO EAT [means even] a small meal: [and] why not at the very outset? Lest he come to prolong it. NOR TO A LAWSUIT, for the end of the trial; [and] why not [enter] at the very outset? Lest he see an argument to overthrow the verdict.<sup>13</sup>

What is the beginning of a hair-cut?<sup>14</sup> — Said R. Abin: When the barber's sheet is placed on one's knees. And when is the beginning of a bath? Said R. Abin: When one removes his cloak.<sup>15</sup> And when is the beginning of tanning? When he ties [an apron] round his shoulders. And when is the beginning of eating? Rab said: When one washes his hands; R. Hanina said: When he loosens his girdle. But they do not differ: the one refers to ourselves [Babylonians]: the other to them [Palestinians].<sup>16</sup> Abaye said: These Babylonian scholars, on the view that the evening service is voluntary,<sup>17</sup> once they have undone their girdle [to eat], we do not trouble them;<sup>18</sup> but on the view that it is obligatory, do we trouble them? But what of the minhah service, which all agree is obligatory, and still we learnt, YET IF THEY BEGAN, THEY NEED NOT BREAK OFF; whereon R. Hanina said, [That means] when he loosens his girdle?

---

(1) The afternoon service.

(2) Lest he forget about the service. This refers to weekdays, and is taught here because of its similarity to the next Mishnah on 11a.

(3) For the service — providing that there will still be time when they finish.

(4) The Shema' ('hear') is the name of the Biblical passages Deut. VI, 4-9; XI, 13-21; Num. XV, 37-41 the first of which commences with that word shema' (Hear O Israel, the Lord our God the Lord is One). The 'prayer' par excellence is the 'Eighteen Benedictions.' Both the shema' and the service must be recited daily, but the former is regarded as a Biblical obligation whereas the latter is a Rabbinical institution (v. Elbogen, *Judische Gottesdienst*, 27ff; J.E. art. *Shemoneh Esreh*); hence the activities mentioned in the Mishnah must be interrupted as soon as it is time to recite the shema', even though it can be recited later, but not for the 'service.'

(5) The Talmud distinguished two times for minhah: the major, i.e., first minhah, at 12:30 p.m. and the minor, i.e., the late minhah, from 3:30 to sunset, which was calculated as at 6 p.m. but the service was not generally delayed after the minor minhah, i.e., after 3:30. V. Elbogen, *op. cit.* pp. 98ff; J. E. XVIII, 59b.

(6) Lit., 'taste'.

(7) The son-in-law of R. Judah ha-Nasi; he cropped his hair closely in the manner of the High Priest, v. Sanh. 22b. This was a long process and if one commenced it even before the major minhah he might be too late for the service.

- (8) For descriptions of long meals and short meals v. T.A. III, pp. 28f.  
 (9) And by the time another pair is procured it may be too late for the service.  
 (10) Or, be overcome by weakness.  
 (11) Even not to superintend the whole process.  
 (12) And make him forget about the service.  
 (13) Which will necessitate starting afresh.  
 (14) So that it shall be unnecessary to break it off for the service.  
 (15) I.e., when he starts undressing.  
 (16) Rashi: the Babylonians were tightly belted, so they loosened the girdle before eating; but for the Palestinians this was unnecessary. R. Han. reverses it.  
 (17) It is disputed in Ber. 27b whether the evening service is compulsory or voluntary.  
 (18) To refrain from their meal until they have prayed.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 10a

— There<sup>1</sup> drinking is rare; here it is usual.<sup>2</sup> Alternatively, as for minhah, since it has a fixed time, one is afraid<sup>3</sup> and will not come to transgress; but as for the evening service, since there is time for it all night, he is not afraid, and may come to transgress.

R. Shesheth demurred: Is it any trouble to remove the girdle<sup>4</sup> moreover, let him stand thus [ungirdled] and pray?—Because it is said, prepare to meet thy God, O Israel.<sup>5</sup> Raba son of R. Huna put on stockings and prayed, quoting, ‘prepare to meet etc.’ Raba removed his cloak,<sup>6</sup> clasped his hands and prayed, saying, ‘[I pray] like a slave before his master.’ R. Ashi said: I saw R. Kahana, when there was trouble in the world, removing his cloak, clasp his hands, and pray, saying, ‘[I pray] like a slave before his master.’ When there was peace, he would put it on, cover and enfold himself and pray, quoting, ‘Prepare to meet thy God, O Israel.’<sup>7</sup>

Raba saw R. Hamnuna prolonging his prayers.<sup>8</sup> Said he, They forsake eternal life and occupy themselves with temporal life.<sup>9</sup> But he [R. Hamnuna] held, The times for prayer and [study of the] Torah are distinct from each other. R. Jeremiah was sitting before R. Zera engaged in study; as it was growing late for the service, R. Jeremiah was making haste [to adjourn]. Thereupon R. Zera applied to him [the verse], He that turneth away from hearing the law, even his prayer is an abomination.<sup>10</sup>

When is the beginning of a lawsuit? R. Jeremiah and R. Jonah one maintains: When the judges wrap themselves round;<sup>11</sup> and the other says: When the litigants commence [their pleas]. And they do not differ: the latter means when they are already engaged in judging;<sup>12</sup> the former, when they are not already engaged in judging.

R. Ammi and R. Assi were sitting and studying between the pillars;<sup>13</sup> every now and then they knocked at the side of the door and announced: If anyone has a lawsuit, let him enter and come. R. Hisda and Rabbah son of R. Huna were sitting all day [engaged] in judgments, and their hearts grew faint,<sup>14</sup> [whereat] R. Hiyya b. Rab of Difti<sup>15</sup> recited to them, and the people stood about Moses from the morning into the evening;<sup>16</sup> now, can you really think that Moses sat and judged all day? when was his learning done? But it is to teach you, Every judge who judges with complete fairness<sup>17</sup> even for a single hour, the Writ gives him credit as though he had become a partner to the Holy One, blessed be He, in the creation.<sup>18</sup> [For] here it is written, ‘and the people stood about Moses from the morning into the evening’; whilst elsewhere it is written, and there was morning, and there was evening, one day.<sup>19</sup>

Until when must they [the judges] sit at judgment?—R. Shesheth said: Until the time of the [main] meal [of the day]. R. Hama observed, What verse [teaches this]? For it is written, Woe to thee, [ ] land, when thy king is a child, and thy princes eat in the morning! Happy art thou, [ ] land, when thy

king is the son of nobles, and thy princes eat in due season, for strength, and not for drunkenness!<sup>20</sup> [i.e.,] in the strength of the Torah and not in the drunkenness of wine.<sup>21</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: The first hour [of the day]<sup>22</sup> is the mealtime for gladiators;<sup>23</sup> the second, for robbers;<sup>24</sup> the third, for heirs;<sup>25</sup> the fourth, for labourers,<sup>26</sup> the fifth, for all [other] people. But that is not so, for R. Papa said: The fourth [hour] is the mealtime for all people?-Rather the fourth hour is the mealtime for all [other] people, the fifth for [agricultural] labourers, and the sixth for scholars. After that it is like throwing a stone into a barrel.<sup>27</sup> Abaye said: That was said only if nothing at all is eaten in the morning; but if something is eaten in the morning, there is no objection.<sup>28</sup>

R. Adda b. Ahabah said: One may recite his prayers [the Eighteen Benedictions] at the baths. An objection is raised: If one enters the baths in the place where people stand dressed,<sup>29</sup> both reading [the shema'] and prayer [the Eighteen Benedictions] are permissible, and a greeting of 'Peace'<sup>30</sup> goes without saying; and one may don the phylacteries there,<sup>31</sup> and it goes without saying that he need not remove them [if already wearing them]; in the place where people stand undressed,<sup>32</sup> a greeting of 'Peace' is not permissible there<sup>33</sup> and reading and praying goes without saying; the phylacteries must be removed, and it goes without saying that they must not be donned!-When R. Adda b. Ahabah made his statement it referred to baths in which no one is present. But did not R. Jose b. Hanina say: The baths of which they [the Rabbis] spoke are even those in which none are present; the privy closet of which they spoke<sup>34</sup> means even such as contains no excrement?-Rather, when R. Adda stated [his ruling] it was in reference to new [baths].<sup>35</sup> But surely [this is just what] Rabina propounded: What if a place is designated for a privy closet; is designation recognized or not?<sup>36</sup> and it was not solved. Now did not the same [query of his] apply to baths?<sup>37</sup> No. Perhaps

---

(1) At minhah time.

(2) It was not customary to drink much by day; but the evening meal was often prolonged through drinking; therefore, on the view that the evening service is obligatory, one must refrain from his meal even if he has removed his girdle.

(3) Careful not to overstep it.

(4) Surely you cannot maintain that by that slight act he has commenced his meal.

(5) Amos IV, 12. When it is customary to wear a girdle, it is not fitting to pray without one.

(6) Rashi: divested himself of his costly upper cloak as a mark of humility.

(7) On these preparations for prayer cf. MGWJ. 1935 Vol. 4, pp. 330f.

(8) Though the general order and contents of the service, e.g., the Eighteen Benedictions (v. Elbogen, op. cit. pp. 5, 27: צלי and צלותא refer to these) was settled, the actual text was left to each individual (ibid, pp. 41 seqq.), and R. Hamnuna may have thus prayed at great length; or perhaps this length was due to devotional intensity.

(9) They spend time in prayer which might be more usefully employed in study: the former, which is a petition for health, sustenance, etc., he called temporal life — not with great exactitude, as it also contains prayers for knowledge, repentance, and forgiveness. This is interesting as shewing the high place occupied by study as a religious observance in itself,

(10) Prov. XXVIII, 9.

(11) In their praying shawls (tallith), that they might be duly impressed with the solemnity of dispensing justice,

(12) Having started earlier with a different suit.

(13) Of the Beth Hamidrash.

(14) Rashi: they grieved at not being able to study. Or literally, because they had not eaten all day.

(15) A town probably to be identified with Dibtha, in the vicinity of Wasit on the Tigris; Obermeyer, p. 197.

(16) Ex. XVIII, 13.

(17) Lit., 'who judges a true judgment according to its truth'. V. Sanh., Sonc. ed., p. 27, n. 8.

(18) Lit., 'work of the Beginning'.

(19) Gen. 1, 5. The deduction is based on the similarity of the phrases used in both cases.-Thus, according to Rashi's first reason for their faintness (v. n. 4) he comforted them with the assurance of great reward. According to the second, he told them that they were not bound to sit and judge all day.

(20) Eccl. X, 16f.

- (21) Translating: thy princes, viz., judges, do not eat the first thing in the morning, but sit and judge until the proper time for eating.
- (22) Which was reckoned from six a.m. to six p.m.
- (23) Whose diet required special attention (Jast.); or perhaps, circus attendants.
- (24) Rashi in Pes. 12b: both are rapacious, hence they eat so early; but robbers, being awake all night, sleep during the first hour of the day.
- (25) Not having to earn a living, they can eat earlier than others.
- (26) In the field.
- (27) Rashi: no benefit is derived.
- (28) To postponing the main meal,
- (29) In the outer chamber.
- (30) ) Lit., 'enquiring after one's Peace.'
- (31) In Talmudic times these were worn all day, not only at the morning service as nowadays.
- (32) In the inner chamber.
- (33) V. infra.
- (34) In the same connection.
- (35) I.e., which had never been used, but merely (designated for baths
- (36) Does designation subject the place to the laws appertaining to a privy?
- (37) But surely he could have solved it on the latest interpretation from R. Adda's ruling.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 10b

a privy is different, because it is offensive.<sup>1</sup>

'A greeting of 'Peace' is not permissible there'. This supports the following dictum of R. Haninuna on 'Ulla's authority: A man may not extend a greeting of 'Peace' to his neighbour in the baths, because it is said, And he called it, The Lord is peace.<sup>2</sup> If so, let it also be forbidden to mention, By faith!<sup>3</sup> in a privy, for it is written, the faithful God?<sup>4</sup> And should you answer, that indeed is so: but R. Hama b. Gorias said in Rab's name, By faith! may be mentioned in a privy?-There the Name itself is not so designated, as we translate it, God is faithful; but here the Name itself is designated 'Peace,' as it is written, and he called it, The Lord is Peace.<sup>5</sup>

Raba b. Mehasia also said in the name of R. Hama b. Gorias in Rab's name: If one makes a gift to his neighbour, he must inform him [beforehand], as it is written, that ye may know that I the Lord sanctify you.<sup>6</sup> It was taught likewise: That ye may know that I the Lord sanctify you: The Holy One, blessed be He, said to Moses, I have a precious gift in My treasure house, called the Sabbath, and desire to give it to Israel; go and inform them. Hence R. Simeon b. Gamaliel said: If one gives a loaf to a child, he must inform his mother. What shall he do to him?<sup>7</sup> — Said Abaye, He must rub him with oil and paint<sup>8</sup> him with kohl.<sup>9</sup> But nowadays that we fear witchcraft what [shall be done]?<sup>10</sup> -Said R. Papa: He must rub him with the self-same kind.<sup>11</sup> But that is not so, for R. Hama son of R. Hanina said: If one makes a gift to his neighbour, he need not inform him, as it is said, and Moses did not know that the skin of his face shone by reason of his speaking with him?<sup>12</sup> — There is no difficulty: the one refers to a matter which is likely to be revealed; the other, to one which is not likely to be revealed. But the Sabbath is a matter which stood to be revealed!-Its reward did not stand to be revealed.<sup>13</sup>

R. Hisda was holding two [priestly] gifts of oxen in his hand.<sup>14</sup> Said he, 'Whoever will come and tell me a new dictum in Rab's name, I will give them to him.' Said Raba b. Mehasia to him, Thus did Rab say: If one makes a gift to his neighbour he must inform him, as it is said, 'that ye may know that I the Lord sanctify you'. Thereupon he gave them to him. Are Rab's dicta so dear to you? asked he. Yes, he replied. That illustrates what Rab said, he rejoined, A garment is precious to its wearer.<sup>15</sup> Did Rab indeed say thus! he exclaimed; I rate the second higher than the first, and if I had another

[priestly gift] I would give it to you.

Raba b. Mehasia also said in the name of R. Hama b. Goria in Rab's name: A man should never single out<sup>16</sup> one son among his other sons, for on account of the two sela's weight of silk, which Jacob gave Joseph in excess of his other sons, his brothers became jealous of him and the matter resulted in our forefathers' descent into Egypt.<sup>17</sup>

Raba b. Mehasia also said in the name of R. Hama b. Goria in Rab's name: A man should always seek to dwell in a city but recently populated, for since it is but recently populated its sins are few, as it is said, behold now, this city is near [kerobah] to flee to, and it is a little one.<sup>18</sup> What is meant by 'kerobah'? Shall we say that it is near and small? But surely they could see that for themselves! Rather [he meant,] because it has been recently populated<sup>19</sup> its sins are few. R. Abin said: What verse [supports this]? Oh, let me [na] escape thither:<sup>20</sup> the numerical value of na is fifty-one;<sup>21</sup> whereas that of Sodom is fifty-two, whilst its peace

---

(1) Hence mere designation may suffice there, yet be ineffective in respect to baths.

(2) Judg. VI, 24. The form of the greeting was 'Peace unto thee,' 'What is thy peace?'

(3) By my word! A term of asseveration,

(4) Deut. VII, 9.

(5) 'Faithful' is an adjective; 'peace' is a predicative substantive referring to God.

(6) Ex. XXXI, 13.

(7) To the child, that his mother may know.

(8) Lit., 'fill',

(9) A powder used for painting the eyelids.-His mother, seeing this, will enquire who did it, and so the child will tell her about the loaf too.

(10) The mother may think that the child was put under a spell.

(11) Of whatever he gives him.

(12) Ex. XXXIV, 29.

(13) And this Moses was bidden to do.

(14) He was a priest, v. Ber. 44a. The 'gifts' are the priestly dues, viz., the shoulder, jaws and the maw.

(15) And you, being Rab's disciple, cherish his sayings.

(16) Lit., 'distinguish'.

(17) Lit., 'and the matter was rolled on and our forefathers descended' etc.

(18) Gen. XIX, 20.

(19) Likewise expressed by kerobah.

(20) Gen. XIX, 20.

(21) Heb. נ; every letter in Hebrew is also a number.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 11a

[lasted] twenty-six [years], as it is written, Twelve years they served Chedorlaomer, and thirteen years they rebelled. And in the fourteenth year, etc.<sup>1</sup> Raba b. Mehasia also said in the name of R. Hama b. Goria in Rab's name: Every city whose roofs are higher than the synagogue will ultimately be destroyed, as it is said, to exalt the house of our God, and to repair the ruins thereof.<sup>2</sup> Yet that refers only to houses; but as for towers and turrets, we have no objection. R. Ashi said: I achieved for the town of Mehasia<sup>3</sup> that it was not destroyed.<sup>4</sup> But it was destroyed!<sup>5</sup> -It was not destroyed as a result of that sin.

Raba b. Mehasia also said in the name of R. Hama b. Goria in Rab's name: [Let one be] under an Ishmaelite but not under a 'stranger';<sup>6</sup> under a stranger but not under a Gueber;<sup>7</sup> under a Parsee but not under a scholar; under a scholar but not under an orphan or a widow.<sup>8</sup>

Raba b. Mehasia also said in the name of R. Hama b. Goria in Rab's name: Rather any complaint, but not a complaint of the bowels; any pain, but not heart pain; any ache, but not head ache; any evil, but not an evil wife! Raba b. Mehasia also said in the name of R. Hama b. Goria in Rab's name: If all seas were ink, reeds pens, the heavens parchment, and all men writers, they would not suffice to write down the intricacies of government. Said R. Mesharshia, What verse [teaches this]? The heaven for height, and the earth for depth, and the heart of kings is unsearchable.<sup>9</sup>

Raba b. Mehasia also said in the name of R. Hama b. Goria in Rab's name: Fasting is as potent against a dream as fire against tow.<sup>10</sup> Said R. Hisda: Providing it is on that very day. R. Joseph added: And even on the Sabbath.<sup>11</sup>

R. Joshua son of R. Idi chanced on the home of R. Ashi. A third grown calf<sup>12</sup> was prepared for him and he was invited, 'Master, partake somewhat.' 'I am engaged in a fast,' he replied. 'And do you not accept Rab Judah's ruling in Rab's name: One may borrow his fast and repay it?'<sup>13</sup> 'It is a fast on account of a dream,' he answered, 'and Raba b. Mehasia said in the name of R. Hama b. Goria in Rab's name: Fasting is as potent against a dream as fire against tow; and R. Hisda said, Providing it is on that very day; and R. Joseph added: And even on the Sabbath.'

YET IF THEY BEGAN, THEY NEED NOT BREAK OFF. ONE MUST BREAK OFF FOR THE READING OF THE SHEMA', [BUT NOT FOR PRAYER]. But the first clause teaches, THEY NEED NOT BREAK OFF?-The second clause refers to study.<sup>14</sup> For it was taught: If companions [scholars] are engaged in studying, they must break off for the reading of the shema', but not for prayer. R. Johanan said: This was taught only of such as R. Simeon b. Yohai and his companions, whose study was their profession; but we<sup>15</sup> must break off both for the reading of the shema' and for prayer. But it was taught: Just as they do not break off for the service, so do they not break off for the reading of the shema'?-That was taught in reference to the intercalation of the year.<sup>16</sup> For R. Adda b. Ahabah said, and the Elders of Hagraunia<sup>17</sup> recited likewise: R. Eleazar b. Zadok said: When we were engaged in intercalating the year at Yabneh,<sup>18</sup> we made no break for the reading of the shema' or prayer.

MISHNAH. A TAILOR MUST NOT GO OUT WITH HIS NEEDLE NEAR NIGHTFALL,<sup>19</sup> LEST HE FORGET AND GO OUT,<sup>20</sup> NOR A SCRIBE WITH HIS QUILL; AND ONE MAY NOT SEARCH HIS GARMENTS [FOR VERMIN, NOR READ BY THE LIGHT OF A LAMP.<sup>21</sup> IN TRUTH IT WAS SAID, THE HAZZAN<sup>22</sup> MAY SEE WHERE THE CHILDREN READ,<sup>23</sup> BUT HE HIMSELF MUST NOT READ. SIMILARLY IT WAS SAID, A ZAB MUST NOT DINE TOGETHER WITH A ZABAH,<sup>24</sup> AS IT MAY LEAD TO SIN.<sup>25</sup>

GEMARA. We learnt elsewhere: One must not stand in private ground and drink in public ground, or on public ground and drink in private ground;<sup>26</sup> but if he inserts his head and the greater part [of his body] into the place where he drinks, it is permitted;

---

(1) Ibid. XIV, 4f. During the twelve years of servitude, the thirteen of rebellion, and the fourteenth of war, they were not at peace; this leaves 26 years of peace before its destruction.

(2) Ezra IX, 9. Thus, when 'the house of our God' is exalted, the ruins are repaired; the present saying is its converse.

(3) A famous town near Sura on the Euphrates (Obermeyer, p. 188) which possessed an academy of which R. Ashi was the principal.

(4) By not permitting houses to be built higher than the Synagogue.

(5) There is evidence that Mehasia was still standing in the second half of the seventh; consequently the destruction mentioned here must have been a partial one; *ibid.* p. 290.

(6) Var. lec.: Edomite. Jast.: rather under Arabic dominion than under Byzantium.

(7) Parsee, v. Git., Sonc. ed., p. 63, n. 2.

(8) A scholar is quick to punish; and God himself punishes an affront to an orphan or widow.

(9) Prov. XXV, 3.

(10) Dreams were believed portents foreshadowing the future, though, as seen here, the evil they foretold might be averted. Cf. Ber. 55-58. B.B. 10a; Yoma 87b et passim. Though R. Meir said, 'Dreams neither help nor harm,' (Hor. 13b) we find that he was warned against a certain innkeeper in a dream (Yoma 38b).

(11) Though otherwise fasting is forbidden on the Sabbath, a dream-fast is permitted.

(12) So Rashi in 'Er. 63a.

(13) If one vows to fast, he may 'borrow,' i.e., postpone it and subsequently 'repay,' i.e., keep it later.

(14) Lit., 'words of Torah.'

(15) Who interrupt our studies for business.

(16) The Jewish year consists of twelve lunar months. As this is about eleven days shorter than the solar year, an additional month was periodically intercalated, and when the Intercalatory Board deliberated the question of prolonging the year, they did not interrupt themselves for the shema or the service.

(17) A town in immediate proximity to Nehardea on the Euphrates. By the middle of the fourth century Nehardea was already on the decline and many scholars preferred to live in Hagrunia, as shown by the phrase, the Elders (i.e., the leading scholars) of Hagrunia. Obermeyer, pp. 265-267.

(18) The famous town N.W. of Jerusalem which R. Johanan b. Zakkai made the chief academical centre and the seat of the Sanhedrin after the fall of the Jewish state in 70 C.E.

(19) Of the Sabbath.

(20) In the evening.

(21) Lest the light flickers and he tilts the lamp that the oil should flow more freely, which is forbidden on the Sabbath.

(22) Lit., 'supervisor.' In the Talmudic period the word did not denote synagogue reader, as in modern times, but was applied to various functionaries, e.g., the person who supervised children's studies in the synagogue, the beadle, the court crier, and the janitor at academical debates. Possibly the same man combined a number of these functions. V. Sot., Sonc. ed., p. 202, n. 4.

(23) V. Gemara.

(24) On zab and zabah v. Glos.

(25) Viz., intimacy, which is forbidden.

(26) On the Sabbath. He must not put his head into the other domain, lest he draw the drinking cup to himself, thus transferring an object from one domain to another.

## **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 11b**

and the same applies to a wine vat.<sup>1</sup> The scholars propounded: What of a karmelith?<sup>2</sup> -Abaye said: It is precisely the same. Raba said: That itself<sup>3</sup> is only a preventive measure.<sup>4</sup> are we to arise and enact a preventive measure<sup>5</sup> to safeguard<sup>6</sup> another preventive measure!<sup>7</sup>

Abaye said, Whence do I say it? Because it is taught, and the same applies to a wine vat. Now what is this wine vat? If private ground, it has [already] been taught: if public ground, it has [also] been taught. Hence it must surely refer to a karmelith. Raba said: 'And the same applies to a wine vat' is [stated] in reference to tithes; and R. Shesheth said likewise, 'And the same applies to a wine vat' refers to tithes. For we learnt: One may drink [wine] over the vat in [a dilution of] both hot or cold [water], and is exempt [from tithing]: this is R. Meir's view. R. Eleazar son of R. Zadok holds him liable. But the Sages maintain: For a hot [dilution] he is liable; for a cold one he is exempt, because the rest is returned.<sup>8</sup> We learnt: A TAILOR MUST NOT GO OUT WITH HIS NEEDLE NEAR NIGHTFALL, LEST HE FORGET HIMSELF AND GO OUT. Surely that means that it is stuck in his garment?<sup>9</sup> -No: it means that he holds it in his hand.<sup>10</sup> Come and hear: A tailor must not go out with a needle sticking in his garment. Surely that refers to the eve of Sabbath?-No; that was taught with reference to the Sabbath. But it was taught, A tailor must not go out with a needle sticking in his garment on the eve of the Sabbath just before sunset?-The author of that is R. Judah, who maintained, An artisan is liable [for carrying out an object] in the manner of his trade.<sup>11</sup> For it was taught: A tailor must not go out with a needle stuck in his garment, nor a carpenter with a chip behind his ear,<sup>12</sup> nor a [wool] corder with the cord in his ear, nor a weaver with the cotton<sup>13</sup> in his

ear, nor a dyer with a [colour] sample round his neck, nor a money-changer with a denar<sup>14</sup> in his ear; and if he does go forth, he is not liable, though it is forbidden: this is R. Meir's view.<sup>15</sup> R. Judah said: An artisan is liable [for carrying out an object] in the manner of his trade, but all other people are exempt. One [Baraita] taught: A zab must not go out with his pouch;<sup>16</sup> yet if he goes out he is not liable, though it is forbidden. And another taught: A zab must not go out with his pouch, and if he goes out he is liable to a sin-offering!-Said R. Joseph, There is no difficulty: the former is R. Meir; the latter R. Judah. Abaye said to him. When have you heard R. Meir [to give this ruling], in respect to something which it is not natural [to carry thus]; but have you heard him in respect to something which demands that mode [of carrying]? For should you not say so, then if an unskilled worker hollows out a measure from a log on the Sabbath, would he indeed be exempt on R. Meir's view?<sup>17</sup> Rather, said R. Hamnuna, there is no difficulty; the one refers to a zab who has had two attacks,<sup>18</sup> the other to a zab who has had three attacks.<sup>19</sup> Now, why does a zab of two attacks differ in that he is liable? [Presumably] because he requires it for examination!<sup>20</sup> But then a zab of three attacks also requires it for counting?<sup>21</sup> It holds good only for that very day.<sup>22</sup> Yet still he needs it to prevent the soiling of his garments?-Said R. Zera, This agrees with the following Tanna, who maintains, The prevention of soiling has no [positive] importance.<sup>23</sup> For we learnt: If one overturns a basin on a wall, in order that the basin be washed [by the rain], it falls within [the terms of], 'and if it [water] be put [etc.]'; if in order

---

(1) This is now assumed to mean that one must not stand in either a public or private ground, as the case may be, and drink from the vat.

(2) May one stand in public or private ground and drink in a karmelith, or vice versa?

(3) The prohibition of actually transporting an object between a karmelith and public or private ground.

(4) V. supra 6a on karmelith.

(5) Sc. the prohibition of standing in one domain and drinking in another.

(6) Lit., 'for'.

(7) Surely not.

(8) The vat is the utensil into which the expressed juice of the grapes runs, whence it descends into the pit beneath. Once it is in the pit its manufacture as wine is complete, and it is liable to tithes, before the rendering of which nothing at all may be drunk. But while it is yet in the vat its manufacture is not complete, and so a little wine may be drunk even before the rendering of the tithes. That, however, is only if it is drunk directly over the vat; if it is taken out, that action itself confers upon it the status of finished wine, and the tithes, etc., must first be given. Thus, when it is taught, 'and the same applies to a wine vat', it means that if one drinks wine from the vat, he is regarded as taking it away, unless he has his head and greater part of his body in the vat, and must render the tithes before he drinks.-Wine was not drunk neat, but diluted with water; if it is diluted with cold water, the rest can be poured back into the vat; if with hot water, it cannot, the hot mixture injuring the rest. R. Meir holds that in both cases, since he does not take it away from the vat, he can drink a little without tithing; R. Eleazar b. R. Zadok rejects this view. The Sages agree with R. Meir if it is diluted with cold water; if it is diluted with hot, since the rest cannot be returned into the vat, it is as though it were carried away, and therefore may not be drunk.

(9) Then even carrying it out on the Sabbath is only Rabbinically forbidden as a preventive measure, lest one carry in general, and yet he must also not go out before the Sabbath as a preventive measure lest he go on the Sabbath itself. Thus we have one preventive measure to safeguard another in respect to the Sabbath.

(10) This is Biblically forbidden on the Sabbath.

(11) And this is such; thus he regards it as Biblically forbidden.

(12) Rashi: this was the sign of his trade, and he wore it that he might be recognized and offered employment.

(13) Krauss in T.A. 1. p. 249 and p. 281 a.l. translates: a small distaff, carried behind the ear as an indication of a man's trade.

(14) A coin.

(15) He regards these as unnatural ways of carrying, whereas Scripture prohibits only the natural mode of any particular form of labour.

(16) To receive his discharge.

(17) Because he did not do it in a professional manner? Surely not, for if so only a skilled worker will be liable for doing

something of his own trade. Hence it must be that a person is liable for doing any labour in the manner natural to himself, and the same applies to a zab and his pouch.

(18) Lit., 'sights'-of discharge.

(19) When a zab has had three attacks he must bring a sacrifice (Lev. XV, 13-15). Consequently, after two attacks he needs this pouch to see whether he has a third (which otherwise may pass unknown to him), and since he needs it that is the natural way for him to carry it, and therefore he is liable.

(20) As in last note.

(21) After he ceases to discharge he must count seven consecutive days of cleanness, i.e., in which there is no discharge (ibid.): a single attack during this period necessitates counting afresh from the following day. Hence he too needs this pouch for that period.

(22) I.e., he is not liable only if he had the third attack on that Sabbath itself; he does not need the pouch then, as in any case he commences counting only on the next day.

(23) I.e., when a thing is done not for its own sake but to prevent something from being soiled, it is not regarded as a positive act and involves no liability.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 12a

that the wall be not damaged [by the rain], it does not fall within [the terms of] 'and if it be put [etc.]'<sup>1</sup> But how compare! There he does not want that fluid at all, whereas here he needs this pouch to receive the discharge.<sup>2</sup> This can only be compared to the second clause: If a tub<sup>3</sup> is placed so that the dripping [of water] should fall therein, the water which rebounds or overflows is not within [the meaning of] 'and if [water] be put'; but the water inside it is within [the meaning of] and if [water] be put!<sup>4</sup> -Rather, said both Abaye and Raba, There is no difficulty: the one is according to R. Judah; the other agrees with R. Simeon.<sup>5</sup>

The School of R. Ishmael taught: A man may go out with his tefillin<sup>6</sup> on the eve of Sabbath near nightfall.<sup>7</sup> What's the reason? Because Rabbah son of R. Huna said: One must feel his tefillin every now and then, [inferring] a minori from [the High Priest's] headplate. If in the case of the headplate, which contained the Divine Name<sup>8</sup> only once, yet the Torah said, and it shall always be on his forehead,<sup>9</sup> [i.e.,] his mind must not be diverted from it; then with the tefillin, which contain the Divine Name many times, how much more so! therefore he is fully cognizant thereof.<sup>10</sup>

It was taught: Hanania said: One must examine<sup>11</sup> his garments on Sabbath eve before nightfall. R. Joseph observed: That is a vital<sup>12</sup> law for the Sabbath.<sup>13</sup>

ONE MAY NOT SEARCH HIS GARMENTS [FOR VERMIN] etc. The scholars propounded: [Does this mean] , ONE MAY NOT SEARCH HIS GARMENTS by day, lest he kill [the vermin], and would this agree with R. Eliezer, (for it was taught, R. Eliezer said: If one kills vermin on the Sabbath, it is as though he killed a camel);<sup>14</sup> while ONE MAY NOT READ BY THE [LIGHT OF A LAMP, lest he tilt it? Or perhaps, both are [forbidden] lest he tilt [the lamp]?<sup>15</sup> -Come and hear: One may not search [his garments] nor read by the light of a lamp. But is it stronger than our Mishnah?<sup>16</sup> Come and hear: One may not search his garments by the light of a lamp, nor read by the light of a lamp, and these are of the halachoth stated in the upper chamber of Hananiah b. Hezekiah b. Garon.<sup>17</sup> This proves that both are on account lest he tilt [the lamp]; this proves it.

Rab Judah said in Samuel's name: [It is forbidden] even to distinguish between one's own garments and his wife's [by lamp light]. Said Raba: That was stated only of townspeople;<sup>18</sup> but those of country folk<sup>19</sup> are easily distinguished. And [even] in the case of townspeople this was stated only of old women; but those of young women are readily distinguishable. Our Rabbis taught: One must not search [his garments] in the street out of decency. In like way R. Judah-others state, R. Nehemiah-said: One must not cause himself to vomit in the street, out of decency. Our Rabbis taught: If one searches his garments [on the Sabbath] he may press [the vermin] and throw it away,

providing that he does not kill it. Abba Saul said: He must take and throw it away, providing that he does not press it. R. Huna said, The halachah is, he may press and throw it away, and that is seemly, even on weekdays. Rabbah killed them, and R. Shesheth killed them.<sup>20</sup> Raba threw them into a basin of water. R. Nahman said to his daughters, 'Kill them and let me hear the sound of the hated ones.'<sup>21</sup>

It was taught, R. Simeon b. Eleazar said: Vermin must not be killed on the Sabbath: this is the view of Beth Shammai; while Beth Hillel permit it. And R. Simeon b. Eleazar said likewise on the authority of R. Simeon b. Gamaliel: One must not negotiate for the betrothal of children [girls],<sup>22</sup> nor for a boy, to teach him the book<sup>23</sup> and to teach him a trade,<sup>24</sup> nor may mourners be comforted, nor may the sick be visited on the Sabbath:<sup>25</sup> that is the ruling of Beth Shammai; but Beth Hillel permit it.

Our Rabbis taught: If one enters [a house] to visit a sick person [on the Sabbath], he should say, 'It is the Sabbath, when one must not cry out, and recovery will soon come.' R. Meir said, [One should say] 'It [the Sabbath] may have compassion.'<sup>26</sup>

---

(1) V. Lev. XI, 38. Foodstuffs, e.g., grain, fruit, etc., cannot become unclean unless moisture has fallen upon them after being harvested; also, this moisture must be such as the owner of the foodstuffs desires. Now, in the first instance the rain was desired; hence, even if it rebounds from the basin on to the fruit, it is regarded as desired moisture, though it was not wanted for the latter, and the fruit is henceforth liable to uncleanness. But in the second it was not wanted at all, and therefore does not render the fruit liable. This proves that an action to prevent another thing from being soiled (here, to save the wall from damage) has no positive value.

(2) And precisely because he needs the pouch he should be liable.

(3) Or kneading trough.

(4) The latter is desired, and therefore if it comes into contact with fruit the fruit is liable to uncleanness, but the water that squirts or overflows is not desired. This shows that when a man's intentions are fulfilled, the action is of positive value; so here too, he carries the pouch with a definite intention, which is fulfilled. Hence he should be liable!

(5) R. Judah maintains that one is culpable for an act even if that which necessitates it is undesired; while R. Simeon holds that there is no liability for such. Thus, here the carrying of the pouch is necessitated by the discharge, but the discharge itself is certainly unwanted.

(6) V. Glos. phylacteries.

(7) In Talmudic times the phylacteries were worn all day and in the street, but not on the Sabbath.

(8) Lit., 'mention'.

(9) Ex. XXVIII, 38.

(10) And need not fear that he will go out with them after nightfall,

(11) Lit., 'feel'; to see whether there is anything attached to them or in them.

(12) Lit., 'great'.

(13) In general, steps must be taken before the Sabbath to avoid the desecration of the Sabbath.

(14) I.e., it is a complete labour, and forbidden.

(15) In which case HE MAY NOT SEARCH HIS GARMENTS at night only.

(16) The same question of interpretation arises here.

(17) V. Mishnah infra 13b.

(18) Rashi: being idle, the men wear wide garments like women's.

(19) Land workers. (11) Whose garments were more like those of men.

(20) Even on the Sabbath (Rashi).

(21) Of their death?

(22) On marrying young v. T.A. II, pp, 28f.

(23) I.e., for his elementary education. The obligation of a child's education lies primarily upon his father (Kid. 30a), and was left to him originally, public instruction being given to adults only. By the reforms of R. Simeon b. Shetah and Joshua b. Gamala elementary schools were set up for children from the age of six or seven and upwards (J. Keth VIII, ad fin.). From this passage we may conclude that the system of engaging private teachers was also in vogue in the education of girls, v. Kid., Sonc. ed., p. 141, n. 1 and Ned., p. 107, n. 2. It may be observed that only boys are referred to here.

(24) This was definitely obligatory upon the father; Kid. 29a.

(25) Both are too sad for the Sabbath.

(26) The due observance of the Sabbath will bring recovery in its wake.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 12b

R. Judah said, 'May the Omnipresent have compassion upon you and upon the sick of Israel.' R. Jose said, 'May the Omnipresent have compassion upon you in the midst of the sick of Israel.' Shebna, a citizen of Jerusalem, on entering would say 'Peace'; and on leaving, 'It is the Sabbath, when one must not cry out and healing will soon come, His compassion is abundant and enjoy the Sabbath rest in peace.' With whom does this dictum of R. Hanina agree: One who has an invalid in his house should combine him with other Jewish sick?<sup>1</sup> With whom? — With R. Jose.

R. Hanina also said: It was [only] with difficulty that comforting mourners and visiting the sick was permitted on the Sabbath.<sup>2</sup>

Rabbah b. Bar Hanah said: When we followed R. Eleazar to inquire after a sick person. sometimes he would say to him, [in Hebrew], 'The Omnipresent visit thee in peace'; at others, he said, [in Aramaic], 'The Omnipresent remember thee in peace'. But how might he do thus: did not Rab Judah say, One should never petition for his needs in Aramaic; and R. Johanan said: When one petitions for his needs in Aramaic, the Ministering Angels do not heed him, for they do not understand Aramaic?<sup>3</sup> — An invalid is different, because the Divine Presence is with him. For R. 'Anan said in Rab's name, How do you know that the Divine Presence supports an invalid? Because it is written, The Lord supports him upon the couch of languishing.<sup>4</sup> It was taught likewise: One who enters [a house] to visit the sick may sit neither upon the bed nor on a seat, but must wrap himself about<sup>5</sup> and sit in front of him,<sup>6</sup> for the Divine Presence is above an invalid's pillow, as it is said, The Lord supports him upon the couch of languishing. And Raba said in Rabin's name: How do we know that the Holy One, blessed be He, sustains the sick? Because it is said, The Lord supports him on the couch of languishing.

NOR MUST HE READ BY THE LIGHT OF A LAMP. Raba said: Even if it is as high as twice a man's stature, or as two ox-goads [height],<sup>7</sup> or even as ten houses on top of each other.<sup>8</sup>

One alone may not read, but for two [together] it is well?<sup>9</sup> But it was taught: Neither one nor two! — Said R. Eleazar, There is no difficulty: the former refers to one subject; the latter to two.<sup>10</sup> R. Huna said: But by [the light] of an open fire even ten people are forbidden.<sup>11</sup> Said Raba: If he is an important man,<sup>12</sup> it is permitted.

An objection is raised: One must not read by the light of a lamp, lest he tilt [it]. Said R. Ishmael b. Elisha, 'I will read and will not tilt.' Yet once he read and wished to tilt. 'How great are the words of the Sages!' he exclaimed, 'who said, One must not read by the light of a lamp.' R. Nathan said, He read and did tilt [it], and wrote in his note book, 'I, Ishmael b. Elisha, did read and tilt the lamp on the Sabbath. When the Temple is rebuilt I will bring a fat sin-offering.'<sup>13</sup> -R. Ishmael b. Elisha was different, since he treated himself as an ordinary person in respect to religious matters.

One [Baraita] taught: An attendant may examine glasses and plates by the light of a lamp; and another taught: He must not examine [them]! There is no difficulty: one refers to a permanent attendant, the other to a temporary one.<sup>14</sup> Alternatively, both refer to a permanent attendant yet there is no difficulty: one refers to [a lamp fed with] oil, the other to naphtha.<sup>15</sup>

The scholars propounded: What of a temporary attendant and a [lamp fed with] oil?-Rab said: There is the halachah, but we do not teach thus.<sup>16</sup> R. Jeremiah b. Abba said: There is the halachah

and we teach it so. R. Jeremiah b. Abba chanced to visit R. Assi. Now, his<sup>17</sup> attendant arose and examined [the glasses] by candlelight.<sup>18</sup> Thereupon his [R. Assi's] wife said to him [R. Assi], 'But you do not act thus!' 'Let him be,' he answered her, 'he holds with his master.'<sup>19</sup>

IN TRUTH IT WAS SAID, THE HAZZAN etc., But you say in the first clause, [HE] MAY SEE; Surely that means to read?<sup>20</sup> -No: to arrange the beginnings of the sections.<sup>21</sup> And Rabbah b. Samuel said likewise: But he may arrange the beginnings of the sections; But not the whole section?

---

(1) I.e., pray for him as one of many.

(2) Because both induce grief, which is contrary to the spirit of the Sabbath, which is 'a day of delight.'

(3) Angels were held to mediate between God and man, carrying the prayers of the latter to the Former (Tobit XII, 12, 15). This is not to be compared with prayer to or worshipping angels, from which Judaism is free. 'Not as one who would first send his servant to a friend to ask for aid in his hour of need should man apply to Michael, or Gabriel, to intercede for him; but he should turn immediately to God Himself, for 'whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be delivered'. (Joel III, 5; Yer. Ber. IX, '3a. Many Rabbinical authorities disapprove even of invoking angels as mediators, as shown by the passage quoted; v. Zunz, S P. p. 148,)

(4) Ps. XLI, 4. — Hence he does not need the angel's intercession,

(5) In a spirit of reverence.

(6) In Ned. 40a the reading is, 'upon the ground.'

(7) Probably twice the height of an ass and its saddle.

(8) Though the lamp is inaccessible and cannot be tilted, the Rabbis enacted a general measure without distinctions.

(9) This follows from the use of the singular in the Mishnah. But when two read, each may remind the other should he wish to tilt the lamp.

(10) When both are reading the same subject in the scroll, each can remind the other. But if they are occupied with different subjects, neither thinks of his companion.

(11) Each sits at a distance from the other, and any one may forget himself and stir up the fire.

(12) Who is not accustomed even on weekdays to trim the lamp.

(13) This shows that the prohibition applies even to a great man like R. Ishmael b. Elisha.

(14) The former is more careful, and may tilt the lamp to see whether there is the least grease on the crockery; hence he must not examine them by a lamp.

(15) The latter emits an unpleasant odour, and so one naturally refrains from tilting.

(16) It is permitted, but this must not be publicly diffused.

(17) R. Jeremiah's.

(18) In R. Assi's house; he was not of course a permanent attendant.

(19) The light of naphtha (or of a candle) is the same as the light of an oil-fed lamp,

(20) How then explain BUT HE HIMSELF MAY NOT READ?

(21) In ancient times the Pentateuch portion which was part of the Sabbath service was read by a number of worshippers (on Sabbaths, seven), whilst the hazzan prompted them.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 13a

An objection is raised: R. Simeon b. Gamaliel said: School children used to prepare their [Biblical] portions and read by lamplight?<sup>1</sup> — There is no difficulty: I can answer either [that it means] the beginnings of the sections; or that children are different: since they are in awe of their teacher, they will not come to tilt it.

SIMILARLY ... A ZAB MUST NOT DINE, [etc. ]. It was taught, R. Simeon b. Eleazar said: Come and see how far purity has spread in Israel! For we did not learn, A clean man must not eat with an unclean woman, but A ZAB MUST NOT DINE TOGETHER WITH A ZABAH, AS IT MAY LEAD To SIN.<sup>2</sup> Similarly, a zab, a parush<sup>3</sup> may not dine with a zab, who is an 'am ha-arez,<sup>4</sup> lest he cause him to associate with him. But what does it matter if he does cause him to associate with him? Rather say [thus]: lest he offer him unclean food to eat. Does then a zab who is a parush

not eat unclean food?<sup>5</sup> -Said Abaye: For fear lest he provide him with unfit food.<sup>6</sup> Raba said: The majority of the 'amme ha-arez do render tithes, but [we fear] lest he associate with him and he provide him with unclean food in the days of his purity.<sup>7</sup>

The scholars propounded: May a niddah<sup>8</sup> sleep together with her husband, she in her garment and he in his?<sup>9</sup> - Said R. Joseph, Come and hear: A fowl may be served together with cheese at the [same] table, but not eaten [with it]: this is Beth Shammai's view. Beth Hillel rule: It may neither be served nor eaten [together]!<sup>10</sup> -There it is different, because there are no [separate] minds.<sup>11</sup> It is reasonable too that where there are [separate] minds it is different, because the second clause teaches, R. Simeon b. Gamaliel said: Two boarders<sup>12</sup> eating at the same table, one may eat meat and the other cheese, and we have no fear.<sup>13</sup> But was it not stated thereon, R. Hanin b. Ammi said in Samuel's name: This was taught only when they do not know each other;<sup>14</sup> but if they do, they are forbidden? And here too they know each other!-How compare! There we have [separate] minds but no unusual feature;<sup>15</sup> but here there are [separate] minds and an unusual feature.<sup>16</sup>

Others state, Come and hear: R. Simeon b. Gamaliel said: Two boarders may eat at the same table, one meat and the other cheese. And it was stated thereon, R. Hanin b. Ammi said in Samuel's name: This was taught only if they do not know each other, but if they do, it is forbidden; and these two know each other! — [No.] There we have [separate] minds but nothing unusual, whereas here there are [separate] minds and an unusual feature.

Come and hear: A ZAB MUST NOT DINE TOGETHER WITH A ZABAH, LEST IT LEAD TO SIN!<sup>17</sup> — Here too there are [separate] minds but nothing unusual.

Come and hear: And hath not eaten upon the mountains, neither hath lifted up his eyes to the idols of the house of Israel, neither hath defiled his neighbour's wife, neither hath come near to a woman who is a niddah:<sup>18</sup> thus a woman who is a niddah is assimilated to his neighbour's wife: just as his neighbour's wife, he in his garment and she in hers is forbidden, so if his wife is a niddah, he in his garment and she in hers is forbidden. This proves it. Now, this disagrees with R. Pedath. For R. Pedath said: The Torah interdicted only intimacy of incestuous coition, as it is said, None of you, shall approach to any that is near of kin to him, to uncover their nakedness.<sup>19</sup>

'Ulla, on his return from the college,<sup>20</sup> used to kiss his sisters on their bosoms; others say, on their hands. But he is self-contradictory, for 'Ulla said, Even any form of intimacy is forbidden,<sup>21</sup> because we say, 'Take a circuitous route, O nazirite, but do not approach the vineyard.'<sup>22</sup> [It is taught in the] Tanna debe Eliyahu:<sup>23</sup> It once happened that a certain scholar who had studied much Bible and Mishnah<sup>24</sup> and had served scholars much,<sup>25</sup> yet died in middle age. His wife took his tefillin and carried them about in the synagogues and schoolhouses and complained to them, It is written in the Torah, for that is thy life, and the length of thy days:<sup>26</sup> my husband, who read [Bible], learned [Mishnah],

---

(1) [This proves that children may read on Friday night by lamplight? Our Mishnah affords no such proof as it could refer to children who read in disregard of the prohibition, v. Tosaf. a.l.].

(2) But there was no need to interdict the first, because even Israelites ate their food only when it was ritually clean (though under no obligation) and would not dine together with an unclean woman, sc. a niddah (v. Glos.) in any case.

(3) Lit., 'separated,' v. text note.

(4) Lit., 'people of the earth', 'the rural population'; the term is synonymous with ignoramus and law breaker, for living on the land they were only partially accessible to the teachings of the Rabbis, and in particular were negligent of ritual purity and the separation of tithes. Those who held aloof from them (separatists) were known as perushim (sing. parush), who were very particular in matters of purity and tithes; v. also Glos. s.v. haber.

(5) Whatever he eats is unclean, since his contact defiles food.

(6) I.e., food from which the priestly and Levitical dues were not rendered,

- (7) If he is a visitor, he will continue even when he becomes clean.
- (8) V. Glos.
- (9) Taking precaution to avoid all bodily contact. Intimacy, of course, is forbidden: do we fear that this may lead to it?
- (10) And the halachah is always as Beth Hillel. They may not be served lest they be eaten together, and by analogy the answer to our problem is in the negative.
- (11) There is no one to restrain the diner from eating the fowl and the cheese together. But here each may restrain the other.
- (12) Or travellers lodging at an inn.
- (13) The assumed reason is that each restrains the other.
- (14) Then one does not take from the other.
- (15) Lit., 'change'. There is nothing on the table to remind one diner that he must not eat of his neighbour's.
- (16) Viz., that they take care to avoid all bodily contact.
- (17) And the same applies here.
- (18) Ezek. XVIII, 6.
- (19) Lev. XVIII, 6. 'Incest' in the Talmud includes adultery.-The same applies to a niddah.
- (20) The term Be Rab denotes either the great Academy founded by Rab or college in general.
- (21) With consanguineous relations, such as a sister.
- (22) A nazirite must not eat grapes or drink wine (v. Num. VI, 1-3); as a precaution he is forbidden even to approach a vineyard. The same reasoning holds good here.
- (23) This is the Midrash consisting of two parts, 'Seder Eliyahu Rabbah' and 'Seder Eliyahu Zuta'. According to the Talmud Keth. 106a the Prophet Elijah taught this Midrash, the Seder Eliyahu, to R. 'Anan, a Babylonian amora of the third century. Scholars are agreed that the work in its present form received its final redaction in the tenth century C.E., though they are not agreed as to where it was written. V. Bacher, Monatschrift, XXIII, 267 et seqq.; in R.E.J. XX, 144-146; Friedmann, introduction to his edition of Seder Eliyahu.
- (24) Kara refers to the study of the Bible; shanah to the study of the Mishnah.
- (25) 'Serving scholars', i.e., being in personal attendance on scholars, was one of the requisites of an academical course.
- (26) Deut. XXX, 20.

## **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 13b**

and served scholars much, why did he die in middle age? and no man could answer her. On one occasion I<sup>1</sup> was a guest at her house,<sup>2</sup> and she related the whole story to me. Said I to her, 'My daughter! how was he to thee in thy days of menstruation?' 'God forbid!' she rejoined; 'he did not touch me even with his little finger.' 'And how was he to thee in thy days of white [garments]?'<sup>3</sup> 'He ate with me, drank with me and slept with me in bodily contact, and it did not occur to him to do other.' Said I to her, 'Blessed be the Omnipresent for slaying him, that He did not condone on account of the Torah!<sup>4</sup> For lo! the Torah hath said, And thou shalt not approach unto a woman as long as she is impure by her uncleanness.'<sup>5</sup> When R. Dimi came,<sup>6</sup> he said, It was a broad bed. In the West [Palestine] they said, R. Isaac b. Joseph said: An apron interposed between them.<sup>7</sup> MISHNAH. AND THESE ARE OF THE HALACHOTH WHICH THEY STATED IN THE UPPER CHAMBER OF HANANIAH B. HEZEKIAH B. GARON, WHEN THEY WENT UP TO VISIT HIM. THEY TOOK A COUNT, AND BETH SHAMMAI OUTNUMBERED BETH HILLEL.; AND ON THAT DAY THEY ENACTED EIGHTEEN MEASURES.<sup>8</sup>

GEMARA. Abaye said to R. Joseph: Did we learn, THESE ARE or AND THESE ARE? Did we learn AND THESE ARE [viz.] those that we have stated [in the former Mishnah]; or did we learn THESE ARE [viz.] those that are to be stated soon?<sup>9</sup> -Come and hear: One may not search his garments by the light of a lamp, nor read by the light of a lamp; and these are of the halachoth stated in the upper chamber of Hananiah b. Hezekiah b. Garon. This proves that we learnt, AND THESE ARE;<sup>10</sup> this proves it.

Our Rabbis taught: Who wrote Megillath Ta'anith?<sup>11</sup> Said they, Hananiah b. Hezekiah and his

companions, who cherished their troubles.<sup>12</sup> R. Simeon b. Gamaliel observed: We too cherish our troubles, but what can we do? For if we come to write [them down], we are inadequate.<sup>13</sup> Another reason is: a fool is not assailed.<sup>14</sup> Another reason: the flesh of the dead does not feel the scalpel. But that is not so, for did not R. Isaac say, Worms are as painful to the dead as a needle in the flesh of the living, for it is said, But his flesh upon him hath pain, And his soul within him mourneth?<sup>15</sup> Say: The dead flesh in a living person does not feel the scalpel.

Rab Judah said in Rab's name: In truth, that man, Hananiah son of Hezekiah by name, is to be remembered for blessing:<sup>16</sup> but for him, the Book of Ezekiel would have been hidden,<sup>17</sup> for its words contradicted the Torah.<sup>18</sup> What did he do? Three hundred barrels of oil were taken up to him and he sat in an upper chamber and reconciled<sup>19</sup> them.

AND ON THAT DAY THEY ENACTED EIGHTEEN MEASURES. What are the eighteen measures?—For we learnt: The following render terumah unfit:<sup>20</sup> one who eats food of the first degree or the second degree, or who drinks unclean liquid;<sup>21</sup> one who enters with head and the greater part of his body into drawn water;<sup>22</sup> a clean person upon whose head and the greater part of his body there fell three logs<sup>23</sup> of drawn water; a Book;<sup>24</sup> one's hands;<sup>25</sup> a tebul yom;<sup>26</sup> and food or utensils which were defiled by a liquid.<sup>27</sup>

which Tanna [holds that] one who eats food of the first or of the second degree [merely] renders unfit

---

(1) Elijah, the supposed author of the Tanna debe Eliyahu; v. n. 1.

(2) Elijah was believed to visit the earth and speak to people.

(3) When a middah's discharge ceased, she donned white garments and examined herself for seven consecutive days, which had to pass without any further discharge of blood before she became clean. During this time she was forbidden to her husband.

(4) He showed no unfair favoritism because of the man's learning.

(5) Lev. XVIII, 19.

(6) V. p. 12, n. 9.

(7) But they were not actually in bodily contact.

(8) Scholars are divided as to when this took place. Z. Frankel, *Darke ha-Mishnah* assigns it to the beginning of the division of the two schools. Graetz maintains that it took place about four years before the destruction of the Temple; Weiss favours the last generation before the destruction, not long after the death of Agrippa I. V. also Halevi, *Doroth*, 1, 3, 580 seq.

(9) Lit., 'before us'. The actual eighteen were forgotten in course of time—hence Abaye's question.

(10) Since the halachoth quoted are given in the previous Mishnah.

(11) 'The scroll of fasting', containing a list of the days on which fasting is forbidden. Thirty five days are listed; on fourteen public mourning was forbidden, whilst fasting was prohibited on all. V. J.E. VIII, 427.

(12) I.e., the days of victorious release from their troubles, and declared the minor festivals.

(13) Every day marks the release from some trouble.

(14) I.e., he does not perceive the troubles which surround him. So we too do not perceive our miraculous escapes.

(15) Job XIV, 22.

(16) Lit., 'for good'.

(17) The technical term for exclusion from the Canon'

(18) E.g. Ezek. XLIV, 31; XLV, 20, q.v.

(19) Lit., 'expounded them'.

(20) For terumah v. Glos. 'Unfit' denotes that it may not be eaten on account of defilement, but does not defile any other terumah by its contact; 'unclean' denotes that it defiles other food too by its touch.

(21) Various degrees of uncleanness are distinguished. The greatest of all is that of a human corpse, called the prime origin (lit., 'father of fathers') of uncleanness; this is followed in successively decreasing stages by 'origin' (lit., 'father') of uncleanness, first, second, third and fourth degrees of uncleanness. When an object becomes unclean through contact

with another, its degree of defilement is one stage below that which defiles it. By Biblical law unclean food or drink does not defile the person who eats it; but the Rabbis enacted that it does, and so he in turn renders terumah unfit by contact.-Ordinary unsanctified food (hullin) does not proceed beyond the second degree; i.e., if second degree hullin touches other hullin the latter remains clean; but if it touches terumah, it becomes a third degree. Again, terumah does not go beyond the third degree (hence it is then designated 'unfit', not 'unclean' in respect of other terumah); but if it touches flesh of sacrifices (hekdesch) it renders this unfit, and it is called 'fourth degree'.

(22) Water which had passed through a vessel, as opposed to 'living water', i.e., well water, river water, or rain water collected in a pit.

(23) 1 log = 549.4 cu.centimetres; v. J.E. Weights and Measures.

(24) Any of the Books of the Bible.

(25) Before washing.

(26) V. Glos.

(27) All these render terumah unfit-they are all discussed in the Gemara.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 14a

but does not defile?<sup>1</sup> -Said Rabbah b. Bar Hanah, It is R. Joshua. For we learnt: R. Eliezer said: One who eats food of the first degree is [himself defiled in] the first degree; of the second degree, is [defiled in] the second degree, of the third degree, is [defiled in] the third degree.<sup>2</sup> R. Joshua said: One who eats food of the first or of the second degree is [defiled in] the second degree;<sup>3</sup> of the third degree, [he enters] the second degree in respect of hekdesch,<sup>4</sup> but not in respect of terumah,<sup>5</sup> this referring to hullin subjected to the purity of terumah.<sup>6</sup>

When one eats food of the first or of the second degree, why did the Rabbis decree uncleanness in his case? Because one may sometimes eat unclean food [hullin] and take a liquid of terumah and put it in his mouth and thus render it unfit.<sup>7</sup> When one drinks unclean liquid, why did the Rabbis decree uncleanness in his case?-Because he may sometimes drink unclean liquid and take food of terumah and put it in his mouth, and thus render it unfit. But it is the same thing!<sup>8</sup> -You might argue, The first is usual but not the second:<sup>9</sup> therefore he informs us [that it is not so]. And one who comes with his head and the greater part of his body [into drawn water], why did the Rabbis decree uncleanness in his case?-Said R. Bibi in R. Assi's name: Because originally people performed tebillah<sup>10</sup> in collected pit water, which was stagnant [noisome], and so they poured drawn water upon them selves.<sup>11</sup> [But when] they began to make this a fixed [law], the Rabbis imposed uncleanness thereon. What is meant by 'a fixed [law]?' Abaye said: They maintained, Not this [pit water] purifies, but both together purify. Said Raba to him, Then what did it matter, seeing that they did perform tebillah in this [the pit water]? But, said Raba, they maintained, Not this [the pit water] purifies but that [the drawn water].<sup>12</sup>

And a clean person upon whose head and the greater part of his body there fell three logs of drawn water, why did the Rabbis decree uncleanness in his case? For if not this, the other would not stand.<sup>13</sup>

And why did the Rabbis impose uncleanness upon a Book? Said R. Mesharsheya: Because originally food of terumah was stored near the Scroll of the Law, with the argument, This is holy and that is holy.<sup>14</sup> But when it was seen that they [the Sacred Books] came to harm,<sup>15</sup> the Rabbis imposed uncleanness upon them.<sup>16</sup> 'And the hands'?-Because hands are fidgety.<sup>17</sup> It was taught: Also hands which came into contact with a Book<sup>18</sup> disqualify terumah, on account of R. Parnok['s dictum]. For R. Parnok said in R. Johanan's name: One who holds a Scroll of the Law naked<sup>19</sup> will be buried naked. 'Naked!' can you really think so? Rather said R. Zera, [It means] naked without good deeds.<sup>20</sup> 'Without good deeds!' can you really think so?<sup>21</sup> Rather say, naked, without that good deed [to his credit].<sup>22</sup> Which was first enacted? Shall we say that the former was first enacted?<sup>23</sup>

- (1) 4. P. 55, n. 5.
- (2) Hence, when he eats defiled food in the first degree, he defiles terumah, not merely renders it unfit (v. p. 55, nn. 5, 6).
- (3) Hence in both cases he merely renders terumah unfit.
- (4) Flesh of sacrifices.
- (5) If he touches hekdesh he defiles it in the third degree, being regarded himself as second degree in respect thereto; but he does not affect terumah at all.
- (6) People (particularly perushim, v. p. 51, n. 1) voluntarily treated hullin as terumah; then it could become unfit in the third degree, but not otherwise (v. p. 55, n. 6), and this is the only way in which it is possible for a person to eat hullin of the third degree, v. Hul. 33b.
- (7) For it may touch the food still in his mouth. Unfit terumah may not be eaten.
- (8) Both being based on the same reason, the second is a corollary of the first and need not be stated.
- (9) So that a Rabbinical measure is not required in the second case.
- (10) I.e., took a ritual bath to be purified of defilement.
- (11) The correct reading appears to be: three logs of drawn water; v. Marginal Gloss to cur. edd.
- (12) This would lead to the neglect of proper tebillah.
- (13) A general measure had to be enacted that three logs of drawn water defiled a person, whether it came upon him by his intention or accidentally. Had the Rabbis drawn a distinction, the former too would have remained unobserved.
- (14) Hence it is fitting that they be placed together.
- (15) The food attracted mice, which naturally injured the Books too.
- (16) To put an end to the practice.
- (17) They are active and apt to touch things. Hence unless their owner has taken care that they should not touch a ritually unclean object after he washed them, they are treated as unclean.
- (18) Lit., 'which come on account of a Book.'
- (19) Without its wrapping.
- (20) ) As though he had never performed a good deed or fulfilled a precept.
- (21) Surely that act does not nullify all his meritorious deeds!
- (22) If he took it for Study or to wrap it up after the public reading likewise a 'good deed'-it is not accounted to him (Tosaf.). Tosaf. also observes that presumably this applies to any of the Books of the Bible.-The reference is to the actual parchment; but there is no objection to the modern practice of elevating the uncovered Scroll whilst holding it by the rollers on which it is wound. The Sephardi Jews, i.e., the descendants of the Spanish Jews, have the entire parchment of the Scroll from end to end shielded with silk or cloth.
- (23) Viz., that hands in general are unclean.

## **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 14b**

But since this was first enacted, why was the other too needed?-Rather the latter was first decreed, and then it was enacted in respect of all hands.

'And a tebul yom.' But the law of tebul yom is Biblical, for it is written, and when the sun is down, he shall be clean; [and afterwards he shall eat of the holy things,<sup>1</sup> i.e., terumah]?-Delete tebul yom from here.

'And food which was defiled through liquid'. Through liquid of which [uncleanness]?<sup>2</sup> Shall we say, through liquid which was defiled by a [dead] reptile:<sup>3</sup> then its law is Biblical,<sup>4</sup> for it is written, and all drink that may be drunk [in every such vessel shall be unclean]<sup>5</sup> \_ Rather it means through liquid defiled by the hands, and it is a preventive measure on account of liquid defiled by a reptile.<sup>6</sup>

'And vessels which were defiled by liquid'. Vessels which were defiled by liquid of which [uncleanness]?<sup>7</sup> Shall we say, By the liquid of a zab? But that is Biblical, for it is written, and if the zab spit upon him that is clean; [then he shall wash his clothes, and bathe himself in water],<sup>8</sup> [meaning] what is in the clean man's hand have I declared unclean unto thee!<sup>9</sup> Rather it refers to

liquid defiled by a reptile, and it is a preventive measure on account of the fluid of a zab.<sup>10</sup>

‘And the hands’. Did then the disciples of Shammai and Hillel<sup>11</sup> decree this: [Surely] Shammai and Hillel [themselves] decreed it! For it was taught, Jose b. Jo’ezer of Zeredah<sup>12</sup> and Jose b. Johanan of Jerusalem<sup>13</sup> decreed uncleanness in respect of the country of the heathens and glassware.<sup>14</sup> Simeon b. Shetah instituted the woman's marriage settlement<sup>15</sup> and imposed uncleanness upon metal utensils.<sup>16</sup> Shammai and Hillel decreed uncleanness for the hands. And should you answer, [It means] Shammai and his band and Hillel and his band [of scholars];<sup>17</sup> surely Rab Judah said in Samuel's name: They enacted eighteen measures, and they differed on eighteen measures,<sup>18</sup> whereas Hillel and Shammai differed only in three places; for R. Huna said, in three places they differed, and no more! And should you answer, They [Hillel and Shammai] came and decreed that it be suspended,<sup>19</sup> while their disciples came and decreed that it be burnt;<sup>20</sup> surely Ilia said: The original decree concerning hands was for burning?-Rather, they [Hillel and Shammai] came and decreed it, yet it was not accepted from them; then their disciples came and decreed, and it was accepted from them.<sup>21</sup>

But still, Solomon decreed it? For Raba Judah said in Samuel's name, When Solomon instituted ‘erubin<sup>22</sup> and the washing of the hands, a Heavenly Echo came forth and declared, ‘My son, if thine heart be wise; My heart shall be glad, even mine’;<sup>23</sup> and ‘My son, be wise, and make my heart glad, That I may answer him that reproacheth me’?<sup>24</sup>

---

(1) Lev. XXII, 7.

(2) I.e., how did this liquid itself become unclean?

(3) Lit., ‘which come on account of a reptile’.

(4) Sc. that this food disqualifies terumah.

(5) Ibid. XI, 34. Though that refers to a liquid defiled through an earthenware vessel, the Talmud deduces in Pes. 18b that the same holds good if it is defiled by a reptile. Now, the latter is original (‘father of’) uncleanness; the fluid is first degree, and the food is second degree, and therefore it renders terumah the third degree, i.e., unfit (v. p. 55, n. 6), and all this is Biblical law, not a Rabbinical enactment.

(6) The latter is Biblical; but if the former were not declared unclean, it would be thought that the latter is not unclean either.

(7) How did the liquid itself become unclean?

(8) Ibid. XV, 8.

(9) This interpretation is not really germane to the difficulty which arises directly from the verse; v. Rashi. Since the clothes are to be washed etc., the saliva must rank as original (‘father of’) uncleanness, for only such defiles garments and man. The vessels therefore defiled by the saliva (or any fluid emanating from a zab) are unclean in the first degree, and defile terumah by Biblical law.

(10) The former is unclean in the first degree, and by Biblical law does not (defile vessels (v. previous note); nevertheless the Rabbis enacted that it shall defile vessels, which in turn render terumah unfit, lest it might be confused with the fluid of a zab, which will also be held incapable of defiling vessels.

(11) As is implied by the terms Beth Shammai, Beth Hillel.

(12) A town in Persia; Neub. Geogr. p. 275.

(13) Two Rabbis of the early Maccabean period (second century B.C.E.); together they formed the beginning of the Zugoth (duumvirate) which governed Jewish religious life until Hillel and Shammai. It may be observed that the title ‘Rabbi’ is not prefixed to their names: the famous letter of Sherira Gaon to Jacob b. Nissim, quoted by Nathan b. Jehiel in the Aruk (s.v. declares that this title dates from the time of R. Johanan b. Zakkai only.

(14) The former, to stem the emigration of Jews from Palestine consequent upon the troublous times of the Maccabees; and the latter probably because glassware was manufactured in those countries, or because they learnt at that time that its manufacture was similar to that of earthenware; Weiss, Dor. 1, 105

(15) When a woman married, she brought a dowry to her husband, which was returnable if he divorced her. Originally the security for the return of the dowry was deposited with her father. This went through a number of changes until Simeon b. Shetah enacted that the husband should trade with the dowry and mortgage all his effects for its repayment,

the purpose being to make divorce more difficult. This is the meaning of the present passage, not that he actually instituted the marriage settlement itself, J, Keth. end of chapter VIII, and Weiss, Dor. 1, 144 and note a.l.

(16) This is discussed below,.

(17) I.e., enacted the eighteen measures.

(18) I.e., these eighteen measures which they enacted jointly were originally subjects of controversy between them (Rashi).

(19) I.e., that the hands are only suspected of uncleanness, and if they touch terumah it is 'suspended', and may neither be eaten, as clean, nor burnt as unclean.

(20) Ruling that the hands are definitely unclean, not merely suspected.

(21) The need for renewing some of the early Rabbinical enactments, to which reference is made in the present discussion, arose through the interdict which the Sadducees laid upon their observance; Weiss, Dor, I, 143f; cf. Halevi, Doroth, I, 3, pp. 584 seq.

(22) V, Glos. and p. 18, n. 7.

(23) Prov. XXIII, 15.

(24) Ibid. XXVII, 11.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 15a

— Solomon came and decreed in respect of holy things,<sup>1</sup> while they came and instituted [it] in respect of terumah.

[To revert to] the main text: 'Rab Judah said in Samuel's name: They enacted eighteen measures, and differed in eighteen 'But it was taught: They were in agreement?-On that day they differed and [only] on the morrow were they in agreement.'<sup>2</sup>

[To revert to] the main text: R. Huna said: In three places Shammai and Hillel differed: Shammai said: Hallah<sup>3</sup> is due from a kab [of flour]; Hillel said: From two kabs: but the Sages ruled neither as the one nor as the other, but a kab and a half is liable to hallah. When the measures were enlarged, they said, Five quarters of flour are liable to hallah. R. Jose said: [Exactly] five are exempt; just over five are liable.<sup>4</sup>

And the second?-Hillel said: A hin full of drawn water renders a mikweh unfit. (For one must state [a dictum] in his teacher's phraseology. Shammai maintained: nine kabs). But the Sages ruled neither as one nor as the other, until two weavers<sup>5</sup> came from the dung gate of Jerusalem and testified on the authority of Shemaiah and Abtalion that three logs of drawn water render a mikweh unfit, and the Sages ratified their words.<sup>6</sup>

And the third?-Shammai said: All women, their time suffices them; Hillel maintained: From examination to examination; but the Sages ruled neither as the one nor as the other, but a full day<sup>7</sup> reduces [the time] between examination and examination, and [the time] between examination and examination reduces a full day.<sup>8</sup> And are there no more? But there is [this]: Hillel said: One shall lay [hands]; while Shammai ruled that one must not lay [hands]?<sup>9</sup> — R. Huna spoke only of those concerning which there is no dispute of their teachers in addition.<sup>10</sup> But there is also [this:] When one vintages [grapes] for the vat [i.e., to manufacture wine], Shammai maintains: It is made fit [to become unclean]; while Hillel ruled: It is not made fit.<sup>11</sup> — That is excepted, for there Hillel was silenced by Shammai'.<sup>12</sup>

'Jose b. Jo'ezer of Zeredah and Jose b. Johanan of Jerusalem decreed uncleanness in respect of the country of the heathens and glassware.' But the Rabbis of the 'eighty years' decreed this? For R. Kahana said, When R. Ishmael son of R. Jose fell sick, they [the Rabbis] sent [word] to him, 'Rabbi, Tell us the two or three things which you stated [formerly] on your father's authority.' He sent back, 'Thus did my father say: One hundred and eighty years before the destruction of the Temple the

wicked State [sc. Rome] spread over Israel.<sup>13</sup> Eighty years before the destruction of the Temple uncleanness was imposed in respect of the country of heathens and glassware. Forty years before the destruction of the Temple the Sanhedrin went into exile<sup>14</sup> and took its seat in the Trade Halls.<sup>15</sup> (in respect to what law [is this stated]?-Said R. Isaac b. Abdimi, To teach that they did not adjudicate in laws of fines.<sup>16</sup> 'The laws of fines' can you think so!<sup>17</sup> But say: They did not adjudicate in capital cases.<sup>18</sup> ) And should you answer, They [Jose b. Jo'ezer and Jose b. Johanan] flourished during these eighty years too: surely it was taught: Hillel and Simeon [his son], Gamaliel and Simeon wielded their Patriarchate during one hundred years of the Temple's existence;<sup>19</sup> whereas Jose b. Jo'ezer of Zeredah and Jose b. Johanan were much earlier!<sup>20</sup>

---

(1) That the hands must be washed before eating e.g., flesh of sacrifices.

(2) V. Halevi, *Doroth*, 1, p. 600 for a discussion of a variant which he considers correct.

(3) V. *Glos*.

(4) 1 kab = four logs = 2197.4 cu.cm. The controversy centres on the interpretation of 'your dough' in Num. XV, 20. The Talmud does not state when the measures were enlarged, but the enlargement was by one fifth, i.e., one 'Sepphoric' log (which was the name of the new measure) == one and one fifth Jerusalem log, as the old one was called; v. 'Ed., *Sonc. ed.*, p. 2, n. 3.

(5) V. Halevi, *op. cit.*, p. 122, n. 59.

(6) A mikweh (v. *Glos*.) must be filled with 'living' water, as opposed to 'drawn' water, i.e., water drawn in vessels, and it must contain not less than forty se'ahs. The controversy refers to the quantity of drawn water which, if poured into the mikweh before it contains forty se'ahs of 'living' water, renders it unfit. The hin is a Biblical measure, equal to twelve logs. The passage 'for one must state (a dictum) in his teacher's phraseology' is difficult, and various interpretations have been advanced. They are discussed by Halevi in *Doroth*, 1, 3, 95-7, who explains it thus: The teachers referred to are not Shemaiah and Abtalion, Hillel's masters in Palestine, but his Babylonian teachers (unnamed). Now hin is not the usual Mishnaic term but Biblical. This, however, was sometimes preferred to Babylonian because it was constant, whereas the Babylonian measure varied in different places (cf. J. E. XIII, 488 s:v. Cab.). Thus Hillel said a hin full instead of twelve logs, in order to be faithful to his teacher's phraseology. V. 'Ed., *Sonc. ed.*, p. 2 notes.

(7) Lit., 'from time to time', the technical phrase for a twenty-four hour day.

(8) A menstruous woman defiles whatever food she touches. Shammai maintains that this is only from when she discovers her discharge, but not retrospectively. Hillel holds that since her discharge may have been earlier, though she has only now observed it, her uncleanness is retrospective to when she last examined and found herself clean. Thus Shammai said, Their time, sc. when they actually find that they are unclean, suffices them and it has no retrospective effects; whilst Hillel rules, They are retrospectively unclean from the present examination to the last. The Sages make a compromise: she is retrospectively unclean for twenty-four hours or from the last examination, whichever is less. V. 'Ed., *Sonc. ed.*, p. 1 notes.

(9) When a man brings a freewill-offering, part of the ritual consists in his laying hands upon the head of the animal (v. Lev. I, 4; III, 2, 8). The dispute refers to festivals.

(10) This matter was disputed by Shammai and Hillel's predecessors too; v. Hag. 16a. For the importance of this particular question v. Frankel, *Darke ha-Mishnah*, p. 44; Weiss, *Dor. I*, 104.

(11) V. P. 45, nn. 1, 4; the same applies to grapes. Now, if the grapes are to be eaten, the liquid they exude whilst being gathered does not subject them to uncleanness, since their owner is displeased therewith. But when they are vintaged for wine they differ; V. *infra* 17a for the full discussion.

(12) I.e., he was unable to refute his proofs and accepted Shammai's ruling.

(13) Judea appears to have entered into official relations with Rome for the first time in 161 B.C.E. at the instance of Judas Maccabeus; Margolis and Marx, *Jewish History*, p. 145. But the first step which laid Judea under subjection of Rome was the quarrel of Hyrcanus II and Aristobulus II over the throne, when both brothers appealed to Pompey (c. 66 C.E). A date midway between these two is given here (110 B.C.E.) which may be assumed as merely approximate. This corresponds roughly to the death of Hyrcanus I in 106 B.C.E.

(14) I.e., they forsook their locale in the Chamber of Hewn Stones in the Temple.

(15) A place on the Temple Mount Hannuth, v. *Sanh.*, *Sonc. ed.*, p. 267, n. 11.

(16) E.g., the fine for seduction, Deut. XXII, 29.

(17) Any court in Palestine consisting of ordained judges was competent to adjudicate in laws of fine, whatever its

locale.

(18) V. Krauss, *op. cit.*, pp. 23f.

(19) I.e., Hillel commenced his Patriarchate a hundred years before the destruction of the Temple, and he was followed by Simeon, Gamaliel and Simeon, his direct descendants, the four spreading over that century. V, Halevi, Doroth, I, 3, pp. 706 seq.

(20) V. P. 59, n. 4.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 15b

Rather say they came and decreed in respect to a clod, that it be burnt,<sup>1</sup> but nothing at all in respect to the atmosphere;<sup>2</sup> while the Rabbis of the eighty years came and decreed in respect to the atmosphere that it [terumah] be suspended.<sup>3</sup> Shall we say that the original enactment was for burning? Surely Ilfa said: The original decree concerning hands was for burning. Thus, only concerning hands was the original decree for burning, but concerning nothing else?—Rather say they came and decreed in respect to a clod, that it be suspended, and nothing at all in respect to the atmosphere; and then the Rabbis of these eighty years came and decreed in respect to a clod that it be burnt and in respect to the atmosphere that it be suspended. Yet still, that<sup>4</sup> was decreed in Usha?<sup>5</sup> For we learnt: Terumah is burnt on account of six doubtful cases [of uncleanness]: — [i] The doubt of Beth ha-Peras;<sup>6</sup> [ii] The doubt of earth which comes from the land of the heathens;<sup>7</sup> [iii] The doubt attached to the garments of an 'am ha-arez;<sup>8</sup> [iv] the doubt of vessels which are found;<sup>9</sup> [v] doubtful saliva;<sup>10</sup> and [vi] the doubtful human urine near cattle urine.<sup>11</sup> On account of their certain contact, which is doubtful defilement, terumah is burnt.<sup>12</sup> R. Jose said: It is burnt even on account of their doubtful contact in a private domain.<sup>13</sup> But the Sages maintain: [If there is doubtful contact] in a private domain we suspend it; in public ground, it [the terumah] is clean. Now 'Ulla observed, These six cases of doubt were enacted at Usha!<sup>14</sup> -Rather say they [Jose b. Jo'ezer and Jose b. Johanan] came and decreed suspense in respect of a clod and nothing at all in respect of atmosphere; then the Rabbis of the eighty years came and decreed suspense in both cases; then they came at Usha and decreed burning in respect of a clod, and as to the atmosphere they left it in status quo.

Why did the Rabbis impose uncleanness upon glassware? — Said R. Johanan in the name of Resh Lakish, Since it is manufactured from<sup>15</sup> sand, the Rabbis declared it the same as earthenware.<sup>16</sup> If so, let them be incapable of purification in a mikveh?<sup>17</sup> Why then did we learn, And the following interpose in utensils: pitch and myrrh gum in the case of glass vessels?<sup>18</sup> -The circumstances here<sup>19</sup> are e.g., they were perforated, and molten lead was poured into them, this agreeing with R. Meir, who maintained, Everything depends on the support.<sup>20</sup> For it was taught: If glass vessels are perforated and [molten] lead is poured into them,—said R. Simeon b. Gamaliel: R. Meir declares them unclean, while the Sages declare them clean.<sup>21</sup> If so,<sup>22</sup>

---

(1) Sc. terumah which came into contact with a clod of earth from the 'land of the heathens', as something definitely unclean.

(2) When terumah enters the atmosphere of the 'land of the heathen' with nothing intervening between it and the ground.

(3) On 'suspended' v. p. 60, n. 2

(4) The enactment of burning in respect to a clod.

(5) A city in Galilee, near Sepphoris and Tiberias, and the scene of an important Rabbinical synod or synods about the time of the Hadrianic persecution in the middle of the second century C.E. V. J.E. 'Synod of Usha'.

(6) A field one square peras (peras half the length of a furrow — fifty cubits) in area, declared unclean because a grave was ploughed in it and the crushed bones scattered over the field, so that their exact position is not known, If terumah enters its atmosphere it must be burnt, though it is doubtful whether it was actually over the crushed bones.

(7) I.e., any earth which comes thence.

(8) V. P. 51, n. 1. His garments are doubtful, because his wife may have sat upon them while a menstruant; v. Hag. 18b.

(9) And it is unknown whether they are clean or not.

(10) All saliva found is suspected of uncleanness, as it may be of a zab; v. p. 58, n. 10.

(11) This is not the same as the preceding, where the substances themselves were not in doubt; e.g., the object was definitely a utensil, or saliva. Here, however, there is a double doubt; it may not be human urine at all, but cattle urine; and even if it is, it may not be a zab's (only his defiles). Yet the Rabbis ruled it definitely unclean, even when found near cattle urine, so that it might be supposed that this is the same.

(12) If *terumah* comes definitely into contact (or as explained in n. 2) with these, which renders it doubtfully unclean, it is burnt.

(13) Cf. p. 20, n. 5.

(14) The difficulty arises from ii.

(15) Lit., 'the beginning of its making'.

(16) Other edd. omit 'R. Johanan said in the name of', reading simply Resh Lakish. It is certainly unlikely that R. Johanan, who, as head of the Academy at Tiberias enjoyed a superiority over Resh Lakish, his contemporary, would report his statement.

(17) Just as earthenware.

(18) Mik. IX, 5. When a utensil is purified in a mikweh, nothing must interpose between it and the water; if it does, the immersion is ineffective: pitch and gum on the side of a glass vessel constitute an interposition.

(19) In Mik. IX, 5.

(20) The perforated glass vessel is supported by the lead, i.e., it can be used only through the lead. Hence, according to R. Meir, it is a metal, not a glass vessel.

(21) Rashi in R.H. 19a offers two explanations: (i) When an unclean vessel is perforated, it becomes clean, since it can no longer be used as a vessel. Now, if a metal utensil is thus broken and then repaired, it reverts to its former state, but not so a glass vessel (*infra* 16a). R. Meir maintains that a glass vessel supported by metal is treated as metal; while the Rabbis hold that it is still regarded as a glass vessel. (ii) A clean glass vessel supported by metal becomes Biblically unclean, according to R. Meir, as a metal utensil, while the Rabbis hold that it is Biblically clean, as a glass vessel, and is subject to defilement only on account of the Rabbinical enactment; the reasoning being the same as before. Tosaf. a.l. s.v. **אֵינָם** is inclined to agree with the second interpretation.

(22) Since they are treated as earthenware vessels.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 16a

let them not become unclean through their [flat or convex] backs.<sup>1</sup> Why did we learn, Earthen vessels and nether vessels<sup>2</sup> are alike in regard to their uncleanness: they become defiled and defile [other objects] through their air space;<sup>3</sup> they become unclean through their outside,<sup>4</sup> but they cannot be defiled through their backs;<sup>5</sup> and their breaking renders them clean.<sup>6</sup> Thus, only earthen and nether vessels are alike in regard to their uncleanness, but not other things?<sup>7</sup> -I will tell you: since they can be repaired when broken,<sup>8</sup> they were assimilated to metal utensils.<sup>9</sup>

If so, let them revert to their former uncleanness, like metal utensils? For we learnt: Metal vessels, both flat and hollow,<sup>10</sup> are subject to defilement. If broken, they become clean; if remade into utensils, they revert to their former uncleanness. s. Whereas in respect to glass vessels we learnt: Wooden, skin, bone and glass utensils, if flat, they are clean;<sup>11</sup> if hollow, they are unclean;<sup>12</sup> if broken, they become clean; if remade into vessels, they are liable to defilement from then onwards. [Thus] only from then onwards, but not retrospectively?-The uncleanness of glass utensils is Rabbinical, and [the resuscitation of] former uncleanness is [also] Rabbinical: now, in the case of that which is unclean by Scriptural law, the Rabbis have imposed [retrospective] uncleanness upon it, but upon that which is unclean by Rabbinical law the Rabbis have imposed no [retrospective] uncleanness.

Yet at least let their flat utensils be unclean, since flat metal utensils are [susceptible to uncleanness] by Scriptural law!-The Rabbis made a distinction in their case, so that *terumah* and sacred food should not be burnt on their account.<sup>13</sup>

---

(1) If an unclean object touches them on the back, which is flat or convex, they should not become unclean, in

accordance with the Mishnah quoted.

(2) Rashi: a kind of white earth; Jast.: a vessel made of alum crystals.

(3) If an unclean object is suspended in the hollow of one of these vessels, even if it does not touch its side, it becomes unclean. Again, if a clean object is suspended in the hollow of an unclean vessel, though it does not actually touch it, it too becomes unclean.

(4) E.g., if the base is concave, and an unclean object is suspended from the outside in the hollow.

(5) Which are flat or convex.

(6) If these vessels, being already unclean, are broken, they become clean; cf. p. 65, n. 7.

(7) yet glass vessels too should be the same according to Resh Lakish's reason.

(8) By being melted down and refashioned, which is impossible with earthen utensils.

(9) Which can be repaired in the same way.

(10) Lit., 'those of them which receive'.

(11) I.e., they cannot be defiled.

(12) As in n. 7.

(13) For these must not be burnt when defiled by Rabbinical law, except in the six cases of doubtful uncleanness enumerated on 15b.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 16b

R. Ashi said: After all, it is similar to earthen utensils, and as for your difficulty, 'let them not become unclean through their [flat or convex] backs', [the reply] is because its inside is as visible as its outside.<sup>1</sup>

'Simeon b. Shetah instituted a woman's marriage settlement and imposed uncleanness upon metal utensils.' But [the uncleanness of] metal utensils is Biblical, for it is written, howbeit the gold, and the silver [... etc.]?<sup>2</sup> -This [the Rabbinical law] was necessary only in respect of former uncleanness.<sup>3</sup> For Rab Judah said in Rab's name: It once happened that Queen Shalzion<sup>4</sup> made a banquet for her son and all her utensils were defiled. Thereupon she broke them and gave them to the goldsmith, who melted them down and manufactured new utensils of them. But the Sages declared, They revert to their previous uncleanness. What is the reason?-They were concerned there to provide<sup>5</sup> a fence against the water of separation.<sup>6</sup>

Now, that is well on the view that they [the Sages] did not rule thus in respect of all forms of defilement but only in respect of the defilement of the dead:<sup>7</sup> then it is correct. But on the view that they ruled thus for all forms of uncleanness, what can be said?-Abaye answered: As a preventive measure lest he might not perforate it to the standard of purification.<sup>8</sup> Raba said: As a preventive measure lest it be said that tebillah<sup>9</sup> of that very day is effective for it.<sup>10</sup> Wherein do they differ?-They differ where a smith refashioned it.<sup>11</sup> And what is another?<sup>12</sup> For we learnt: If one places vessels under a spout to catch rain water therein, whether they are large vessels or small, or even vessels [made] of stone, earth<sup>13</sup> or dung, they render the mikweh unfit. It is all one whether he places or forgets them [there]: that is Beth Shammai's view; but Beth Hillel declare it clean<sup>14</sup> if he forgets them.<sup>15</sup> Said R. Meir: They took a count, and Beth Shammai outnumbered Beth Hillel. Yet Beth Shammai admit it that if he forgets [the utensils] in a courtyard,<sup>16</sup> it is clean.<sup>17</sup> R. Jose said: The controversy still stands in its place.<sup>18</sup>

R. Mesharsheya said: The scholars of Rab<sup>19</sup> said: All agree that, if he places them [under the spout] when clouds are massing, they<sup>20</sup> are unclean;<sup>21</sup> [if he places them there] when the clouds are dispersed, all agree that they are clean.<sup>22</sup> They differ only if he places them there when the clouds were massing, but they then dispersed, and subsequently massed together again:<sup>23</sup> one Master [Beth Hillel] holds that his intention was nullified,<sup>24</sup> while the other Master holds that his intention was not nullified.

Now, according to R. Jose, who maintained, The controversy still stands in its place, they are less [than eighteen]?<sup>25</sup> -Said R. Nahman b. Isaac: On that same day they also enacted that the daughters of Cutheans<sup>26</sup> are niddoth<sup>27</sup> from their cradles.<sup>28</sup>

And what is another? For we learnt: All movable objects induce uncleanness by the thickness of an ox-goad.<sup>29</sup> Said R. Tarfon,

---

(1) From without; hence it is all regarded as the inside.

(2) Num. XXXI, 22. The text continues: everything that may abide the fire, ye shall make go through the fire, and it shall be clean; nevertheless it shall be purified with the water of separation.

(3) V, supra a.

(4) i.e., Salome Alexandra, wife and successor of Alexander Jannai and according to the Talmud, sister of Simeon b. Shetah.

(5) Lit., 'on account of'.

(6) V. n. 2.; i.e., they were anxious to safeguard this law, which would fall into disuse if the expedient of melting and refashioning were widely adopted.

(7) Only then is the former uncleanness revived.-The verse quoted in n. 2. refers to such.

(8) The hole which removes its status of a utensil must be of a certain size, — large enough to permit a pomegranate to fall through.

(9) V. Glos.

(10) When it is purified by means of tebillah it may not be used until the evening; but making a hole and repairing it permits its immediate use. One seeing this vessel thus used on the same day may think that it underwent tebillah, and that the latter too releases it for immediate use.

(11) Abaye's reason still holds good, for one may think that a small note too would have sufficed. But Raba's reason does not operate, for it is plainly evident that this was newly remade.

(12) Of the eighteen enactments.

(13) Roughly manufactured, without being kneaded and baked.

(14) I.e., the mikweh retains its powers of purification.

(15) V. p. 61, n. 3. The spout was fixed in the earth before it was actually a spout, and after fixing it was made hollow to act as a water duct to the mikweh. In that case the water that passes through it is regarded as 'living water'. When, however, the water falls from the spout into vessels, it becomes 'drawn water', which renders the mikweh unfit. This holds good whether they are very large vessels, too big to be susceptible to uncleanness, e.g., a tub more than forty se'ahs in capacity, or very small, so that I might think of disregarding them altogether; also, even if of dung, when they are not regarded as vessels at all in respect to uncleanness. If they are merely forgotten there, Beth Hillel maintain that the water is not 'drawn', since it was unintentional.

(16) But not under the spout, and they are filled with the rain water which flows thence into the mikweh.

(17) V. n. 3. Because he had no intention at all of filling it, since he did not place it under the spout.

(18) I.e., they differ here too.

(19) The term debe Rab means either the disciples of the Academy founded by Rab or scholars in general; Weiss, Dor, III, 158 (Ed. 1924).

(20) Utensils purified in the mikweh.

(21) Because the mikweh was rendered unfit, as above. For he showed that he desired the water to flow into the utensils, and though he had forgotten them by the time the rain descended, his original intention was fulfilled, and the water is regarded as drawn.

(22) Since there were no clouds, his placing the utensils there was not with the intention of filling them.

(23) And by then he has forgotten them.

(24) By the dispersal of the clouds; hence the subsequent filling does not render the water drawn.

(25) Since there is a controversy, the halachah agrees with Beth Hillel, that the mikweh is fit.

(26) The Cutheans were the descendants of the heathens who settled in Samaria after the destruction of the Northern Kingdom. They accepted a form of Judaism, and the Rabbis' attitude towards them varied. At times they were regarded as Jews, but they were subsequently declared non-Jews. The present enactment treats them as Jews, who, however, are looked upon with disfavour.

(27) Pl. of niddah, a menstruant woman.

(28) I.e., from birth they are treated as unclean, like a niddah. The purpose of this enactment was to discourage intermarriage with them (Tosaf.).

(29) This refers to the defilement caused by a dead person, not by contact but through the fact that both the dead person and the object defiled are under the same covering, e.g., the roof of a house or an overhead awning (cf. Num. XIX, 14f), which induces uncleanness to the object defiled. The width of the covering object must not be less than the thickness of an ox-goad, for which v. infra '7a.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 17a

May I bury my children,<sup>1</sup> if this is not an erroneous halachah, for the hearer heard [a ruling] and erred [therein]. [Viz.,] a peasant was passing with an ox-goad on his shoulder and one end thereof overshadowed a grave, and he was declared unclean in virtue of [the law of] utensils which overshadowed the dead.<sup>2</sup> R. Akiba said, I will rectify [it] so that the words of the Sages<sup>3</sup> may be fulfilled. [Viz.,] all movable objects induce uncleanness in their bearers by the thickness of an ox-goad; [and induce uncleanness] in themselves, by any thickness; and in other people or utensils, by the width<sup>4</sup> of a handbreadth. And R. Jannai observed: and the ox-goad of which they spoke is not a handbreadth in thickness but in circumference, and they enacted [this law] concerning its circumference on account of its thickness.<sup>5</sup> But according to R. Tarfon who said, 'May I bury my children but this halachah is incorrect!' they are less [than eighteen ]? — Said R. Nahman b. Isaac, That the daughters of Cutheans are niddoth from their cradles was also enacted on that same day; and on the other [question]<sup>6</sup> he agrees with R. Meir.<sup>7</sup>

And another?-When one vintages [grapes] for the vat [I.C., to manufacture wine], Shammai maintains: It is made fit (to become unclean); while Hillel ruled, It is not made fit.<sup>8</sup> Said Hillel to Shammai: Why must one vintage [grapes] in purity, yet not gather [olives] in purity?<sup>9</sup> If you provoke me, he replied, I will decree uncleanness in the case of olive gathering too. A sword was planted in the Beth Hamidrash and it was proclaimed, 'He who would enter, let him enter, but he who would depart, let him not depart!'<sup>10</sup> And on that day Hillel sat submissive before Shammai, like one of the disciples,<sup>11</sup> and it was as grievous to Israel<sup>12</sup> as the day when the [golden] calf was made. Now, Shammai and Hillel enacted [this measure], but they would not accept it from them; but their disciples came<sup>13</sup> and enacted it, and it was accepted from them.<sup>14</sup>

[Now,] what is the reason?<sup>15</sup> -Said Ze'iri in R. Hanina's name: For fear lest he vintage it into unclean baskets.<sup>16</sup> Now, that is well on the view that an unclean vessel renders fluid effective;<sup>17</sup> but on the view that an unclean vessel does not render fluid effective, what can be said?-Rather, said Ze'iri in R. Hanina's name: For fear lest he vintage it in pitch lined baskets.<sup>18</sup> Raba said: It is a preventive measure on account of tightly cleaving, [clusters].<sup>19</sup> R. Nahman said in Rabbah b. Abbuha's name: [It is a preventive measure, for] a man sometimes goes to his vineyard to see if the grapes are ready for vintaging, takes a bunch of grapes to squeeze it, and sprinkles [the juice] on the grapes, and at the time of gathering the moisture is still dripping on them.

And another?-Said

---

(1) Lit., 'may I cut off my children that this halachah is cut off'.

(2) I.e. any utensil which overshadows the dead becomes itself unclean, whatever its width, and the peasant was declared unclean for the same day till the evening because he was actually carrying and in direct contact with this ox-goad. But one of the disciples who heard this ruling erroneously imagined that he was unclean in virtue of the law stated in n. 7. involving an uncleanness of seven days, and thus drew a false conclusion.

(3) Who said that all movable objects induce uncleanness by the thickness of an ox-goad.

(4) Lit., 'aperture'.

(5) If its thickness is a handbreadth, it induces uncleanness of seven days by Biblical law, and therefore the Sages extended this to the former case too, to prevent confusion. This is one of the eighteen enactments. V. Oh. XVI, 1.

(6) Sc. one who places vessels under a spout, v. supra 16b.

(7) Rashba's version omits this passage, because R. Tarfon accepted R. Akiba's view; v. Halevi, Doroth, I, 3, P. 587-8.

(8) V. P. 45, nn. 1 and 4.

(9) You maintain that grapes are fit to become defiled, and therefore must be vintaged into ritually clean baskets: why then do you not insist upon it when the olives are gathered too, for surely the same reasoning applies?

(10) This was the practice when a vote was taken upon any question; Halevi, Doroth, I, 3, p. 585 n. 18.

(11) I.e., the assembly voted against him-of course the actual expression is not to be understood literally.

(12) In view of the humility to which Hillel, who was the Nasi, had been subjected.

(13) At the assembly in the house of Hananiah b. Hezekiah b. Garon.

(14) Hence it is one of the eighteen measures.

(15) Why does the exuding liquid make the grapes susceptible to uncleanness? For the logic is the reverse, seeing that this liquid is wasted and its exuding is not with its owner's desire, whereas the owner's desire is necessary for it to cause susceptibility to defilement.

(16) Since the uncleanness comes simultaneously with the fluid, the latter renders the grapes fit to become unclean, even without the owner's desire.

(17) Lit., 'makes the liquid count'-to qualify other objects to become unclean.

(18) Since the liquid is not lost, its exuding is not contrary to the owner's desire.

(19) Lit., 'the biting ones'. One must separate these by force, thus causing juice to spurt out. Since he does this himself, the juice certainly makes the grapes susceptible; then as a preventive measure the law was extended to all exuding juice, in order to obviate confusion.

## **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 17b**

Tabi the hunter in Samuel's name: That the produce of terumah is terumah was also enacted on that day.<sup>1</sup> What is the reason?-R. Hanina said: It was a preventive measure, on account of undefiled terumah [being retained] in the hand of an Israelite.<sup>2</sup> Raba observed: If they are suspected of this, they would not separate [terumah] at all: [and furthermore] — since he can render one grain of wheat [as terumah for the whole], in accordance with Samuel,<sup>3</sup> and does not, he is indeed trusted.<sup>4</sup> Rather, said Raba, it is a preventive measure on account of unclean terumah in the priest's hands, lest he keep it with him and be led to sin.<sup>5</sup>

And another?-R. Hiyya b. Ammi said in 'Ulla's name: That one must give his purse to a Gentile if [the Sabbath] evening falls upon him on the road was also enacted on that day.<sup>6</sup>

And another? — Bali said in the name of Abimi of Senawta:<sup>7</sup> [The interdict against] their bread, oil, wine and daughters<sup>8</sup> all these are of the eighteen measures.<sup>9</sup>

Now, this is well according to R. Meir; but according to R. Jose, there are only seventeen?<sup>10</sup> — There is also that of R. Aha b. Adda. For R. Aha b. Adda said in R. Isaac's name: Their bread was forbidden on account of their oil, and their oil on account of their wine.<sup>11</sup> 'Their bread on account of their oil'!-wherein is [the interdict of] oil stronger than that of bread?<sup>12</sup> Rather [say] they decreed against their bread and oil on account of their wine, and against their wine on account of their daughters, and against their daughters on account of 'the unmentionable,'<sup>13</sup> and [they decreed] something else on account of some other thing. What is this 'something else?'- Said R. Nahman b. Isaac: They decreed that a heathen child shall defile by gonorrhoea,<sup>14</sup> so that an Israelite child should not associate with him for sodomy.<sup>15</sup> But if so, according to R. Meir too [it is difficult, for] there are nineteen!-Food and drink which were defiled through liquid he accounts as one.

**MISHNAH. BETH SHAMMAI RULE: INK, DYES AND ALKALINE PLANTS<sup>16</sup> MAY NOT BE STEEPED UNLESS THEY CAN BE DISSOLVED WHILE IT IS YET DAY;<sup>17</sup> BUT BETH HILLEL, PERMIT IT. BETH SHAMMAI RULE: BUNDLES OF WET FLAX MAY NOT BE PLACED IN AN OVEN UNLESS THEY CAN BEGIN TO STEAM WHILE IT IS YET DAY, NOR WOOL. IN THE DYER'S KETTLE UNLESS IT CAN ASSUME THE COLOUR [OF THE DYE]; BUT BETH HILLEL PERMIT IT. BETH SHAMMAI MAINTAIN: SNARES FOR WILD BEASTS, FOWLS, AND FISH, MAY NOT BE SPREAD UNLESS THEY CAN BE CAUGHT WHILE IT IS YET DAY; BUT BETH HILLEL PERMIT IT. BETH SHAMMAI RULE: ONE MUST NOT SELL, TO A GENTILE, OR HELP HIM TO LOAD [AN ASS], OR LIFT UP [AN ARTICLE] UPON HIM UNLESS HE CAN REACH A NEAR PLACE;<sup>18</sup> BUT BETH HILLEL PERMIT IT. BETH SHAMMAI MAINTAIN: HIDES MUST NOT BE GIVEN TO A TANNER,**

## NOR GARMENTS TO A GENTILE FULLER, UNLESS THEY CAN BE DONE WHILE IT IS YET DAY; BUT IN ALL THESE [CASES] BETH HILLEL, PERMIT [THEM]

- (1) By Biblical law, if terumah is resown its produce is hullin (q.v. Glos.), but the Rabbis decreed that it is terumah and belongs to the priest.
- (2) Who may resow and keep it for himself, thus depriving the priest of his dues. (10) The text is in slight disorder.
- (3) V. Kid. 58b.
- (4) Not to retain the terumah, by resowing it.
- (5) Whilst keeping it for resowing, he may forget that it is unclean, and eat it. Therefore it was enacted that even if resown its produce may not be eaten, though it will not be regarded as unclean (Tosaf. as explained by Maharsha).
- (6) Infra 153a; and not carry it along short distances of less than four cubits each.
- (7) In A.Z. 36a the reading is Niwte, i.e., the Nabatean. Senawta is probably a dialect form of the same.
- (8) Sc. of Gentiles.
- (9) They are counted as one.
- (10) V. supra 16b. This seems a repetition of the question there.
- (11) Actually these were ancient prohibitions, going back to the days of Daniel (cf. Dan. I, 8; Josephus, Ant. I. 3, 12.). But in the course of time their observance grew weak, and the disciples of Shammai and Hillel renewed and strengthened the prohibition as one of their eighteen enactments. V. Halevi, Doroth, I, 3, pp. 591ff, seq., v. also Weiss, Dor, I, 129.
- (12) For this implies that there was greater reason for prohibiting their oil than their bread.
- (13) Lit., 'something else', viz., idolatry.
- (14) Even if he is not suffering therewith.
- (15) Thus this is the eighteenth.
- (16) Jast. Rashi: horse beans, used for cattle.
- (17) These materials had to be steeped in water before they were fit for their purpose, and Beth Shammai rule that this may not be done on Friday unless there is time for the process to be completed before the Sabbath. Yashuru means dissolved and soaked through, and will bear the latter meaning in respect of beans, according to Rashi's translation.
- (18) i.e., his destination must be near enough to be reached before the Sabbath.

### Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 18a

BEFORE SUNSET.<sup>1</sup> R. SIMEON B. GAMALIEL, SAID: IT WAS THE PRACTICE IN MY FATHER'S HOUSE TO GIVE WHITE GARMENTS TO A GENTILE FULLER THREE DAYS BEFORE THE SABBATH.<sup>2</sup> AND BOTH [SCHOOLS] AGREE THAT THE BEAM OF THE [OIL] PRESS AND THE CIRCULAR WINE PRESS MAY BE LADEN.<sup>3</sup> GEMARA. Which Tanna [holds that] pouring water into ink constitutes its steeping?<sup>4</sup> -Said R. Joseph, It is Rabbi. For it was taught: If one pours in flour and another water, the second is liable:<sup>5</sup> this is Rabbi's view.<sup>6</sup> R. Jose son of R. Judah said: He is not liable unless he kneads [them]. Abaye said to him, Yet perhaps R. Jose [son of R. Judah] ruled thus only in respect to flour, which is subject to kneading: but as for ink, which is not subject to kneading, I may say that he is liable?<sup>7</sup> -You cannot think so, for it was taught: if one pours in the ashes and another the water, the second is liable: this is Rabbi's view. R. Jose son of R. Judah said: [He is not liable] unless he kneads them.<sup>8</sup> Yet perhaps what is [meant by] ashes? Earth [dust],<sup>9</sup> which does require kneading.<sup>10</sup> But both ashes and earth [dust] were taught?-Were they then taught together?<sup>11</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: Water may be conducted into a garden on the eve of the Sabbath just before dark, and it may go on being filled the whole day; and a perfume brazier may be placed under garments which continue to absorb the perfume the whole day; and sulphur may be placed under [silver) vessels and they undergo the process of sulphuring the whole day; and an eye salve<sup>12</sup> may be placed on the eye and a plaster on a wound and the process of healing continues all day.<sup>13</sup> But wheat may not be placed in a water-mill unless it can be ground when it is still day. What is the reason? Rabbah answered, Because it makes a noise.<sup>14</sup> Said R. Joseph to him, Let the Master say it is on account of the resting of utensils? For it was taught: And in all things that I have said unto you take

ye heed:<sup>15</sup> this includes the resting of utensils!<sup>16</sup> Rather, said R. Joseph, it is on account of the resting of utensils. Now that you say that according to Beth Hillel the resting of utensils is a Biblical precept,<sup>17</sup> why are sulphur and a perfume brazier permitted?-Because it [the vessel in which they lie] performs no action. Why are wet bundles of flax permitted? — Because it [the oven in which they lie] performs no action and is motionless. But what of the trap for wild beasts, fowl and fish, which performs an action,<sup>18</sup> Why are they permitted?-There too [it means] with a fish hook and a trap made with little joists,<sup>19</sup> so that no action is performed.

Now, however, that R. Oshaia said in R. Assi's name, Which Tanna [maintains that] the resting of utensils is a Biblical precept? It is Beth Shammai: then according to Beth Shammai, whether it [the utensil] performs an action or not, it is forbidden, while in the opinion of Beth Hillel even if it performs an action it is permitted. And now that you say that according to Beth Shammai it is forbidden even if it performs no action, if so,

---

(1) Lit., 'with the sun', i.e., while the sun is shining.

(2) Because these require more time.

(3) By day, though the fluid goes on oozing during the Sabbath.

(4) The Mishnah merely discusses this, and does not speak about kneading the ingredients too. Hence the mere pouring must be regarded as a labour forbidden on the Sabbath, for otherwise there would be no controversy in respect to Friday.

(5) For desecrating the Sabbath.

(6) Thus he holds that the mere pouring in of water constitutes kneading, which is forbidden on the Sabbath. The making of ink is prohibited as a derivative (v. p. 3, n. 2.) of kneading.

(7) For mere pouring, even on R. Jose son of Judah's view.

(8) Though ashes do not require kneading.

(9) In Heb. these words are very similar and sometimes interchanged.

(10) For making clay.

(11) In the same Baraitha? They were stated in separate Baraithas, not necessarily by the same teacher, and both may mean the same thing.

(12) Heb. kilur, \*\* collyrium.

(13) Healing on the Sabbath itself is forbidden, unless there is danger to life.

(14) Which detracts from the sanctity of the Sabbath.

(15) Ex. XXIII, 13. The preceding verse deals with the Sabbath.

(16) A man is commanded to let the vessels rest as well as he himself.

(17) For this Baraitha must reflect Beth Hillel's ruling, since its other clauses oppose the views of Beth Shammai as expressed in our Mishnah.

(18) The spring of the trap closes and the mesh of the nets tightens as they catch their prey,

(19) So arranged as to permit the animal to get in but not out. Thus they are passive instruments.

## **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 18b**

why are a perfume brazier and sulphur permitted?<sup>1</sup> -There it lies upon the earth.<sup>2</sup> What of a tank [for brewing beer], a lamp, a pot and a spit-why do Beth Shammai permit [them]?<sup>3</sup> -Because their ownership is renounced.<sup>4</sup> Who is the author of the following, which our Rabbis taught: A woman must not fill a pot with pounded wheat<sup>5</sup> and lupines and place it in the oven on the eve of the Sabbath shortly before nightfall; and if she does put them [there], they are forbidden at the conclusion of the Sabbath for as long as they take to prepare.<sup>6</sup> Similarly, a baker must not fill a barrel of water and place it in the oven on the eve of the Sabbath shortly before nightfall; and if he does, it [the water] is forbidden at the conclusion of the Sabbath for as long as it takes to prepare [boil]. Shall we say that this agrees with Beth Shammai, not Beth Hillel?<sup>7</sup> — You may even say that it is Beth Hillel: it is a preventive measure, lest he stir the coals. If so, let us decree [likewise] in respect of a perfume brazier and sulphur?-There he will not stir them] for if he does, the smoke will enter and harm them.<sup>8</sup> Let us decree in respect of wet bundles of flax too?-There, since a draught is

injurious to them, he will not uncover it.<sup>9</sup> Let us decree also in respect of wool in the dye kettle?-Samuel answered: This refers to a kettle removed [from the fire]. But let us fear that he may stir within it?<sup>10</sup> -This refers to [a kettle] removed from [the fire] and sealed down.<sup>11</sup>

And now that the Master said: 'It is a preventive measure, lest one rake the coals', a raw dish<sup>12</sup> may be placed in an oven on the eve of Sabbath shortly before nightfall. What is the reason? Since it will not be fit for the evening,<sup>13</sup> he withdraws his mind from it and will not come to rake the coals.<sup>14</sup> Again, if it is [quite] boiled, it is well.<sup>15</sup> If partly boiled,<sup>16</sup> it is forbidden. Yet if a raw bone is thrown into it, it is permitted.<sup>17</sup>

And now that the Master said, 'Whatever may be harmed by the draught, one will not uncover it': with flesh of a kid, where it [the oven] is daubed round,<sup>18</sup> it is well;<sup>19</sup> with [flesh] of a buck, where it [the oven] is not daubed round, is forbidden. But as to [flesh] of a kid, where it is not daubed round, or of a buck, where it is daubed round: R. Ashi permits it, while R. Jeremiah of Difti<sup>20</sup> forbids it. Now, according to R. Ashi, who permits it, did we not learn, Meat, onion[s] or egg[s] may not be roasted unless they can be roasted before sunset?-There the reference is to [flesh] of a buck, and where it [the oven] is not daubed round. Others state: With [the flesh] of a kid, whether it [the oven] is daubed round or not, it is well; of a buck too, if it is daubed round, it is well. They differ in respect to [flesh] of a buck, it [the oven] not being daubed: R. Ashi permits it, while R. Jeremiah of Difti forbids it. Now, according to R. Ashi who permits it, did we not learn, Meat, onion[s] or egg[s] may not be roasted unless they can be roasted before sunset?-There the reference is to meat on the coals [direct].<sup>21</sup> Rabina said: As for a raw gourd, it is well:<sup>22</sup> since a draught is injurious to it, it is like flesh of a kid.

BETH SHAMMAI MAINTAIN: ONE MUST NOT SELL[etc.]. Our Rabbis taught: Beth Shammai maintain: A man must not sell an article to a Gentile, nor lend [it] to him nor loan him [money] nor make him a gift [on the eve of Sabbath], unless he can reach his house [before sunset]; while Beth Hillel rule: [unless] he can reach the house nearest the [city] wall.<sup>23</sup> R. Akiba said: [Unless] he can depart from the door of his [the Jew's] house [before the Sabbath]. Said R. Jose son of R. Judah: The words of R. Akiba are the very words of Beth Hillel:<sup>24</sup> R. Akiba comes only to explain the words of Beth Hillel.<sup>25</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: Beth Shammai maintain: A man must not sell his leaven to a Gentile, unless he knows that it will be consumed before Passover: this is Beth Shammai's view. But Beth Hillel say: As long as he [the Jew] may eat it, he may sell it. R. Judah said:

- 
- (1) For on this hypothesis the Baraita must agree with Beth Shammai, since the placing of wheat in a mill is forbidden.
  - (2) Not in a vessel.
  - (3) Beer brews in its tank more than eight days, thus including the Sabbath. Similarly, the lamp burns during the Sabbath, the pot stands on the heated range, causing some shrinkage of its contents, and the spit was allowed to lie in the oven with the Passover sacrifice roasting on Friday night. Thus all these utensils are employed on the Sabbath.
  - (4) This is a legal fiction. Their owner formally renounces his ownership, and then he is under no obligation to ensure that they rest.
  - (5) Or, peas.
  - (6) So that she should not profit by having virtually prepared it on the Sabbath.
  - (7) Since Beth Hillel do not require utensils to rest.
  - (8) The garments or vessels.
  - (9) The oven, to rake up the coals.-The coals burnt inside the ancient ovens.
  - (10) Sc. the wool within the kettle, to make it absorb the dye more thoroughly. This too is forbidden.
  - (11) Hence he is not likely to forget.-In this and the following cases the fear is not that he may do these things intentionally but unintentionally in a moment of forgetfulness.
  - (12) I.e., a pot containing a raw dish.

- (13) The evening meal was eaten soon after nightfall, and it would not be ready by then.
- (14) There is ample time for it to be ready on the morrow without his stirring. But pounded wheat and lupines require very much boiling, and therefore they are forbidden.
- (15) Permitted, because the coals will not require raking.
- (16) Lit., 'boiled and not boiled'.
- (17) This serves to show that he has no mention of eating it before the morrow.
- (18) To seal it down.
- (19) Goat flesh is tender and injured by a draught.
- (20) V. p. 35, n. 5.
- (21) Not in the oven. It is then easy to turn it and rake the coals: hence it is forbidden.
- (22) It may be placed in the oven even if it cannot be cooked by the Sabbath.
- (23) If the Gentile lives in another town, it is sufficient if he can take it to the nearest house there, even if he cannot reach his own before the Sabbath.
- (24) Their views are identical.
- (25) I.e., he states Beth Hillel's ruling, not an independent one, and thus differs from the first Tanna's interpretation of Beth Hillel's attitude.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 19a

Babylonian kutah<sup>1</sup> and any [other] kind of kutah may not be sold thirty days before Passover.<sup>2</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: Food may be placed before a dog in a courtyard, [and] if it takes it and goes out, one has no duty toward it.<sup>3</sup> Similarly, food may be placed before a Gentile in a courtyard, [and] if he takes it and goes out, one has no duty toward him. What is the purpose of this further [dictum]; [surely] it is the same [as the first]?-You might argue, The one is incumbent upon him, whereas the other is not:<sup>4</sup> therefore we are informed [otherwise].<sup>5</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: A man must not hire his utensils to a Gentile on the eve of Sabbath; [but] on Wednesday or Thursday it is permitted.<sup>6</sup> Similarly, letters may not be sent by a Gentile on the eve of Sabbath, [but] on Wednesday or Thursday it is permitted. It was related of R. Jose the priest-others say, of R. Jose the Pious-that his handwriting was never found in a Gentile's hand.<sup>7</sup> Our Rabbis taught: Letters may not be sent by Gentiles on the eve of Sabbath unless a fee is stipulated.<sup>8</sup> , Beth Shammai maintain: There must be time to reach his [the addressee's] house [before the Sabbath];<sup>9</sup> while Beth Hillel rule: There must be time to reach the house nearest the [city] wall.<sup>10</sup> But has he not stipulated?<sup>11</sup> -Said R. Shesheth, This is its meaning: And if he did not stipulate, Beth Shammai maintain: There must be time to reach his [the addressee's] house; while Beth Hillel rule: to reach the house nearest the [city] wall. But you said in the first clause that one must not send [at all]?<sup>12</sup> — There is no difficulty: in the one case a post office is permanently located in the town,<sup>13</sup> in the other case a post office is not permanently located in the town.<sup>14</sup> Our Rabbis taught: One may not set out in a ship less than three days before the Sabbath. This was said only [if it is] for a voluntary purpose, but [if] for a good deed,<sup>15</sup> it is well; and he stipulates with him<sup>16</sup> that it is on condition that he will rest [on the Sabbath], yet he does not rest:<sup>17</sup> this is Rabbi's view. R. Simeon b. Gamaliel said: It is unnecessary. But from Tyre to Sidon<sup>18</sup> it is permitted even on the eve of Sabbath.<sup>19</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: Gentile cities must not be besieged less than three days before the Sabbath, yet once they commence they need not leave off. And thus did Shammai say: until until it fall,<sup>20</sup> even on the Sabbath. R. SIMEON B. GAMALIEL, SAID: IT WAS THE PRACTICE IN MY FATHER'S HOUSE etc. It was taught, R. Zadok said, This was the practice of R. Gamaliel's house, viz., they used to give white garments to the fuller three days before the Sabbath, but coloured garments even on the eve of the Sabbath. And from their usage<sup>21</sup> we learn that white [garments] are more difficult to wash than coloured ones. Abaye was giving a coloured garment to a fuller and asked him, How much do you want for it? 'As for a white garment,' he answered. 'Our Rabbis have already

anticipated you,' said he.<sup>22</sup>

Abaye said: When one gives a garment to a fuller he should deliver it to him by measure and receive it back by measure, for if it is more, he spoiled it by stretching, and if less he spoiled it by shrinking.<sup>23</sup>

AND BOTH AGREE THAT THE BEAM OF THE [OIL] PRESS AND THE CIRCULAR WINE PRESS MAY BE LADEN. Wherein do all [the other acts] differ that Beth Shammai forbid them, and wherein do [those relating to] the beam of the [oil] press and the circular wine press differ, that Beth Shammai do not forbid them?—Those other [acts] which, if done on the Sabbath involve a sin-offering, Beth Shammai forbade on the eve of the Sabbath just before nightfall; [but the loading of] the beam of the [oil] press and the circular wine press, which if done on the Sabbath does not involve a sin-offering, they did not forbid.<sup>24</sup>

Which Tanna [maintains] that everything which comes automatically is well?<sup>25</sup> — Said R. Jose son of R. Hanina, It is R. Ishmael. For we learnt: [In the case of] garlic, half-ripe grapes, and parched ears [of corn] were crushed before sunset, R. Ishmael said: One may finish them at night; R. Akiba said:

- 
- (1) Jast.: a preserve consisting of sour milk, bread-crusts and salt.
  - (2) It is used as a sauce or relish and hence lasts a long time. It was customary to give popular lectures about the Festivals thirty days before them, and therefore from that time one was forbidden to sell kutah to a Gentile.
  - (3) To restrain it from carrying it out into the street.
  - (4) He has a duty towards his animals which he does not owe to a stranger, and therefore I might think that in the latter case food must not be given, since it may be carried out.
  - (5) That even so food may be placed before a Gentile. Because though one has no legal obligation, he has the duty of charity towards him, just as towards a Jew, as stated in Git. 61a (Tosaf.).
  - (6) Though he will use it on the Sabbath.
  - (7) He never sent a letter by a Gentile lest he might take it to its destination on Sabbath. This was a measure of ultra stringency.
  - (8) Once the fee is stipulated the Gentile works for himself, to earn it, and not for the Jew.
  - (9) Otherwise it is forbidden even if the fee was already stipulated.
  - (10) If the addressee lives in a different town; cf. p. 77, n. 9.
  - (11) In which case the first Tanna, i.e., Beth Hillel, rules that it may be carried on the Sabbath itself.
  - (12) Other edd. more plausibly, But it was taught that they must not be sent (at all)? The reference is then to the preceding Baraitha, not this one, for this one distinctly states that if the fee was arranged it is permitted; v. marg. gloss, cur. edd.
  - (13) Of the addressee. Then letters may be sent, even if the fee was not stipulated, providing that the messenger can reach the post office or the nearest house in that town before the Sabbath.
  - (14) Rashi: then one must not send if the fee was not stipulated, as he may go searching for him on the Sabbath.
  - (15) Lit., 'a matter of a precept'.
  - (16) The Gentile owner of the ship.
  - (17) I.e., though the condition will not be carried out.
  - (18) Both on the Phoenician coast, about thirty miles apart.
  - (19) Being such a short distance.
  - (20) Deut. XX, 20. The reference is to a besieged city.
  - (21) Lit., 'words'.
  - (22) I know from them that this requires less labour.
  - (23) And he is entitled to make a deduction.
  - (24) On Sabbath eve before nightfall.
  - (25) I.e., permitted, as here, the beams being laden before the Sabbath and the juice then oozing automatically on the Sabbath.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 19b

One may not finish them [at night].<sup>1</sup> And R. Eleazar [b. Pedath] said, It is R. Eleazar [b. Shammua']. For we learnt: If honeycombs are crushed on the eve of Sabbath and it [the honey] exudes spontaneously,<sup>2</sup> it is forbidden;<sup>3</sup> but R. Eleazar permits it.

Now, as to R. Jose son of R. Hanina, what is the reason that he did not answer as R. Eleazar?-He can tell you: it is only there [that R. Eleazar permits it], since it was originally food and still food;<sup>4</sup> but here<sup>5</sup> it was originally food and now a liquid.<sup>6</sup> And R. Eleazar [b. Pedath]?<sup>7</sup> - He can answer you: But we know R. Eleazar [b. Shammua'] to hold that even olives and grapes are also permitted. For when R. Hoshaya came from Nehardea, he came and brought a Baraitha in his hands: If olives and grapes are crushed on the eve of Sabbath and they [their juices] exude spontaneously, they are forbidden;<sup>8</sup> R. Eleazar and R. Simeon permit it. And R. Jose b. R. Hanina?-He did not know this Baraitha.<sup>9</sup>

And R. Eleazar! what is the reason that he did not answer as R. Jose son of R. Hanina?-He can tell you: was it not stated thereon:<sup>10</sup> where they lack crushing there is no controversy at all;<sup>11</sup> they differ only where pounding is lacking:<sup>12</sup> and these too<sup>13</sup> are similar to those that lack crushing. R. Jose son of R. Hanina gave a practical decision in accordance with R. Ishmael.<sup>14</sup>

As to the oil belonging to the pressers, and the mats of the pressers:<sup>15</sup> Rab forbade it,<sup>16</sup> and Samuel permitted it.<sup>17</sup> As to coupled mattings<sup>18</sup> Rab forbids them,<sup>19</sup> and Samuel permits [them]. R. Nahman said: As to a goat [kept] for its milk, a ewe for its shearings, a fowl for its eggs, oxen for ploughing and dates for trading: Rab forbids, and Samuel permits [them],<sup>20</sup> and they differ in the controversy of R. Simeon and R. Judah.<sup>21</sup> A certain disciple gave a practical decision in Harta of Argiz<sup>22</sup> in accordance with R. Simeon;<sup>23</sup> thereupon R. Hamnuna banned him.<sup>24</sup> But do we not hold as R. Simeon?-It was in the place of Rab,<sup>25</sup> and so he should have acted accordingly. There were two disciples: one saved [food, etc.] in one utensil, and one saved [it] in four or five utensils;<sup>26</sup> and they differ in the same dispute as that of Rabbah b. Zabda and R. Huna.<sup>27</sup>

**MISHNAH. MEAT, ONION[S], AND EGG[S] MAY NOT BE ROASTED UNLESS THEY CAN BE ROASTED WHILE IT IS YET DAY. BREAD MAY NOT BE PUT INTO AN OVEN JUST BEFORE NIGHTFALL, NOR A CAKE UPON COALS, UNLESS ITS SURFACE CAN FORM A CRUST WHILE IT IS YET DAY; R. ELEAZAR SAID: THERE MUST BE TIME FOR THE BOTTOM [SURFACE] THEREOF TO FORM A CRUST. THE PASSOVER SACRIFICE MAY BE LOWERED INTO THE OVEN JUST BEFORE NIGHTFALL,<sup>28</sup> AND THE FIRE MAY BE LIGHTED WITH CHIPS<sup>29</sup> IN THE PILE IN THE CHAMBER OF THE HEARTH,<sup>30</sup>**

---

(1) A heavy weight was placed upon them to cause their juice to run out, and the controversy is whether this may be done on the Sabbath, since they were already crushed before.

(2) On the Sabbath.

(3) To consume them on the Sabbath.

(4) Honey is a food, not a drink, even after it oozes out.

(5) The case of the Mishnah, where the oil exudes from the olives, etc.

(6) Olives and grapes are food; oil and wine are liquid. Since it changes so much on the Sabbath, it may be that R. Eleazar forbids it.

(7) Does he not admit the force of this argument?

(8) For drinking on the Sabbath.

(9) This may also mean: he rejects the authenticity of this Baraitha, for not all Baraithas were of equal authority.

(10) On the Mishnah quoted by R. Jose b. R. Hanina.

(11) It is certainly forbidden on all views.

- (12) 'Pounding' (shehikah) connotes a further stage in the process, after crushing.
- (13) In our Mishnah.
- (14) Supra a bottom.
- (15) The remnants of the oil in the corners and the oil which gathered in the mats with which the olives were covered belonged to the workers who pressed it out.
- (16) To be handled on the Sabbath.
- (17) This oil is 'mukzeh,' v. p. 81, n. 4, and it is disputed infra44a et passim whether such may be handled on the Sabbath. Rab and Samuel differ on the same question.
- (18) Keroke (כֶּרֶק) connotes mattings which can be rolled up, and zuze means in pairs. Rashi explains: mattings used in couples to form a roof-like protection for merchandise. He also quotes a variant found in Geonic responsa: כֶּרֶק דְּזִיּוּי ship mattings.
- (19) To be handled on the Sabbath.
- (20) V. next note.
- (21) Infra 156b on 'mukzeh'. All these are 'mukzeh', set apart, i.e., their owner has set them apart not to be eaten but for the purposes stated, and it is disputed infra 156b whether one may change his mind and slaughter them on Festivals for food. With the exception of dates kept for trading the present controversy is in respect of Festivals, whilst that of dates refers to the Sabbath too.
- (22) In S. Babylon on the right arm of the Euphrates, subsequently called Hira. Obermeyer, Landschaft, p. 234.
- (23) That the above are permitted.
- (24) A form of excommunication. The banned person observed certain mourning rites and was shunned by his colleagues. Generally speaking it lasted for thirty days.
- (25) I.e., it was within his jurisdiction.
- (26) They saved them from being destroyed in a fire.
- (27) V. infra i 20a.
- (28) And left to roast on the Sabbath. We have no fear that one may rake the coals on the Sabbath (v. supra 18b),
- (29) Ma'ahizin means to ignite logs by means of burning chips.
- (30) A room where the priests warmed themselves, as they performed the service in the Temple barefoot and became cold. The priests were very careful, and so it is sufficient if the fire just catches on, and no fear is entertained that they may forgetfully rake it into a blaze in the evening.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 20a

BUT IN THE COUNTRY<sup>1</sup> THERE MUST BE TIME FOR THE FIRE TO TAKE HOLD OF ITS GREATER PART.<sup>2</sup> R. JUDAH SAID: IN THE CASE OF CHARCOAL, JUST A LITTLE [SUFFICES].<sup>3</sup>

GEMARA. And how much?<sup>4</sup> - R. Eleazar said in Rab's name: That it may be roasted before sunset as the food of the son of Derusai.<sup>5</sup> It was stated likewise: R. Assi said in R. Johanan's name: Whatever is as the food of the son of Derusai's not subject to [the interdict of] the cooking of Gentiles.<sup>6</sup> It was taught: Hanina said: Whatever is as the food of the son of Derusai may be kept on the stove,<sup>7</sup> though it is not swept [clear of the cinders] and besprinkled with ashes.<sup>8</sup>

BREAD MAY NOT BE PUT, etc. The scholars propounded: Does the BOTTOM [surface] mean the one by the oven, or perhaps BOTTOM means the one by the fire?<sup>9</sup> -Come and hear: R. Eleazar said: There must be time for the surface adhering to the oven to form a crust.

because a whole company is present and should one man forget himself another will remind him. THE PASSOVER SACRIFICE MAY BE LOWERED), [etc.]. What is the reason? - Because the members of the company are extremely careful.<sup>10</sup> But otherwise, it would not [be permitted]? Yet a Master said: [With the flesh of) a kid, whether it [the oven] is daubed round or not, it is well?<sup>11</sup> — There it is cut up, whereas here it is not cut up.<sup>12</sup>

AND THE FIRE IS LIGHTED WITH CHIPS, etc. Whence do we know this?—Said R. Huna: Ye shall kindle no fire throughout your habitations:<sup>13</sup> [only] throughout your habitations you may not kindle, but you may kindle in the pile in the chamber of the Hearth. R. Hisda demurred: If so, even on the Sabbath too!<sup>14</sup> Rather, said R. Hisda: The verse, when it comes, conies to permit [the burning of] limbs and the fat;<sup>15</sup> while the priests are very particular.<sup>16</sup>

BUT IN THE COUNTRY, THERE MUST BE TIME FOR THE FIRE TO TAKE HOLD, etc. What is meant by ‘their greater part?’ — Rab said: the greater part of each [log]; and Samuel said: That it should not be said, Let us bring chips to place under them.<sup>17</sup> R. Hiyya taught [a Baraita which affords] support to Samuel: That the flame should ascend of its own accord, and not with the help of something else.<sup>18</sup>

As to a single log, Rab said: The greater part of its thickness; while others state, The greater part of its circumference. R. Papa observed: Therefore we require the greater part of both its thickness and its circumference. This is a controversy of Tannaim: R. Hiyya said: That the log may be rendered unfit for an artisan's work; R. Judah b. Bathyra said: That the fire should take hold on both sides.<sup>19</sup> And though there is no proof of the matter, there is a hint thereof: the fire hath devoured both the ends of it, and the midst of it is burned; is it profitable for any work.<sup>20</sup>

And there was a fire lit the ah<sup>21</sup> burning before him,<sup>22</sup> What is ‘ah?’<sup>20</sup> ‘Rab said, Willow-fire;<sup>23</sup> while Samuel said: Logs kindled by willowfire. A certain man announced, who wants ahwawna? and it was found to be willows.

R. Huna said: Canes do not require the greater part,<sup>24</sup> [but] if they are tied together, the greater part is required;<sup>25</sup> kernels [of dates] do not require the greater part; but if they are put in bales they require the greater part. R. Hisda demurred: On the contrary, [separate] canes may fall apart,<sup>26</sup> but if tied together they cannot fall apart; kernels can fall apart, but if placed in bales they cannot? It was stated likewise,

---

(1) Lit., ‘borders’, the technical term for Palestine in contradistinction to the Temple (and generally, though not here, to Jerusalem).

(2) Sc. of the logs.

(3) Providing that the coals start burning before nightfall, even if only slightly, it is permitted.

(4) Must the meat etc. be roasted before the Sabbath?

(5) I.e., a third done. Rashi: he was a robber and always ate in a hurry.

(6) Food cooked entirely by Gentiles is forbidden; but if a third done by a Jew, it may be finished by a Gentile.

(7) On the Sabbath; i.e., if it was a third done before.

(8) V. infra 36b.

(9) The oven or stove would appear to have been without a closed bottom, but perhaps consisted of a number of bars over the fire, and the loaves were placed thereon and pressed to the sides of the oven; v. T.A., pp. 87f- The question is whether BOTTOM surface means the surface directly on the open bars facing the fire underneath, or that adhering to the side of the oven.

(10) V. p. 82, n. 11.

(11) V. supra 18b.

(12) The Passover sacrifice was roasted whole. Hence the draught would not injure it, and therefore it is permitted only on account of the reason stated.

(13) Ex. XXXV, 3.

(14) Let it be permitted.

(15) Of animals sacrificed on Friday; these may be burnt on Friday night, the interpretation being, ‘through all your habitations’, i.e., for a secular purpose, but not for a sacred purpose.

(16) That is the real reason of the ruling in the Mishnah, as explained in p. 83, n. 2.

(17) it should be burning strongly enough not to require such assistance.

(18) V. infra 21a (p. 89). But Rashi observes that its author there is Hama b. Hama, and further that it is not a Baraita, and so he mentions that other scholars relate it immediately to this Mishnah, whereof it is an explanation. (10) The fire must take hold of the greater part of its thickness before the Sabbath. (11) I.e., the fire must take hold of the greater part of its thickness.

(19) I.e., the greater part of its circumference.

(20) Ezek. XV, 4.

(21) A.V. hearth; R.V. brazier.

(22) Jer. XXXVI, 22.

(23) אַהַוַּנָּה ahawwna; willow twigs used for kindling a fire.

(24) it is sufficient if they are kindled before the Sabbath, even if the greater part has not caught on, because they will go on burning without further attention.

(25) To be burning before the Sabbath, because the air has no access and it may otherwise require attention.

(26) And fail to catch alight from each other, thus necessitating attention.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 20b

R. Kahana said: Canes tied together require the greater part; if not tied together, they do not require the greater part. Kernels require the greater part; if put in bales they do not.<sup>1</sup>

R. Joseph learned: Four fires do not require the greater part, [viz.] of pitch, sulphur, cheese,<sup>2</sup> and grease.<sup>3</sup> In a Baraita it was taught: straw and rakings too.<sup>4</sup> R. Johanan said: Babylonian woods do not require the greater part. R. Joseph demurred: To what does this refer? Shall we say, To chips?<sup>5</sup> But if [concerning] a wick 'Ulla said, He who kindles must kindle the great part of what protrudes,<sup>6</sup> is there a question of chips!<sup>7</sup> Rather, said R. Joseph: [It refers to] the bark of cedar.<sup>8</sup> Rami b. Abba said: [It refers to] dry twigs.

## CHAPTER II

MISHNAH. WHEREWITH MAY WE KINDLE [THE SABBATH LIGHTS], AND WHEREWITH MAY WE NOT KINDLE THEM?<sup>9</sup> WE MAY NOT KINDLE [THEM] WITH LEKESH, HOSEN [TOW], KALLAK, A BAST WICK, A DESERT WICK, SEAWEED, ZEFETH [PITCH], SHA'AWAH [WAX], KIK OIL, OIL OF BURNING,<sup>10</sup> TAIL FAT, OR TALLOW. NAHUM THE MEDE SAID: WE MAY KINDLE [THEM] WITH BOILED HELEB; BUT THE SAGES MAINTAIN: WHETHER BOILED OR NOT, YOU MAY NOT KINDLE THEREWITH.<sup>11</sup>

GEMARA. Lekesh is cedar bark. But cedar bark is simply wood!<sup>12</sup> -It means the woolly substance [bast] within it.

NOR WITH HOSEN [TOW]. R. Joseph said: [That is,] hatched flax. Abaye demurred: But it is written, And the hosen shall be as ne'oreth?<sup>13</sup> Rather said Abaye: It is crushed but uncombed flax.

NOR WITH KALLAK. Samuel said: I asked all seafarers about it, and they told me that it is called kulka.<sup>14</sup> R. Isaac b. Ze'ira said: Gushkera.<sup>15</sup> Rabin and Abaye were sitting before Rabana<sup>16</sup> Nehemiah the brother of the Resh Galutha.<sup>17</sup> Seeing that he was wearing metaksa,<sup>18</sup> Rabin said to Abaye, That is the kallak of which we learnt. We call it peranda silk, he answered him. An objection is raised: [Garments of] silk, kallak and corded [silk], are liable to fringes.<sup>19</sup> This refutes it.<sup>20</sup> Alternatively, silk is one thing and peranda silk is another.

NOR WITH A BAST WICK: [I.e.,] willow-bast. Rabin and Abaye were walking in the valley of Tamruritha,<sup>21</sup> when they saw some willows. Said Rabin to Abaye, That is the idan [bast] of which we learnt. But that is simply wood, he objected. Thereupon he peeled it and showed him the wool-like substance within.

## NOR WITH A DESERT WICK: Mullein.<sup>22</sup>

NOR WITH SEAWEED. What is this? Shall we say, The black moss of pits? But that is crumbly!<sup>23</sup> Rather said R. Papa: it is the black fungus of ships. A Tanna taught: To these [enumerated in the Mishnah] were added [wicks] of wool and hair.<sup>24</sup> And our Tanna?-Wool shrinks [and] hair smoulders.<sup>25</sup>

NOR WITH PITCH [ZEFETH]. ZEFETH is pitch; SHA'AWAH is wax. A Tanna taught: Thus far the unfit of wicks [is taught]; from here onwards it is the unfit of oils.<sup>26</sup> But that is obvious?-It is necessary in respect to wax: you may say, It is not fit for wicks either; hence we are informed [otherwise].<sup>27</sup>

Rami b. Abin said: 'Itrona<sup>28</sup> is the by-product of pitch; wax is the residue of honey.

- 
- (1) Thus he agrees with R. Huna in respect to staves, and with R. Hisda in respect to kernels.
  - (2) Alfasi reads: wax.
  - (3) I.e., any fatty substance.
  - (4) 'Rakings' refers to small stubble collected in the field.
  - (5) Because they burn easily.
  - (6) Before the Sabbath.
  - (7) Which burn less freely.
  - (8) This was extremely dry and burnt rapidly.
  - (9) I.e., of what must the wick be made?
  - (10) Explained in the Gemara.
  - (11) The foreign terms are discussed in the Gemara.
  - (12) And is obviously unfit for a wick.
  - (13) Isa. I, 31. E.V. And the strong shall be as tow, but Abaye identifies hason with hosen and thus deduces that hosen is not ne'oreth (hatcheled flax).
  - (14) Jast.: cissaros-blossom, 'a woolly substance growing on stones at the Dead Sea, looking like gold, and being very soft; its name is **קלף** (\*\*): and it resembles sheep wool'.
  - (15) A cotton-like plant.
  - (16) I.e., Rabbi. This is a Babylonian title, perhaps = Rabbenu, our teacher.
  - (17) 'Head of the Exile', the title of the official head of Babylonian Jewry.
  - (18) \*\*, silk. (11)Sachs, Beitr. II, p. 185 refers to late Greek \*\* (\*\*, fillet) from which he derives French frange, Eng. fringe (Jast.).
  - (19) V. Num. XV, 38.-This shows that kallak is not identical with silk.
  - (20) Raban's observation.
  - (21) Or perhaps, in a secluded valley.
  - (22) A tall, woolly weed.
  - (23) A wick cannot be made from it in any case.
  - (24) As being unfit for use.
  - (25) When lit; hence they are unfit in any case.
  - (26) I.e., from PITCH.
  - (27) A waxen wick (i.e., a wax candle) is permitted. V., however, Tosaf. a.l.
  - (28) A sort of resin.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 21a

What is the practical bearing of this?-In respect of buying and selling."<sup>1</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: All those of which they ruled that you must not light [the Sabbath lamp]

therewith on the Sabbath, yet a fire may be made of them, both for warming oneself and for using the light thereof, whether on the earth or on the stove;<sup>2</sup> and they merely prohibited the making of a wick of them for a [Sabbath] lamp. NOR WITH KIK OIL. Samuel said: I asked all seafarers about it, and they told me that there is a certain bird in the sea towns called kik.<sup>3</sup> R. Isaac son of Rab Judah said: It is cotton-seed oil; Resh Lakish said: Oil from Jonah's kikayon.<sup>4</sup> Rabbah b. Bar Hanah said: I myself have seen Jonah's kikayon; it resembles the ricinus tree and grows in ditches. It is set up at the entrance of shops;<sup>5</sup> I from its kernels oil is manufactured, and under its branches rest all the sick of the West [i.e., Palestine].

Raba said: As to the wicks which the Sages said that you must not kindle therewith for the Sabbath, [the reason] is because their flame burns unevenly.<sup>6</sup> The oils which the Sages said you must not kindle therewith is because they do not flow [freely] to the wick.<sup>7</sup> Abaye asked Rabbah: As to the oils which the Sages said you must not kindle therewith for the Sabbath, is it permissible to pour a little [good] oil into them and light [therewith]? Do we forbid it, lest one come to light therewith [the forbidden oil in its unmixed state, or not? He answered him, You must not light [therewith]. What is the reason? -Because you must not light.<sup>8</sup>

He raised an objection: if one wraps a material which may be used [as a wick] for lighting around a material which may not be lit, one must not light therewith. R. Simeon b. Gamaliel said: In my father's house a wick was wound over a nut and they did light therewith. Thus he teaches that one may light!<sup>9</sup> -He replied: Instead of refuting me by R. Simeon b. Gamaliel's view, support me by the first Tanna's [ruling]! - That is no difficulty: an act is [more] weighty.<sup>10</sup> Thus the difficulty still remains, [for] surely it was for lighting?<sup>11</sup> - No: for floating.<sup>12</sup> If for floating, what is the reason of the first Tanna?<sup>13</sup> -It is all R. Simeon b. Gamaliel, but there is a lacuna, and it was taught thus: If one wraps a material which may be used for lighting around a material which may not be lit, you must not light therewith. When is that said? For lighting; but for floating it is permitted, for R. Simeon b. Gamaliel said, In my father's house a wick was wound about a nut and lit. Yet that is not so, for R. Beruna said in Rab's name: The melted tallow and the dissolved inwards of fish, one may pour a little oil and light [therewith]?<sup>14</sup> -These flow [freely] in their natural state, while those [in the Mishnah] do not flow [freely] in their natural state,<sup>15</sup> but that the Rabbis forbade melted tallow on account of unmelted tallow and the dissolved inwards of fish on account of the undissolved inwards of fish.<sup>16</sup> Then let us prohibit melted tallow and the dissolved inwards of fish diluted with oil on account of the same without an admixture of oil?<sup>17</sup> -That itself is [merely] a preventive measure, and are we to arise and enact one preventive measure to safeguard<sup>18</sup> another preventive measure?

Rami b. Hama recited: The wicks and oil which the Sages said, One may not light therewith on the Sabbath, one must [also] not light therewith in the Temple, because it is said, to cause a lamp to burn continually.<sup>19</sup> -He recited and he interpreted it: the flame must ascend of itself, and not through something else.<sup>20</sup> We learnt: The outworn breeches and girdles of priests were unravelled, and with these they kindled [the lights]?<sup>21</sup> -The rejoicing of the Water-Drawing<sup>22</sup> was different.<sup>23</sup> Come and hear: Worn out priestly garments were unravelled, and of these wicks were made for the Temple. Surely that means [the garments] of composite materials?<sup>24</sup> -No: [the garments] of linen [are meant].<sup>25</sup>

R. Huna said: With regard to the wicks and oils which the Sages said, One must not light therewith on the Sabbath, one may not light therewith on Hanukkah,<sup>26</sup> either on the Sabbath or on weekdays. Raba observed, What is R. Huna's reason? He holds that if it [the Hanukkah lamp] goes out, one must attend thereto,<sup>27</sup> and one may make use of its light.<sup>28</sup> R. Hisda maintained: One may light therewith on weekdays, but not on the Sabbath. He holds, If it goes out,

---

(1) When one orders 'itrona or wax, he must be supplied with the residue of pitch or honey respectively.

(2) Var. lec.: in the lamp.

- (3) Jast. identifies it with the pelican.
- (4) V. Jonah IV, 6. E.V. gourd, Jast.: ricinus tree, or the sprout bearing the castor-berry.
- (5) To provide shade and fragrance.
- (6) In a notched manner, as it were (Rashi). Jast.: the flame nibbles at them, producing sputtering sparks.
- (7) And so one may trim the wick or tilt the lamp on the Sabbath; hence they are forbidden, Riban states the reason because the lamp may go out, thus destroying the cheerfulness of the Sabbath.
- (8) Rashi: you must not light it when unmixed, and therefore when mixed too it is forbidden, as a preventive measure. The 'Aruk explains; Because etc., i.e., there is a tradition to that effect. But there is also another reading: because it cannot be lit., i.e., the mixture has the same defects as the forbidden oil itself.
- (9) Though a nut itself is not fit.
- (10) Lit., 'an act is a teacher'. Since R. Simeon b. Gamaliel relates that this was actually done, it must be presumed that this is the halachah, for an individual did not act upon his view in opposition to the majority
- (11) I.e., the wick and the nut were meant to burn together.
- (12) To enable the wick to float on the surface of the oil instead of sinking.
- (13) Why does he forbid it?
- (14) Though tallow itself is forbidden (supra 20b), which refutes Raba.
- (15) The Mishnah speaks of unmelted tallow.
- (16) But the prohibition went no further; hence if diluted with oil, it is permissible.
- (17) If the former is permitted, the latter too may be used.
- (18) Lit., 'for'.
- (19) Ex. XXVII, 21.
- (20) Le-ha'aloth (E.V. to burn) literally means to cause to go up.-These wicks and oils do not burn of themselves but need frequent attention. V. p. 84, n. 9.
- (21) The girdles contained wool, which, as stated on 20b, was added to the forbidden materials enumerated in the Mishnah. The reference is to the Temple, and thus this refutes Rami b. Hama.
- (22) Lit., 'the house of drawing'.
- (23) At the daily morning service during the Feast of Tabernacles a libation of water, in addition to the usual libation of wine, was poured out on the altar. This was drawn from the Pool of Siloam on the night of the first day, and carried in procession to the Temple amid great rejoicing; cf. Suk. 53a: 'He who has not seen the rejoicing of the Water-Drawing has never seen rejoicing in his life.' The outer court of the Temple was brilliantly illuminated, and for this, not for the ordinary Temple lamp, the unravelled breeches and girdles were used. Rashi observes: because this was not a Biblical precept. Another reason may be that so much was used that it was really a fire, rather than a flame, which is permitted supra. V. J.E. XII, 476 2.
- (24) Of wool and linen. I.e., the girdles; v. n. i.
- (25) The breeches.
- (26) V. infra b.
- (27) I.e., relight it. Therefore it must be made of good oil in the first place, lest it go out and is not relit.-This, of course, can only apply to weekdays.
- (28) E.g., for reading. Therefore these wicks and oils are forbidden on the Sabbath as the first reason in p. 88, n. 5, which applies here too.

## **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 21b**

it does not require attention, and one may make use of its light. R. Zera said in R. Mattenah's name — others state, R. Zera said in Rab's name — :Regarding the wicks and oils which the Sages said, One must not light therewith on the Sabbath, one may light therewith on Hanukkah, either on weekdays or on the Sabbath. Said R. Jeremiah, What is Rab's reason? He holds, If it goes out, it does not require attention, and one may not make use of its light.<sup>1</sup> The Rabbis stated this before Abaye in R. Jeremiah's name, but he did not accept it. [But] when Rabin came,<sup>2</sup> the Rabbis stated it before Abaye in R. Johanan's name, whereupon he accepted it.<sup>3</sup> Had I, he observed, merited the great fortune,<sup>4</sup> I would have learnt this dictum originally. But he learnt it [now]?-The difference is in respect of the studies of one's youth.<sup>5</sup>

Now, if it goes out, does it not require attention? But the following contradicts it: Its observance is from sunset until there is no wayfarer in<sup>6</sup> the street. Does that not mean that if it goes out [within that period] it must be relit?—No: if one has not yet lit, he must light it;<sup>7</sup> or, in respect of the statutory period.<sup>8</sup>

‘Until there is no wayfarer in the street.’ Until when [is that]? — Rabbah b. Bar Hanah said in R. Johanan's name: Until the Palmyreans have departed.<sup>9</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: The precept of Hanukkah [demands] one light for a man and his household;<sup>10</sup> the zealous [kindle] a light for each member [of the household]; and the extremely zealous, — Beth Shammai maintain: On the first day eight lights are lit and thereafter they are gradually reduced;<sup>11</sup> , but Beth Hillel say: On the first day one is lit and thereafter they are progressively increased.<sup>12</sup> ‘Ulla said: In the West [Palestine] two amoraim,<sup>13</sup> R. Jose b. Abin and R. Jose b. Zebida, differ therein: one maintains, The reason of Beth Shammai is that it shall correspond to the days still to come,<sup>14</sup> and that of Beth Hillel is that it shall correspond to the days that are gone; but another maintains: Beth Shammai's reason is that it shall correspond to the bullocks of the Festival;<sup>15</sup> whilst Beth Hillel's reason is that we promote in [matters of] sanctity but do not reduce.

Rabbah b. Bar Hana said: There were two old men<sup>16</sup> in Sidon:<sup>17</sup> one did as Beth Shammai and the other as Beth Hillel: the former gave the reason of his action that it should correspond to the bullocks of the Festival, while the latter stated his reason because we promote in [matters of] sanctity but do not reduce.

Our Rabbis taught: It is incumbent to place the Hanukkah lamp by the door of one's house on the outside;<sup>18</sup> if one dwells in an upper chamber, he places it at the window nearest the street. But in times of danger<sup>19</sup> it is sufficient to place it on the table. Raba said: Another lamp is required for its light to be used;<sup>20</sup> yet if there is a blazing fire it is unnecessary. But in the case of an important person,<sup>21</sup> even if there is a blazing fire another lamp is required.

What is [the reason of] Hanukkah? For our Rabbis taught: On the twenty-fifth of Kislev<sup>22</sup> [commence] the days of Hanukkah, which are eight on which a lamentation for the dead and fasting are forbidden.<sup>23</sup> For when the Greeks entered the Temple, they defiled all the oils therein, and when the Hasmonean dynasty prevailed against and defeated them, they made search and found only one cruse of oil which lay with the seal of the High Priest,<sup>24</sup> but which contained sufficient for one day's lighting only; yet a miracle was wrought therein and they lit [the lamp] therewith for eight days. The following year these [days] were appointed a Festival with [the recital of] Hallel<sup>25</sup> and thanksgiving.<sup>26</sup>

We learnt elsewhere: If a spark which flies from the anvil goes forth and causes damage, he [the smith] is liable. If a camel laden with flax passes through a street, and the flax overflows into a shop, catches fire at the shopkeeper's lamp, and sets the building alight, the camel owner is liable; but if the shopkeeper placed the light outside, the shopkeeper is liable.<sup>27</sup> R. Judah said: In the case of a Hanukkah lamp he is exempt.<sup>28</sup> Rabina said in Rab's name: This proves that the Hanukkah lamp should [in the first instance] be placed within ten.<sup>29</sup> For should you think, above ten, let him say to him, ‘You ought to have placed it higher than a camel and his rider.’ ‘Yet perhaps if he is put to too much trouble, he may refrain from the [observance of the] precept’.<sup>30</sup>

R. Kahana said, R. Nathan b. Minyomi expounded in R. Tanhum's name:

---

(1) To show that it was lit in celebration of Hanukkah, not merely for illumination.

(2) V. p. 12, n. 9.

- (3) R. Johanan being a greater authority than R. Jeremiah.
- (4) The verb denotes both to be fortunate and to merit.
- (5) These are more abiding. Abaye felt that he would have had a surer hold upon it had he learned it earlier.
- (6) Lit., 'Until the foot ceases from'.
- (7) Anytime within that period.
- (8) I.e., the lamp must contain sufficient oil to burn for that period. Nevertheless, if it goes out sooner, it need not be rekindled.
- (9) Lit., 'until the feet of the Tarmodians have ceased'. Tarmod or Tadmor is Palmyra, an oasis of the Syrian desert. They sold lighting materials and went about in the streets later than the general populace as their wares might be needed.
- (10) I.e., one light is lit every evening of the eight days (v.infra) for the entire household.
- (11) One less each day.
- (12) Up to eight.
- (13) V. Glos.
- (14) I.e., each evening one must kindle as many lights as the number of days of Hanukkah yet to come.
- (15) 'The Festival', without a determinate, always refers to Tabernacles (Sukkoth). Thirteen bullocks were sacrificed on the first day, twelve on the second, and so on, one less each succeeding day; v, Num. XXIX, 12 seqq.
- (16) The Heb. zaken, pl. zekenim, frequently means learned men, without particular reference to age (Kid. 32b), and may connote this here.
- (17) On the coast of Phoenicia.
- (18) To advertise the miracle. Their houses did not open directly on to the street but into a courtyard, and there the lamp was to be placed (Rashi); v., however, Tosaf, a.l.
- (19) When there is religious persecution.
- (20) Agreeing with the view supra that the light of the Hanukkah lamp may not be used.
- (21) Who is not accustomed to work at the light of a blazing fire.
- (22) The ninth month of the Jewish year, corresponding to about December.
- (23) This is an extract of the Megillath Ta'anith, lit., 'the scroll of fasting'.
- (24) Hence untouched and undefiled.
- (25) 'Praise', Ps. CXIII-CXVIII, recited on all Festivals; v. Weiss, Dor, I, p. 108, n. 1.
- (26) This lighting took place in 165 B.C.E. Exactly three years before, on the same day, Antiochus Epiphanes had a pagan altar erected in the Temple, upon which sacrifices were offered (I Macc. I, 41-64). Apart from the Talmudic reason stated here, Judas Maccabeus chose 25th of Kislev as the anniversary of the Temple's defilement, and the dedication of the new altar was celebrated with lights for eight days, similarly to the Feast of Tabernacles, which lasted eight days and was celebrated by illuminations (I Macc. IV, 36; II Macc. X, 6; supra a, p. 90, n. 3). Actually the revolt was against the Syrians, of whom Antiochus Epiphanes was king, but the term 'Greeks' is used loosely, because the Seleucid Empire was part of the older Empire founded by Alexander the Great of Macedon, and because it was a reaction against the attempted Hellenization of Judea. The historic data are contained in the First Book of the Maccabees.
- (27) For the loss of the flax.
- (28) Because, as stated above, it should be placed outside; the onus then lies upon the camel driver.
- (29) Handbreadths from the ground.
- (30) Possibly the lamp may be placed at the outset higher, yet the Rabbis did not wish to make the precept too burdensome.

## **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 22a**

If a Hanukkah lamp is placed above twenty cubits [from the ground] it is unfit, like sukkah and a cross-beam over [the entrance of] an alley.<sup>1</sup> R. Kahana also said, R. Nathan b. Minyomi expounded in R. Tanhum's name: Why is it written, and the pit was empty, there was no water in it?<sup>2</sup> From the implication of what is said, 'and the pit was empty', do I not know that there was no water in it; what then is taught by, 'there was no water in it'? There was no water, yet there were snakes and scorpions in it.

Rabbah said: The Hanukkah lamp should be placed within the handbreadth nearest the door.<sup>3</sup> And

where is it placed?-R. Aha son of Raba said: On the right hand side: R. Samuel<sup>4</sup> of Difti<sup>5</sup> said: On the left hand side.<sup>6</sup> And the law is, on the left, so that the Hanukkah lamp shall be on the left and the mezuzah<sup>7</sup> on the right.

Rab Judah said in R. Assi's name:<sup>8</sup> One must not count money by the Hanukkah light. When I state this before Samuel, he observed to me, Has then the lamp sanctity?<sup>9</sup> R. Joseph demurred: Does blood possess sanctity? For it was taught: he shall pour out [the blood thereof], and cover it [with dust]:<sup>10</sup> wherewith he pours out, he must cover,<sup>11</sup> i.e., he must not cover it with his foot,<sup>12</sup> so that precepts may not appear contemptible to him. So here too<sup>13</sup> it is that precepts may not appear contemptible to him.

R. Joshua b. Levi was asked: Is it permitted to make use of the booth decorations during the whole of the seven days?<sup>14</sup> He answered him [the questioner], Behold! it was said, One must not count money by the Hanukkah light.<sup>15</sup> God of Abraham! exclaimed R. Joseph, he makes that which was taught dependent upon what was not taught: [of] booths it was taught, whereas of Hanukkah it was not. For it was taught: if one roofs it [the booth] in accordance with its requirements, beautifies it with hangings and sheets, and suspends therein nuts, peaches, almonds, pomegranates, grape clusters, garlands of ears of corn, wines, oils and flours; he may not use them until the conclusion of the last day of the Feast; yet if he stipulates concerning them,<sup>16</sup> it is all according to his stipulation. — Rather, said R. Joseph: The basis<sup>17</sup> of all is [the law relating to] blood.<sup>18</sup>

It was stated: Rab said: One must not light from lamp to lamp;<sup>19</sup> but Samuel maintained, You may light from lamp to lamp. Rab said: Fringes<sup>20</sup> may not be detached<sup>21</sup> from one garment for [insertion in] another, but Samuel ruled, Fringes may be detached from garment to garment. Rab said, The halachah is not as R. Simeon in respect to dragging; but Samuel maintained, The halachah is as R. Simeon in respect to dragging. Abaye said: In all matters the Master [Rabbah] acted in accordance with Rab, except in these three, where he did as Samuel: [viz.,] one may light from lamp to lamp; one can detach [the fringes] from one garment for [insertion in] another; and the halachah is as R. Simeon in respect to dragging. For it was taught: R. Simeon said: One may drag a bed, seat, or bench,<sup>22</sup> provided that he does not intend to make a rut.

One of the Rabbis sat before R. Adda b. Ahabah and sat and said: Rab's reason<sup>23</sup> is on account of the cheapening of the precept. Said he to them, Do not heed him: Rab's reason is because he impairs the precept.<sup>24</sup> Wherein do they differ?-They differ where he lights from lamp to lamp:<sup>25</sup> on the view that it is because of the cheapening of the precept, one may light from lamp to lamp;<sup>26</sup> but on the view that it is because he impairs the precept, even from lamp to lamp is forbidden.

R. Awia objected: As to a sela'<sup>27</sup> of

---

(1) A sukkah (q.v. Glos.) built higher than twenty cubits, or a cross-beam which permits carrying in a side street (v. p. 30, n. 5 and 'Er. 2a) placed higher than twenty cubits from the ground, is unfit. Similarly a Hanukkah lamp, because it is too high to be noticed and does not advertise the miracle.

(2) Gen. XXXVII, 24.

(3) On the outside, as stated on 21b. But if it is placed further away, there is nothing to show that it was set there by the owner of the house.

(4) In She'eltoth, Wa-yishlah, 26 the reading is R. Jeremiah.

(5) V. p. 35, n. 5.

(6) Both meaning as one enters the house.

(7) V. Glos.

(8) Cur. ed. adds: in Rab's name: Rosh omits it, and it appears to be absent from Rashi's text too.

(9) Surely not.

(10) Lev. XVII, 13. This refers to a beast or a fowl killed for food.

- (11) Sc. with this hand.
- (12) Kicking the dust over it.
- (13) Viz., the Hanukkah lamp.
- (14) The booths which were erected for the Feast of Tabernacles (Lev. XXIII, 42) were adorned with fruit suspended from the roofs.
- (15) Being dedicated to a religious observance, it must not be put to secular use. The same applies here.
- (16) the prohibition is regarded as coming into force at twilight of the first day when they become dedicated to their religious purpose. The stipulation whereby the prohibition is lifted is: 'I will not hold aloof from them throughout the period of twilight', so that it does not become dedicated them,
- (17) Lit. 'the father'.
- (18) As stated above: things taken for religious purposes must not be treated slightly.
- (19) One Hanukkah lamp must not be lit from another. Or, when a lamp with several branches is used, in accordance with the practice of the 'most zealous' (supra 21b; this too is the modern usage), one branch must not be lit from another.
- (20) V. Num. XV, 38.
- (21) Lit., 'untied'.
- (22) Over an earthen floor on the Sabbath.
- (23) For ruling that one must not kindle one lamp from another.
- (24) It looks like taking light away from one lamp and giving it to another.
- (25) Directly, without an intermediary chip.
- (26) There is nothing degrading when it directly lights another lamp for the same religious purpose.
- (27) V. Glos.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 22b

second tithe,<sup>1</sup> one may not weigh by it gold denarii,<sup>2</sup> even to redeem therewith other second tithe. Now, it is well if you say that Rab and Samuel differ [over direct lighting] from lamp to lamp, yet with a chip Samuel admits that it is forbidden: then this is not a refutation.<sup>3</sup> But if you [on Samuel's view] say that it is permitted even with a chip, then this is a refutation?—Rabbah answered: It is a preventive measure, lest he does not find his weights exact and leaves<sup>4</sup> them hullin.<sup>5</sup>

R. Shesheth objected: Without the veil of testimony ... shall [Aaron] order it?<sup>6</sup> does He then require its light: surely, during the entire forty years that the Israelites travelled in the wilderness they travelled only by His light! But it is a testimony to mankind<sup>7</sup> that the Divine Presence rests in Israel. What is the testimony?<sup>8</sup> — Said Rab: That was the western branch [of the candelabrum] in which the same quantity of oil was poured as into the rest, and yet he kindled [the others] from it and ended therewith.<sup>9</sup> Now here, since the branches are immovable, it is impossible other than that he take [a chip] and kindle [it];<sup>10</sup> which is a difficulty both on the view that it is because of the cheapening of the precept and on the view that it is because of the impairing of the precept? — R. Papa reconciled it [thus: it is lit] by long wicks.<sup>11</sup> Yet after all, on the view that it is because of the impairing of precepts there is a difficulty? That is [indeed] a difficulty.

What is our decision thereon? — R. Huna, the son of R. Joshua, said: We consider: if the lighting fulfils the precept, one may light from lamp to lamp:<sup>12</sup> but if the placing [of the lamp] fulfils the precept,<sup>13</sup> one may not light from lamp to lamp.<sup>14</sup> For the scholars propounded: Does the kindling or the placing constitute the precept? — Come and hear: For Raba said, If one was holding the Hanukkah lamp and thus standing, he does nothing:<sup>15</sup> this proves that the placing constitutes the precept! — [No:] There a spectator may think that he is holding it for his own purposes.<sup>16</sup> Come and hear: For Raba said: if one lights it within and then takes it outside, he does nothing. Now, it is well if you say that the kindling constitutes the precept; [for this reason] we require the kindling to be [done] in its proper place,<sup>17</sup> [and] therefore he does nothing. But if you say that the placing constitutes the precept, why has he done nothing? — There too an observer may think that he lit it for his own purposes. Come and hear: For R. Joshua b. Levi said,

---

(1) The tenth of the produce which was eaten by its owner in Jerusalem. When the actual produce could not be carried, it was redeemed, and the redemption money assumed the sanctity of second tithe and was expended in Jerusalem, v. Deut. XIV, 22-26.

(2) One sela' = four denarii, and the value depended on the weight.

(3) For the gold denarii are not actually sanctified when they are weighed, though that is their purpose. Thus they are similar to the chip which may not be lit at the Hanukkah lamp because it is secular itself.

(4) Lit., 'withdraws'.

(5) The gold denarii may be deficient in weight and not be declared second tithe after all. Thus he will have used the second tithe sela' purely for a secular purpose.

(6) Lev. XXIV, 3; v. 1-4.

(7) Lit., 'those who enter the world'.

(8) How was this a testimony?

(9) Half a log of oil was poured into each branch, which was estimated to burn through the longest night. Thus by the morning they were extinguished. The following evening the priest cleaned out the old wicks, poured in fresh oil, and relit it: yet this western branch was still burning when he came to clean them out, which was done last of all. This miracle testified to the Divine Presence in Israel. On the western branch of the candelabrum v. Men. 78b.

(10) In order to light the others.

(11) Which reached the other branches.

(12) Just as the kindling of the branches of the candlestick in the Temple from the western branch.

(13) I.e., the prime observance of the Hanukkah lamp is not the kindling thereof but placing it in a conspicuous place.

(14) For the lit lamp or branch is already sanctified, as it were, whilst no complete religious observance is fulfilled by the act of lighting the next, on the present hypothesis.

(15) He does not fulfil the precept.

(16) Whereas the essence of the Hanukkah lamp is to advertise the miracle.

(17) Sc. outside; supra 21b.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 23a

With regard to a lantern which was burning the whole day [of the Sabbath],<sup>1</sup> at the conclusion of the Sabbath it is extinguished and then [re-]lit.<sup>2</sup> Now, it is well if you say that the kindling constitutes the precept: then it is correct. But if you say that the placing constitutes the precept, is this [merely] extinguished and [re-]lit: surely it should [have stated], It must be extinguished, lifted up, replaced and then relit? Moreover, since we pronounce a benediction, 'Who sanctified us by His commandments and commanded us to kindle the lamp of Hanukkah,' it proves that the kindling constitutes the precept. This proves it.

And now that we say that the kindling constitutes the precept, if a deaf-mute, idiot, or minor<sup>3</sup> lights it, he does nothing. But a woman may certainly light [it], for R. Joshua b. Levi said: The [precept of the] Hanukkah lamp is obligatory upon women, for they too were concerned in that miracle.<sup>4</sup>

R. Shesheth said: The [precept of the] Hanukkah lamp is incumbent upon a guest.<sup>5</sup> R. Zera said: Originally, when I was at the academy, I shared the cost<sup>6</sup> with mine host;<sup>7</sup> but after I took a wife I said, Now I certainly do not need it, because they kindle [the lamp] on my behalf at my home.<sup>8</sup>

R. Joshua b. Levi said: All oils are fit for the Hanukkah lamp, but olive oil is of the best. Abaye observed: At first the Master [Rabbah] used to seek poppy-seed oil, saying, The light of this is more lasting;<sup>9</sup> but when he heard this [dictum] of R. Joshua b. Levi, he was particular for olive oil, saying, This yields a clearer light. R. Joshua b. Levi also said: All oils are fit<sup>10</sup> for ink, and olive oil is of the best. The scholars propounded: for kneading or for smoking?<sup>11</sup> — Come and hear: For R. Samuel b. Zutra recited: All oils are fit for ink, and olive oil is of the best, both for kneading and for smoking.

R. Samuel b. Zutra recited it thus: All soots are fit for ink: and olive oil is the best. R. Huna said: All gums are good for ink, but balsam gum is the best of all.

R. Hiyya b. Ashi said: He who lights the Hanukkah lamp must pronounce a blessing; while R. Jeremiah said He who sees the Hanukkah lamp must pronounce a blessing. Rab Judah said: On the first day, he who sees must pronounce two, and he who lights must pronounce three blessings;<sup>12</sup> thereafter, he who lights pronounces two, and he who sees pronounces one. What is omitted?<sup>13</sup> — The ‘season’ is omitted.<sup>14</sup> Yet let the ‘miracle’ be omitted?<sup>15</sup> The miracle holds good for every day.<sup>16</sup>

What benediction is uttered?<sup>17</sup> -This: Who sanctified us by His commandments and commanded us to kindle the light of Hanukkah.<sup>18</sup> And where did He command us?<sup>19</sup> -R. Awia said: [It follows] from, thou shalt not turn aside [from the sentence Which they shall shew thee].<sup>20</sup> R. Nehemiah quoted: Ask thy father, and he will shew thee; Thine elders, and they will tell thee.<sup>21</sup>

R. Amram objected: Dem'a<sup>22</sup> can be employed for an ‘erub<sup>22</sup> and for a joint ownership;<sup>23</sup> a benediction is pronounced over it, and grace in common is recited after it,<sup>24</sup> and it<sup>25</sup> may be separated by a naked person, and at twilight.<sup>26</sup> But if you say that every Rabbinical [precept] requires a benediction, here, when one stands naked, how can he pronounce a benediction: lo! we require, therefore shall thy camp be holy [that he see no unclean thing in thee],<sup>27</sup> which is absent?-Said Abaye, A certain Rabbinical law<sup>28</sup> requires a benediction, whereas a doubtful Rabbinical law does not.<sup>29</sup> But what of the second day of Festivals, which is a Rabbinical [institution] based on doubt,<sup>30</sup> and yet it requires a benediction?<sup>31</sup> -There it [was instituted] in order that it should not be treated slightly.<sup>32</sup> Raba said: The majority of the ‘amme ha-arez tithe<sup>33</sup> [their produce].<sup>34</sup> R. Huna said: If a courtyard has two doors, it requires two [Hanukkah] lamps. Said Raba, That was said only [if they are situated] at two [different] sides; but [if] on the same side, it is unnecessary. What is the reason?<sup>35</sup> Shall we say, because of suspicion?<sup>36</sup> Whose suspicion? Shall we say, that of strangers:<sup>37</sup> then let it be necessary even on the same side?<sup>38</sup> Whilst if the suspicion of townspeople, then even [if] on two different sides it is still unnecessary?<sup>39</sup> — After all, it is on account of the suspicion of the townspeople, yet perchance they may pass one [door] and not the other, and say, ‘just as it [the lamp] has not been lit at this door, so has it not been lit at the other.’

And whence do you know<sup>40</sup> that we pay regard to suspicions? Because it was taught, R. Simeon said: On account of four considerations the Torah ordered pe'ah<sup>41</sup> to be left at the end of the field:<sup>42</sup> [as a precaution] against the robbing of the poor, against wasting the time of the poor, against suspicion, and against [transgressing], thou shalt not finish off [the corners of thy field].<sup>43</sup> [As a precaution] against the robbing of the poor: lest the owner see a free hour<sup>44</sup> and say to his poor relations, ‘This is pe'ah;’<sup>45</sup>

---

(1) Having been lit on the Sabbath eve as a Hanukkah lamp,

(2) As a Hanukkah lamp for the next day.

(3) These three are frequently grouped: their actions have no legal or religious validity.

(4) According to the Talmud Jewish virgins were subjected to the *jus primae noctis* before the Maccabean revolt (cf. I Macc. I, 26f, which may perhaps refer to this), and were rescued from it by the ‘miracle’, i.e., the successful Maccabean uprising.

(5) Not living in his own house but as a guest or boarder elsewhere.

(6) Lit., ‘the coins’-the cost of the oil for the Hanukkah lamp.

(7) He did not kindle lights for himself but purchased a share in those lit by his host.

(8) He continued to study away from home after marriage.

(9) Rashi: this oil burned slower. Tosaf.’s reading seems to be: this gives a stronger light: on grounds of logic this would appear preferable.

(10) Ink was made of soot and oil or gum, and was a solid cake of pigment which had to be loosened before use. Cf.

supra, Mishnah on 17b.

(11) Is it the best for kneading with soot or for creating the smoke which produces the soot?

(12) V. P.B. p. 274; the spectator omits the first, since he does not kindle the lights. Rashi and Asheri observe that only a spectator who has not yet kindled the lights himself, or who cannot do so, e.g., when he is in a boat, is required to pronounce these benedictions.

(13) After the first day.

(14) *ibid.* the third blessing: ‘ . . . and has enabled us to reach this season’. This is appropriate for the first evening only.

(15) I.e., the second benediction: ‘ . . . Who wroughtest miracles . . .’

(16) The cruse miraculously burned all the eight days; v. supra 21b.

(17) Lit., ‘he blesses’.

(18) *Ibid.* the first blessing. The literal translation is given here, the passage being in the third person.

(19) This precept is not Biblical, of course.

(20) Deut. XVII, 11.

(21) *Ibid.* XXXII, 7. Both verses teach that a Rabbinical observance has Biblical sanction, and thus roots subsequent tradition in the Bible itself. Cf. I. Abrahams, *Permanent Values of the Talmud*, pp. 79ff.

(22) V. Glos,

(23) I.e., to link up a number of side streets in respect of carrying on the Sabbath; v. p. 18, n. 7; it is the same with side streets.

(24) ‘Grace in common’ is recited when three persons or more dine together; it is then prefaced by one of them saying, ‘My masters, let us recite grace;’ this man acts as leader. When only two dine together, each recites grace by himself.

(25) The tithe of dem'ai.

(26) Friday evening. The tithe of certain tebel (v. Glos.) may not be separated on the Sabbath, nor at twilight, for it is doubtful whether this belongs to the previous or to the following day. But since dem'ai is only a doubtful tithe, it is permitted as a double doubt; cf. p. 64, n. 7.

(27) Deut. XXIII, 15.

(28) Lit., ‘a certain (law) of their words’.

(29) The kindling of light is a definite and certain observance; the tithing of dem'ai, however, is done through doubt.

(30) Scripture ordained Festivals of one day only at the beginning and end (viz., Passover and Tabernacles, v. Lev. XXIII, 7f, 35f) or one day altogether (Pentecost and New Year; *ibid.* 21, 24). The exact days when these were to be observed depended upon New Moon of the month in which they fell (except Pentecost), which was originally determined by direct observation, not by calculation. By experience it was found that New Moon was always either twenty-nine or thirty days after the previous New Moon, and as soon as it was thus fixed by the Great Court in Jerusalem, envoys were dispatched to inform the communities in time for the Festival. But they could not reach the Jewish communities outside Palestine in time, and therefore they observed two days instead of one. Thus the original reason of the added second day at the beginning and the end was on account of doubt, though it was retained even when the New Moon came to be determined by calculation, which precluded doubt.

(31) Viz. ‘sanctification of the Festival’, which was done by means of a benediction.

(32) Unless the second day was formally sanctified people would not treat it as holy.

(33) Pl. of ‘am ha-arez; v. p. 51, n. 1.

(34) So that dem'ai is less than an ordinary doubt, but merely a Rabbinical stringency; therefore a benediction is not required.

(35) That two lamps are required.

(36) Viz., if a person sees a door without a lamp he may suspect the owner of having neglected it altogether.

(37) Lit., the world’-i.e., a stranger passing through the town may be unaware that a lamp is burning at another door.

(38) For a stranger may think that the courtyard fronts two separate houses.

(39) They know that both belong to the same house.

(40) Lit., ‘say’.

(41) V. Glos.

(42) Instead of enacting that a certain portion of the field be left for the poor, its situation to be at the owner's discretion.

(43) Lev. XIX, 9. ‘Thou shalt not finish off’ implies at the end of the field, where the harvesting is completed.

(44) When no poor are about in the field.

(45) But now the poor will know when the end of the field is likely to be reached.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 23b

and against wasting the time of the poor: that the poor should not have to sit and watch out, 'now the owner will leave pe'ah'; and against suspicion: that passers-by may not say, 'cursed be the man who has not left pe'ah in his field'; and against [transgressing] thou shalt not finish off: are not all these on account of, 'thou shalt not finish off'?<sup>1</sup> -Said Raba, [It means, as a precaution] against cheats.<sup>2</sup>

R. Isaac b. Redifah said in R. Huna's name: A lamp with two spouts is credited to two people.<sup>3</sup> Raba said: If one fills a dish with oil and surrounds it with wicks, and places a vessel over it,<sup>4</sup> it is credited to many people; if he does not place a vessel over it, he turns it into a kind of fire,<sup>5</sup> and is not credited even to one.

Raba said: It is obvious to me [that if one must choose between] the house light and the Hanukkah light,<sup>6</sup> the former is preferable, on account [of the importance] of the peace of the home;<sup>7</sup> [between] the house light and [wine for] the Sanctification of the Day,<sup>8</sup> the house light is preferable, on account of the peace of the home. Raba propounded: What [if the choice lies between] the Hanukkah lamp and the Sanctification of the Day: is the latter more important, because it is permanent;<sup>9</sup> or perhaps the Hanukkah lamp is preferable, on account of advertising the miracle? After propounding, he himself solved it: The Hanukkah lamp is preferable, on account of advertising the miracle.

R. Huna said: He who habitually practises [the lighting of] the lamp will possess scholarly sons; he who is observant of [the precept of] mezuzah<sup>10</sup> will merit a beautiful dwelling; he who is observant of fringes<sup>11</sup> will merit a beautiful garment; he who is observant of the Sanctification of the Day will be privileged to fill barrels of wine.<sup>12</sup>

R. Huna was accustomed frequently to pass the door of R. Abin the carpenter.<sup>13</sup> Seeing that he habitually lit many lights, he remarked, Two great men will issue hence. R. Idi b. Abin and R. Hiyya b. Abin issued thence. R. Hisda was accustomed frequently to pass the house of R. Shizbi's father.<sup>14</sup> Seeing that he habitually lit many lights, he remarked, A great man will issue hence. R. Shizbi issued thence.

R. Joseph's wife used to kindle [the Sabbath lights] late.<sup>15</sup> [Thereupon] R. Joseph said to her, It was taught: He took not away the pillar of cloud by day, and the pillar of fire by night.<sup>16</sup> this teaches that the pillar of cloud overlapped<sup>17</sup> the pillar of fire, and the pillar of fire overlapped the pillar of cloud. Thereupon she thought of doing it very early. Said an old man to her: It was taught: Providing that one is not too early<sup>18</sup> or too late.

Raba said: He who loves the Rabbis will have sons who are Rabbis ; he who honours the Rabbis will have Rabbis for sons-in-law; he who stands in awe of the Rabbis will himself be a Rabbinical scholar. But if he is not fit for this, his words will be heeded like those of a Rabbinical scholar.<sup>19</sup>

NOR WITH OIL OF BURNING. What is OIL OF BURNING? Said Rabbah, Oil of terumah which was defiled; and why is it called OIL OF BURNING? Because it stands to be burnt. And why is this forbidden on the Sabbath?-Since it is one's duty to destroy it, we fear lest he tilt [the lamp].<sup>20</sup> Abaye objected: if so, let it be permitted on Festivals.<sup>21</sup> Why did we learn: One must not kindle [the lamp] on Festivals with oil of burning!-Festivals are forbidden on account of the Sabbath.<sup>22</sup> R. Hisda said: We have no fear lest he tilt [it], but here the reference is to a Festival which falls on the eve of the Sabbath, and as for the prohibition, [the reason is] because sacred food<sup>23</sup> must not be burnt on Festivals.<sup>24</sup> But since the second clause<sup>25</sup> states, One must not light on Festivals with oil of burning, it follows that the first clause does not refer to Festivals?-R. Hanina of Sura answered: This [the second clause] states, 'What is the reason': what is the reason that one must not light [the lamp] on

Festivals with oil of burning? Because sacred food must not be burnt on Festivals.<sup>26</sup>

- (1) The other three are reasons why the Torah said this.
- (2) Who may not leave anything and maintain that they left pe'ah in the middle of the field.
- (3) Who each fulfils his obligations, i.e., where only one light is used; supra 21b.
- (4) So that the whole looks like a lamp with many spouts.
- (5) All the flames merge into one and create one great blaze; it does not look like a lamp at all then.
- (6) He cannot afford both. Rashi observes that this refers to the Sabbath.
- (7) V. infra 25b.
- (8) The Sabbath and the Festivals were sanctified over wine.
- (9) Coming every week; by comparison Hanukkah is temporary, coming but once a year.
- (10) V. Glos.
- (11) V.Num. XV, 38.
- (12) I.e., he will be wealthy.
- (13) Many of the Rabbis were workers or tradespeople, the office of the Rabbinate being unpaid in most cases.
- (14) So translated by Bah.
- (15) Just before nightfall.
- (16) Ex. XIII, 22.
- (17) Lit., 'completed'.
- (18) As it is not evident that it is lit in honour of the Sabbath.
- (19) This dictum was possibly a reproof of the hostility sometimes shown towards the Rabbis: cf. Sanh. 99b.
- (20) To accelerate it.
- (21) Since making a fire on Festivals is permitted.
- (22) Lest it be thought that the latter too is permitted.
- (23) Which includes terumah.
- (24) Even when, being defiled, it is unfit for food.
- (25) The Mishnah on 24b.
- (26) [The words, 'one must not light on Festivals with oil of burning' in the second clause, is another way of stating the rule that holy food must not be burnt on Festivals].

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 24a

It was taught in accordance with R. Hisda: All those [materials] concerning which the Rabbis ruled, One must not light therewith on Sabbath, may be used for lighting on Festivals, except oil of burning,<sup>1</sup> because sacred food must not be burnt on Festivals.

The scholars propounded: Is Hanukkah to be mentioned in grace after meals? Since it is a Rabbinical [institution], we do not mention it; or perhaps it is mentioned to give publicity to the miracle?-Said Raba in R. Sehora's name in R. Huna's name: It need not be mentioned; yet if one comes to mention it, he does so in the 'Thanks' [benediction].<sup>2</sup> R. Huna b. Judah chanced to visit Raba's academy [and] thought to mention it [Hanukkah] in [the benediction] 'he will rebuild Jerusalem.'<sup>3</sup> Said R. Shesheth to them [the scholars], It is as the Prayer:<sup>4</sup> Just as [it is inserted in] the Prayer in the [benediction of] 'Thanks,'<sup>5</sup> So [is it inserted in] grace after meals in the [benediction of] 'Thanks'.<sup>6</sup>

The scholars propounded: Is New Moon to be mentioned in grace after meals? Should you say that it is unnecessary in the case of Hanukkah, which is only Rabbinical, then on New Moon, which is Biblical,<sup>7</sup> it is necessary; or perhaps since the performance of work is not forbidden, it is not mentioned? Rab said: It is mentioned; R. Hanina said: It is not mentioned. R. Zerika said: Hold fast<sup>8</sup> to Rab's [ruling], because R. Oshaia supports him. For R. Oshaia taught: On those days when there is an additional offering,<sup>9</sup> viz., New Moon and the weekdays of Festivals<sup>10</sup> at the Evening, Morning and Afternoon [services] the Eighteen [Benedictions] are recited, and the nature of the occasion is

inserted in the 'Abodah;<sup>11</sup> and if one does not insert it, he is turned back;<sup>12</sup> and there is no Sanctification over wine,<sup>13</sup> and mention thereof is made in grace after meals. On those days when there is no additional offering, viz., Mondays, Thursdays,<sup>14</sup> Fasts,<sup>15</sup> and Ma'amadoth<sup>16</sup> -What business have Mondays and Thursdays [here]?<sup>17</sup> -Rather [say thus:] on the Mondays, Thursdays and the [following] Mondays of Fasts<sup>18</sup> - and of Ma'amadoth<sup>19</sup> — at the Evening, Morning and Afternoon [Services] the Eighteen [Benedictions] are recited, and the nature of the occasion is inserted in 'Thou hearkenst unto Prayer';<sup>20</sup> yet if one does not insert it he is not made to repeat it,<sup>21</sup> and no reference is made on these [days] in grace after meals.<sup>22</sup>

The scholars propounded: Should one refer to Hanukkah in the Additional Services?<sup>23</sup> Since there is no Additional Service for [Hanukkah] itself, we do not refer to it; or perhaps it [the Sabbath and New Moon] is a day which requires four services?<sup>24</sup> — R. Huna and Rab Judah both maintain: It is not referred to; R. Nahman and R. Johanan both maintain: It is referred to. Abaye observed to R. Joseph. This [ruling] of R. Huna and Rab Judah is [synonymous with] Rab's. For R. Gidal said in Rab's name: If New Moon falls on the Sabbath, he who reads the Haftarah<sup>25</sup> in the prophetic lesson need not mention New Moon,<sup>26</sup> since but for the Sabbath there is no prophetic lesson on New Moon.<sup>27</sup> How compare! There, there is no prophetic lesson on New Moon at all; whereas here it [the reference to Hanukkah] is found in the Evening, Morning and Afternoon Services. Rather it is similar to the following. Viz., R. Ahadebuy said in the name of R. Mattenah in Rab's name: When a Festival falls on the Sabbath, he who reads the haftarah in the prophetic lesson at the Sabbath Afternoon Service<sup>28</sup> need not mention the Festival, since but for the Sabbath there is no prophetic lesson at the Afternoon Service on Festivals.

- 
- (1) [Although one may light therewith on Sabbaths, one may not do so on Festivals, v. Tosaf a.l.].
  - (2) The second benediction of grace; so called because it commences with, 'we give thanks unto Thee'.
  - (3) The fourth benediction of grace.
  - (4) The 'Prayer' par excellence is the Eighteen Benedictions; v. p. 32, n. 3.
  - (5) The eighteenth benediction.
  - (6) The 'mention' is an added passage which relates very briefly the story of Hanukkah.
  - (7) Cf. Num. XXVIII, 11-15.
  - (8) Lit., 'in your hand'.
  - (9) I.e., additional to the daily burnt-offering; v. Num. XXVIII, 1, seq.
  - (10) The first and seventh days of Passover, and the first and eighth of Tabernacles have the full sanctity of Festivals, and no work, except what is necessary for the preparation of food, is permitted. The intermediate days are of a semi-festive nature, other work too being permitted under certain conditions.
  - (11) Lit., '(sacrificial) service', the name of the seventeenth Benediction.
  - (12) To repeat the passage, because these are special occasions instituted in the Bible.
  - (13) Lit., 'goblet'. V. p. 102, n. 8.
  - (14) On these days Reading of the Law forms part of the Service, as on the Sabbath. According to the Talmud (B.K. 82a) this was instituted by Ezra, so that three days should not pass without Torah.
  - (15) Specially proclaimed for rain (Ta'an. 10a).
  - (16) Ma'amad, pl. ma'amadoth, lit., posts': 'a division of popular representatives deputed to accompany the daily services in the Temple with prayers, and also a corresponding division in the country towns, answering to the divisions of priests and Levites' (Jast.). Each district sent its representatives on certain days; v. Ta'an. Mishnah 26a.
  - (17) This is an interjection. Why should I think that special mention must be made? The Reading of the Law is certainly insufficient cause.
  - (18) In times of drought fasts were held on Monday, Thursday and the following Monday.
  - (19) On these days four fasts were kept: Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday; Ta'an ibid.
  - (20) The name of the sixteenth Benediction.
  - (21) Because these are not Biblical institutions.
  - (22) The first clause states that a reference is made on New Moon, in agreement with Rab.
  - (23) Of the Sabbath and New Moon; these always occur during Hanukkah, which commences on the 25th of the month

and lasts eight days.

(24) The three stated above plus the Additional. Hence this Additional Service ranks as the rest, and requires a mention of Hanukkah.

(25) 'Conclusion'. A passage of the Prophets, with which the Reading of the Law concludes. The passage generally had some bearing upon the portion of the Law, except on special occasions. On the origin and the development of the Haftarah v. J.E. s.v. 'Haftarah' and 'Liturgy': Elbogen, *Der Judische Gottesdienst*, 174 seq.

(26) 'Who sanctifieth the Sabbath and the New Moon', the conclusion of the last benediction after the haftarah.

(27) This is the same reasoning as that which governs R. Huna's and Rab Judah's view above.

(28) This is not mentioned elsewhere in the Talmud. Rashi quotes a Geonic responsum that a haftarah from the prophets was read in early times, until the practice was forbidden by the Persians. V. Elbogen, *op. cit.*, p. 182.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 24b

Yet the law is as none of these rulings, but as R. Joshua b. Levi's dictum: When the Day of Atonement falls on the Sabbath, he who recites the Ne'ilah Service<sup>1</sup> must refer to the Sabbath:<sup>2</sup> it is a day when four services are obligatory.<sup>3</sup> Then one law contradicts another! [First] you say that the law is as R. Joshua b. Levi, whereas it is an established principle that the law is as Raba. For Raba said: On a Festival that falls on the Sabbath, the Reader<sup>4</sup> who descends before the desk<sup>5</sup> at the Evening Service<sup>6</sup> need not make mention of the Festival,<sup>7</sup> since but for the Sabbath the Reader would not descend [before the desk] at the Evening Service on Festivals.<sup>8</sup> -How compare! There, by ritual law it is not required even on the Sabbath,<sup>9</sup> and it was the Rabbis who instituted it on account of danger;<sup>10</sup> but here it is a day when four services are a [statutory] obligation.

NOR WITH TAIL FAT etc. But the SAGES are identical with the first Tanna?<sup>11</sup> -They differ in respect to R. Beruna's dictum in Rab's name,<sup>12</sup> but it is not clearly defined.<sup>13</sup>

MISHNAH. ONE MAY NOT KINDLE [THE SABBATH LAMP] WITH OIL OF BURNING ON FESTIVALS.<sup>14</sup> R. ISHMAEL SAID: ONE MAY NOT LIGHT [IT] WITH 'ITRAN,<sup>15</sup> FOR THE HONOUR OF THE SABBATH; BUT THE SAGES PERMIT IT WITH ALL OILS; WITH SESAME OIL, NUT OIL, RADISH OIL, FISH OIL,, GOURD OIL, ITRAN AND NAPHTHA. R. TARFON SAID: ONE MAY LIGHT [IT] WITH OLIVE OIL, ONLY.

GEMARA. What is the reason?-Because sacred [commodities] may not be burnt on Festivals.<sup>16</sup> Whence do we know it?-Said Hezekiah, and the School of Hezekiah taught likewise: And ye shall let nothing of it remain until the morning; but that which remaineth of it until the morning [ye shall burn with fire]:<sup>17</sup> now [the second] until the morning' need not be stated. What then is the teaching of, until the morning'? Scripture comes to appoint the second morning for its burning.<sup>18</sup> Abaye said: Scripture saith, 'the burnt-offering of the Sabbath [shall be burnt] on its Sabbath',<sup>19</sup> but not the burnt-offering of weekdays on the Sabbath, nor the burnt-offering of weekdays on Festivals.<sup>20</sup> Raba said, Scripture saith, [no manner of work shall be done on them, save that which every man must eat,] that only may be done of you:<sup>21</sup> 'that', but not its preliminaries;<sup>22</sup> 'only', but not circumcision out of its proper time, which might [otherwise] be inferred a minori.<sup>23</sup> R. Ashi said: on the first day shall be a solemn rest [Shabbathon]<sup>24</sup>

---

(1) The 'closing service'. Originally this was held daily in the Temple just before the closing of the Temple gates (cf. Ta'an. IV, 1). Outside the Temple a Ne'ilah service was held only on public fast days; sub sequently, however, it was abolished and retained for the Day of Atonement only. Elbogen, pp. 68, 152.

(2) 'Thou didst sanctify the Sabbath and this Day of Atonement'.

(3) And the same applies to Festivals falling on the Sabbath.

(4) Lit., 'the congregation messenger or representative'.

(5) In Talmudic times the reading desk in Babylonian synagogues was on a lower level than the rest of the synagogue.

(6) He recites the 'one benediction embodying the seven'. V. P.B. pp. 119f.

- (7) He merely concludes with 'Who sanctifiest the Sabbath'.
- (8) To read the benediction mentioned in n. 5. This runs counter to the view of R. Joshua b. Levi.
- (9) The repetition of the Eighteen Benedictions on weekdays and the 'seven benedictions' on Sabbaths and Festivals by the Reader was originally instituted on account of the uneducated, who could not pray for themselves. In the Evening Service, however, which in origin was regarded as of a voluntary character (v. Ber. 27b), this repetition was omitted, and the same should apply to the Sabbath too.
- (10) The Synagogues were situated outside the town, therefore the Rabbis prolonged the service by the addition of this passage so that latecomers might not be left alone in the synagogue and have to return home by themselves.
- (11) V. Mishnah on 20b.
- (12) Supra 21a.
- (13) Who accepts and who rejects that view.
- (14) V. supra 23b.
- (15) Jast.: a sort of resin used for lighting in place of oil.
- (16) V. supra 23b.
- (17) Ex. XII, 10. The reference is to the Passover sacrifice.
- (18) i.e., the sixteenth of the month, which was not a Festival, v. p. 105, n. 2. This shows that its burning on the Festival is forbidden.
- (19) Num. XXVIII, 10. This is the literal translation of the verse; the E.V. is not so true to the original.
- (20) E.g., the animal sacrificed before the Sabbath or a Festival is not to be burnt the following evening. Hence sacrifices and sacred food in general, if unfit, may a minori not be burnt on Festivals.
- (21) With reference to festivals. Ex. XII, 16.
- (22) E.g., one may roast meat, but not construct an oven or make a spit for the roasting.
- (23) A child is circumcised on the Sabbath if it is the eighth day after birth (Lev. XII, 3), but not otherwise. This is deduced from 'alone', which is a limitation. But for this one could infer a minori (v. infra 132b) that it is permissible. Thus we learn that when an act need not be done on a particular day, it may not be done on the Sabbath or Festivals, and the same applies to the burning of defiled sacred food.
- (24) Lev. XXIII, 39.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 25a

is an affirmative precept:<sup>1</sup> thus there is an affirmative and a negative precept in respect of Festivals, and an affirmative precept cannot supersede a negative and an affirmative precept.<sup>2</sup>

Thus it [the burning of defiled terumah] is forbidden only on Festivals, but on weekdays it is well.<sup>3</sup> What is the reason? Said Rab: Just as it is obligatory to burn defiled sacred food, so it is obligatory to burn defiled terumah, and the Torah said, When it is burnt, you may benefit therefrom. Where did the Torah say thus?—[It follows] from R. Nahman's [dictum]. For R. Nahman said in Rabbah b. Abbuha's name, Scripture saith, And I, behold, I have given thee the charge of mine heave-offerings:<sup>4</sup> the Writ refers to two terumoth,<sup>5</sup> viz., clean and unclean terumah, and the Divine Law said '[I have given] thee', [meaning], let it be thine for burning it under thy pot. Alternatively, [it follows] from R. Abbahu's [dictum]. For R. Abbahu said in R. Johanan's name: 'Neither have I put away thereof, being unclean:'<sup>6</sup> 'thereof' you may not 'put away,'<sup>7</sup> but you may 'put away' [burn] defiled oil of terumah. Yet [perhaps] say: 'thereof' you may not 'put away', but you may 'put away undefiled oil of kodesh<sup>8</sup> which is defiled? — Does it [the reverse] not follow a fortiori: if tithe, which is light,<sup>9</sup> yet the Torah said, neither have I put away thereof, being unclean'; then how much more so kodesh, which is more stringent? If so, in the case of terumah too let us say, does it [the reverse] not follow a afortiori?<sup>10</sup> — Surely thereof' is written!<sup>11</sup> And why do you prefer it thus?<sup>12</sup> — It is logical that I do not exclude kodesh, since it is [stringent] in respect of (Mnemonic: Pa Nak'akas):<sup>13</sup> [i] Piggul, [ii] Nothar, [iii] sacrifice [Korban], [iv] Me'ilah, [v] Kareth, and [vi] 'it is forbidden [asur] to an onen.'<sup>14</sup> On the contrary, terumah is not to be excluded, since [it is stringent] in respect of its (mnemonic Ma HPaz): [i] Death [Mithah], [ii] a fifth [Homesh],

- (1) For it intimates, rest therein.
- (2) The negative precept is 'no manner of work' etc.; while the affirmative precept to burn what is left over is in Ex. XII, 10, quoted supra. Thus unfit sacred food may not be burnt on Festivals, and the same applies to unclean terumah.
- (3) One may benefit from the burning, e.g., by using it as fuel.
- (4) Num. XVIII, 8. Heb. terumothai, pl. of terumah with passage.
- (5) Since it is in the plural.
- (6) Deut. XXVI, 14; v. whole passage. The reference is to the second tithe, and 'being unclean' is understood as meaning whether the person or the tithe was unclean.
- (7) I.e., by using it as fuel.
- (8) V. Glos. E.g., that used in connection with the meal offerings; v. Lev. II, 1.
- (9) I.e., its sanctity is less than that of sacrifices.
- (10) For its sanctity is higher than that of tithes.
- (11) Implying a limitation as stated.
- (12) Lit., 'what (reason) do you see?'- Why exclude terumah by exegesis and include kodesh a fortiori? Perhaps it should be the reverse?
- (13) A mnemonic is a word or phrase made up of the initial letters of a number of other words or phrases, as an aid to the memory.
- (14) V. Glos. for these words. (i) Piggul, lit., 'abomination', is a sacrifice killed with the intention of eating it without the boundaries appointed for same; (ii) nothar, with the intention of eating it after its appointed time. These are the connotations of the words here, though elsewhere piggul has the meaning given here to nothar (Tosaf.). These unlawful intentions render the sacrifice an 'abomination', and it may then not be eaten even within its lawful boundaries and time on pain of kareth. (iii) It is designated a sacrifice (Korban). (iv) If one puts it to secular use he is liable to a trespass-offering (Me'ilah). (v) Kareth is incurred for eating it in an unclean bodily state. Kareth (lit., 'cutting off') is the Divine penalty of premature death and childlessness, which is severer than 'Death at the hand of Heaven', which does not include childlessness.-Since Kodesh is so strict in all these matters, it is logical that the limitation does not apply to it.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 25b

, [iii] it cannot be redeemed [Pidyon], and [iv] it is forbidden to Zarim?<sup>1</sup> The former are more numerous. Alternatively, kodesh is more stringent, since it involves the penalty of kareth. R. Nahman b. Isaac said: Scripture saith, [The first-fruits of thy corn, of thy wine, and of thine oil ... ] shalt thou give to him:<sup>2</sup> to 'him', but not for its light;<sup>3</sup> hence it can be used for light [if defiled].<sup>4</sup>

R. ISHMAEL SAID etc. What is the reason?-Rabbah answered, Since it is malodorous, it is feared that he [the occupant of the house] will leave it and go out. Said Abaye to him, Then let him leave it! I maintain, he replied, that the kindling of the lamp on the Sabbath is a duty,<sup>5</sup> for R. Nahman b. R. Zabda-others state, R. Nahman b. Raba-said in Rab's name: The kindling of the lamp for the Sabbath is a duty; the washing of the hands and the feet in warm water on the eve [of the Sabbath] is voluntary. Whilst I maintain that it is a mizwah.<sup>6</sup> How is it a mizwah? For Rab Judah said in Rab's name: This was the practice of R. Judah b. Il'ai: On the eve of the Sabbath a basin filled with hot water was brought to him, and he washed his face, hands, and feet, and he wrapped himself and sat in fringed linen robes,<sup>7</sup> and was like an angel of the Lord of Hosts. But his disciples hid the corners of their garments from him.<sup>8</sup> Said he to them, My sons! Have I not thus taught you: A linen robe, in respect to fringes-Beth Shammai exempt it, while Beth Hillel hold it liable, and the halachah is as Beth Hillel? But they held, It is forbidden on account of a night garment.<sup>9</sup>

And thou hast removed my soul far off from peace; I forgot prosperity.<sup>10</sup> What is the meaning of, 'and thou hast removed my soul far off from peace'?-R. Abbahu said: This refers to the kindling of the light on the Sabbath.<sup>11</sup> I forgot prosperity;<sup>12</sup> R. Jeremiah said: This refers to the [loss of] baths. R. Johanan said: This means the washing of hands and feet in hot water. R. Isaac Nappaha<sup>13</sup> said: This refers to a beautiful bed and beautiful bedclothes upon it.<sup>14</sup> R. Abba said: This refers to a decked-out bed and an adorned wife for scholars. Our Rabbis taught: Who is wealthy? He who has

pleasure in his wealth: this is R. Meir's view. (Mnemonic: Mat Kas).<sup>15</sup> R. Tarfon said: He who possesses a hundred vineyards, a hundred fields and a hundred slaves working in them.<sup>16</sup> R. Akiba said: He who has a wife comely in deeds.<sup>17</sup> R. Jose said: He who has a privy near his table.<sup>18</sup>

It was taught: R. Simeon b. Eleazar said: One may not light [the Sabbath lamp] with balsam. What is the reason?—Rabbah said: Since its smell is fragrant, there is [the need of] a preventive measure, lest one draw supplies from it.<sup>19</sup> Said Abaye to him,

---

(1) For Zar, pl. Zarim, v. Glos. (i) If a zar or an unclean priest eats terumah, he is liable to Death at the hand of heaven; (ii) if a zar eats it unwittingly, he must restore it and add a fifth; (iii) under no circumstances can terumah be redeemed and converted to hullin, whereas kodesh can be redeemed if it is blemished; and finally (iv), it is always forbidden to zarim. But certain sacrifices (kodesh) are permitted to zarim after the sprinkling of the blood, e.g., the thanksgiving and the peace-offerings.

(2) Deut. XVIII, 4.

(3) I.e., the priest must be able to use it himself, and not have to burn it for its heat or light. Hence defiled corn, etc., which may not be eaten as terumah, may not be separated as terumah for undefiled corn.

(4) For otherwise, why exclude it?

(5) I.e., the lamp must be lit where the evening repast is consumed. If the person leaves it and dines elsewhere he does not fulfil his obligation.

(6) Mizwah denotes either a definite precept or something which while not actually commanded is meritorious. The latter is meant here.

(7) The fringes were of wool. This constitutes a forbidden mixture (v. Deut. XXII, 11), and it is disputed by Tannaim whether this should be done.

(8) Because they were not provided with fringes, V. next note.

(9) A garment worn only at night is not subject to fringes; consequently, this forbidden mixture (v. n. 3) is then forbidden, since there is no precept of fringes to supersede it. The disciple held that Beth Hillel's ruling was Scriptural only; nevertheless it is forbidden by Rabbinical law, to avoid confusing night attire with day attire.

(10) Lam. III, 17.

(11) Jeremiah laments that they could not even afford this; loss of light brings loss of peace.

(12) Lit., 'good'.

(13) Or, the smith; v. p. 102, n. 13.

(14) Or, a beautiful couch and its appointments.

(15) V. p. 110, n. 1. R. Meir, R. Tarfon, R. AKiba, and R. Jose.

(16) The most famous dictum on wealth is in Ab. IV, 1: Who is wealthy? He who rejoices in his portion. Nevertheless, other Rabbis took a more material view of wealth, as here. Maharsha suggests that R. Tarfon intentionally states his case in an exaggerated form, to intimate that one who seeks wealth can never really attain it, unless he is satisfied with what he possesses. On that view R. Tarfon's statement really agrees with that in Aboth. Actually R. Tarfon was very wealthy, and Judaism is not opposed to wealth in principle. 'Despise not riches. Honour the wealthy if they are benevolent and modest. But remember that the true riches is contentment'. — Sefer Ma'aloth Hammidoth, quoted by M. Joseph in Judaism as Creed and Life, p. 388.

(17) He spoke from personal experience: his wife stood out as a model of fidelity and trust, and it was she alone who enabled and encouraged him to attain his high position (Ned. 50a).

(18) In a time when sanitary arrangements were very primitive and privies were situated in fields, this would be a sign of wealth, V. T.A. I, 48.

(19) Which is forbidden; v. Bez. 22a.

## **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 26a**

Let the Master say, because it is volatile?<sup>1</sup> — He states, one thing and yet another.' One thing, because it is volatile; and yet another, as a preventive measure, lest he draw supplies from it.

A certain mother-in-law hated her daughter-in-law. Said she to her, 'Go and adorn yourself with

balsam oil.<sup>2</sup> She went and adorned herself. On her return she said to her, 'Go and light the lamp.' She went and lit the lamp: a spark flew out on her and consumed her.

But Nebuzaradan the captain of the guard left of the poorest of the land to be vinedressers [kormim] and husbandmen [yogbim].<sup>3</sup> 'Kornim:' R. Joseph learnt: This means balsamum gatherers from the En Gedi to Ramah. Yogbim: These are those which catch hilazon<sup>4</sup> from the promontory of Tyre as far as Haifa.<sup>5</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: One must not feed a lamp with unclean tebel<sup>6</sup> on weekdays, and all the more so on the Sabbath. Similarly, one must not light [a lamp] with white naphtha on weekdays, and all the more so on the Sabbath. As for white naphtha, that is well, [the reason being] because it is volatile. But what is the reason of unclean tebel?-Scripture saith, And I, behold, I have given thee the charge of mine heave-offerings [terumothai]:<sup>7</sup> the Writ refers to two terumoth, clean and unclean terumah:<sup>8</sup> just as you enjoy nought of clean terumah save from its separation and onwards,<sup>9</sup> So also unclean terumah, you may enjoy nought thereof save from its separation and onwards.<sup>10</sup>

[To turn to] the main text: R. Simeon b. Eleazar said: One may not kindle [the Sabbath lamp] with balsam. And thus did R. Simeon b. Eleazar say: Balsam [zari] is merely the sap of resinous trees. R. Ishmael said: All that proceeds from trees, one may not light. R. Ishmael b. Berokah said: One may light only with the produce of fruit.<sup>11</sup> R. Tarfon said: One may light [the Sabbath lamp] with nought but olive oil. Thereupon R. Johanan b. Nuri rose to his feet and exclaimed, What shall the Babylonians do, who have only sesame oil? And what shall the Medeans do, who have only nut oil? And what shall the Alexandrians do, who have only radish oil? And what shall the people of Cappadocia<sup>12</sup> do, who have neither the one nor the other, save naphtha? But you have nought else but that concerning which the Sages said, One may not kindle [therewith].<sup>13</sup> And one may kindle with fish oil and 'itran.<sup>14</sup> R. Simeon Shezuri<sup>15</sup> said: One may kindle with oil of gourds and with naphtha. Symmachos said: All that which comes from flesh, we may not kindle therewith, except fish oil. But Symmachos is identical with the earlier Tanna?<sup>16</sup> -They differ in respect to R. Beruna's dictum in Rab's name,<sup>17</sup> but it is not clearly defined.<sup>18</sup>

It was taught, R. Simeon b. Eleazar said: Whatever comes forth from trees is not subject to the law of three by three fingerbreadths,<sup>19</sup> and one may cover [a booth] therewith,<sup>20</sup> except flax.<sup>21</sup> Abaye observed,

---

(1) Explosive and dangerous.

(2) Anointing with oil is and was a common practice in the hot eastern countries; Krauss, T.A. I, 229 and 233.

(3) Jer. LII, 16.

(4) Purple-fish, used for dyeing tekeleth, a peculiar kind of blue.

(5) **וִּגְבִּים** is derived from **גָּבַ** 'to split', with reference to the splitting of the mollusc in order to extract the dye; v. infra 76a.

(6) V. Glos.

(7) Num. XVIII, 8.

(8) V. supra 25a.

(9) Clean terumah is used for human consumption, and before it is actually separated it is forbidden, even to the priest, i.e., he may not enjoy the produce in which it is contained.

(10) Unclean terumah can be used only as fuel, and the analogy shows that this is permitted only when it is actually separated, but not while it is yet tebel.

(11) Excluding fish and mineral oil, and oil tapped direct from the tree.

(12) A district of Asia Minor.

(13) You cannot add to the list of forbidden oils enumerated on 20b.

(14) A sort of resin.

(15) Of Shezor, supposed to be Sheghor, near Kefar Anan in Galilee, v. Neub., Geogr., p. 278.

(16) Sc. R. Johanan b. Nuri.

(17) V. supra 11a. One holds that tallow, being flesh, may not be used at all, even if mixed with oil, thus rejecting the view expressed there, and the other maintains that the mixture is permitted.

(18) Who accepts R. Beruna's dictum and who rejects it.

(19) A piece of cloth three fingerbreadths square (or more) is liable to become unclean. R. Simeon b. Eleazar excepts the produce of trees, e.g., cotton cloth.

(20) The booth (sukkah), in which one must dwell during the Feast of Tabernacles (Lev. XXIII, 42), must be covered with a material that is not liable to defilement (Suk. 12.b); hence the produce of trees is fit for this purpose.

(21) Even if not made up into a garment and as yet merely spun (v. infra 27b). Though not liable to defilement by reptiles it is subject to the uncleanness of leprosy.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 26b

R. Simeon b. Eleazar and the Tanna of the School of R. Ishmael<sup>1</sup> said the same thing. R. Simeon b. Eleazar, as stated. The Tanna of the School of R. Ishmael: what is that? For the School of R. Ishmael taught: Since garments are mentioned in the Torah unspecified, while the Writ specified wool and flax in the case of one of them: [then] just as there, wool and flax [are specified], so all [garments] are of wool and flax.<sup>2</sup> Raba said: They differ in respect to three [handbreadths] by three in other clothes [not wool or linen]: R. Simeon b. Eleazar accepts [their liability to defilement],<sup>3</sup> whilst the Tanna of the School of R. Ishmael rejects it.<sup>4</sup>

Now all at least agree that an area of three [fingerbreadths] of wool or linen is subject to the defilement of leprosy. How do we know it? Because it was taught, A garment:<sup>5</sup> I know it only of a [complete] garment; whence do I learn it of [cloth] three [fingerbreadths] square? From the verse, and the garment.<sup>6</sup> Yet say that it is to include three [handbreadths] square?<sup>7</sup> -Does that not follow a minori: if a warp and a woof become unclean,<sup>8</sup> is there a question of three [handbreadths] square?<sup>9</sup> If so, if it is three [fingerbreadths] square, let it also be deduced a minori?<sup>10</sup> — Rather, [this is the reply]: three [handbreadths] square, which is of use<sup>11</sup> both to the wealthy and to the poor, can be deduced a minori<sup>12</sup> three [fingerbreadths] square, which is of use to the poor only, but not to the rich,<sup>13</sup> cannot be learnt a minori: hence it is only because Scripture wrote it; but had Scripture not written it, we could not deduce it a minori.

Yet say [that its purpose is] to include three [handbreadths] square of other materials?<sup>14</sup> -Scripture saith, a woollen garment, or a linen garment:<sup>15</sup> only a woollen or a linen garment, but not anything else. Yet say, when it is excluded it is from [the defilement of] three [fingerbreadths] square, but three [handbreadths] square can become unclean?-Two limitations are written: 'a woollen garment or a linen garment',<sup>16</sup> [hence] one is to exclude [them] from [the defilement of] three [fingerbreadths] square, and the other to exclude them from [the defilement of] three [handbreadths] square.

Now, according to Raba, who said, They differ in respect of three [handbreadths] by three in other clothes, R. Simeon b. Eleazar accepting [their liability to defilement], whilst the Tanna of the School of R. Ishmael rejects it,-how does he [R. Simeon b. Eleazar] know [the defilement of] three [handbreadths] square of other materials?

---

(1) No particular Tanna is meant, but the collective view of that School.

(2) E.g., the uncleanness of garments caused by the carcasses of forbidden animals (Lev. II, 25) or reptiles (v. 32): there the garments are unspecified. On the other hand, with respect to leprosy in garments wool and flax are specified: The garment also that the plague of leprosy is in, whether it be a woollen garment, or a linen garment.-Lev. XIII, 47.

(3) In his statement he employs the word shalosh, feminine, which must refer to fingerbreadths (ezba'oth, fem.). Hence they are not subject to the stricter law that even when only three fingerbreadths square they shall be liable to defilement. Whence it follows that they are subject to the next standard of liability, viz., three handbreadths (sheloshah, masc).

agreeing with tefahim, handbreadths); v. infra.

(4) For he simply rules that wherever 'garments' is stated it means wool or flax.

(5) Lev. XIII, 47: referring to leprosy.

(6) We-habeged, E.V. The garment also, 'And' is regarded as an extension.

(7) But not the smaller standard.-Shalosh refers to ezba'oth, fingerbreadths; sheloshah to tefahim, handbreadths; v. n. 1.

(8) Lev. ibid.

(9) No extension is needed for that.

(10) Since cloth containing a warp and a woof can be less.

(11) Lit., 'fit'.

(12) For it is then nearer to an actual garment.

(13) A rich man would not trouble to save it for some possible service-hence it is further removed from 'garment'.

(14) Lit., 'garments'.

(15) Lev. XIII, 48; these are also specified in v. 47.

(16) V. P. 115, n. 13.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 27a

— He deduces it from, or raiment.<sup>1</sup> For it was taught:<sup>2</sup> 'raiment': I only know [it] of raiment,<sup>3</sup> how do I know [it of] three [handbreadths] square of other materials?<sup>4</sup> Therefore it is stated, 'or raiment.' And Abaye? how does he employ this or raiment!-He utilizes it to include three [fingerbreadths] square of wool or linen, that it becomes unclean through creeping things.<sup>5</sup> And Raba?<sup>6</sup> -The Merciful One revealed this in reference to leprosy,<sup>7</sup> and the same holds good of reptiles. And Abaye?<sup>8</sup> — It [the analogy] may be refuted: as for leprosy, [the reason is] because the warp and the woof [of wool or linen] become defiled in their case.<sup>9</sup> And the other?<sup>10</sup> -Should you think that leprosy is stricter, let the Divine Law write [it]<sup>11</sup> with reference to reptiles,<sup>12</sup> and leprosy would be learnt from them. And the other?-Leprosy could not be derived from reptiles, because it may be refuted: as for reptiles, [the reason is] because they defile by the size of a lentil.<sup>13</sup> Abaye said: This Tanna of the School of R. Ishmael rebuts another Tanna of the School of R. Ishmael. For the School of R. Ishmael taught: 'A garment': I know it only of a woollen or a linen garment: whence do I know to include camel hair<sup>14</sup>, rabbit wool, goat hair,<sup>15</sup> silk, kallak,<sup>16</sup> and seritim?<sup>16</sup> From the verse, or raiment'. Raba said: When does this Tanna of the School of R. Ishmael reject [the defilement of] other materials? [Only in respect of] three [fingerbreadths] square; but [if it is] three [handbreadths] square, he accepts it. But it was Raba who said that in respect of three [handbreadths] by three in other clothes, R. Simeon b. Eleazar accepts [their liability to defilement], while the Tanna of the School of R. Ishmael rejects it?-Raba retracted from that [view]. Alternatively, this latter [statement] was made by R. Papa.<sup>17</sup>

R. Papa said: 'So all [are of wool or flax],<sup>18</sup> is to include kil'ayim.<sup>19</sup> But of kil'ayim it is explicitly stated, Thou shalt not wear a mingled stuff, wool and linen together?<sup>20</sup> -I might argue, That is only in the manner of wearing,<sup>21</sup> but to place it over oneself<sup>22</sup> any two materials [mingled] are forbidden. Now, does that not follow a fortiori': if of wearing, though the whole body derives benefit from kil'ayim,<sup>23</sup> you say, wool and linen alone [are forbidden] but nothing else; how much more so wrapping oneself! Hence this [dictum] of R. Papa is a fiction.<sup>24</sup> R. Nahman b. Isaac said: 'So all etc.'

---

(1) Lev. XI, 32, q.v. 'Or'-(Heb. **אֵשׁ** is an extension.

(2) This phrase always introduces a Baraita, which contains the teaching of a Tanna. Since it is controverted by Abaye (v. text), Rashi deletes 'for it was taught', for it is axiomatic that an amora (Abaye was such) cannot disagree with a Tanna, and assumes that it is a continuation of Raba's statement. Tosaf. defends it, and the style too is that of a Baraita.

(3) Sc. that a garment is subject to defilement.

(4) Not wool or linen.

(5) 'Or raiment' is in a passage referring to these.

(6) How does he know that?

(7) V. supra 26b.

(8) Does he not admit this?

(9) I.e., the thread itself, whether warp or woof, is liable to defilement. But Scripture does not state this in reference to reptiles, and so the deduction of three fingerbreadths square may not apply to it either.

(10) Raba: how does he dispose of this refutation?

(11) The extension of 'and the garment' supra 26b.

(12) Instead of leprosy.

(13) A piece the size of a lentil is sufficient to defile, whereas the smallest leprous eruption to defile is the size of a bean, which is larger than a lentil.

(14) Lit., 'wool of camels'.

(15) I.e., stuffs made of these.

(16) V. supra p. 86, n. 6.

(17) Raba's successor; of many dicta it was not known whether they were his or Raba's; Tosaf. infra b. s.v. **רַב פּוֹנָא**

(18) In the first citation of the Tanna of the School of R. Ishmael, supra 26b.

(19) V. Glos. I.e., only a mixture of wool or flax is forbidden, but no other. Accordingly it does not relate to defilement at all, and does not contradict the other teaching of the School of R. Ishmael. — Rashi reads at the beginning of this passage, For R. Papa said, since this dictum of R. Papa explains why in his opinion the two are not contradictory.

(20) Deut. XXII, 11.

(21) Then a mixture of wool and linen alone is forbidden.

(22) E.g., as a covering or wrap.

(23) When one wears a garment it comes into closer contact with the separate limbs of the body, affording them protection and warmth, than when he merely covers or wraps himself in a robe.

(24) Incorrect.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 27b

is to include fringes.<sup>1</sup> [But] of fringes it is explicitly stated, 'Thou shalt not wear a mingled stuff, wool and linen together'; and then it is written, Thou shalt make thee fringes?<sup>2</sup>, I might argue, it is as Raba. For Raba opposed [two verses]: it is written, [and that they put upon the fringe of] each border,<sup>3</sup> [which indicates] of the same kind of [material as the] border; but it is also written, '[Thou shalt not wear a mingled stuff,] wool and linen together'?<sup>4</sup> How is this [to be reconciled]? Wool and linen fulfil [the precept]<sup>5</sup> both in their own kind and not in their own kind;<sup>6</sup> other kinds [of materials] discharge [the obligation] in their own kind, but not in a different kind. [Thus,] you might argue, it is as Raba:<sup>7</sup> therefore we are informed [otherwise].<sup>8</sup>

R. Aha son of Raba asked R. Ashi: According to the Tanna of the School of R. Ishmael, why is uncleanness different that we include other garments? Because 'or raiment' is written! Then here too<sup>9</sup> let us say that other garments are included from [the verse] wherewith thou coverest thyself?<sup>10</sup> — That comes to include a blind person's garment. For it was taught: That ye may look upon it:<sup>11</sup> this excludes a night garment. You say, this excludes a night garment; yet perhaps it is not so, but rather it excludes a blind man's garment? When it is said, 'wherewith thou coverest thyself', lo! a blind man's garment is stated. How then do I interpret<sup>12</sup> that ye may look upon it'? As excluding a night garment. And what [reason] do you see to include a blind man's [garment], and to exclude a night garment? I include a blind man's garment, which can be seen by others,<sup>13</sup> while I exclude night garments, which are not seen by others. Yet say [rather] that it<sup>14</sup> is to include other garments?<sup>15</sup> It is logical that when one treats of wool and linen he includes [a particular garment of] wool and linen; but when one treats of wool and linen, shall he include other garments?<sup>16</sup>

Abaye said: R. Simeon b. Eleazar and Symmachos said the same thing. R. Simeon b. Eleazar, as stated.<sup>17</sup> Symmachos, for it was taught: Symmachos said: If one covers it [the booth] with spun [flax], it is unfit, because it may be defiled by leprosy. With whom [does that agree]? With this Tanna. For we learnt: The warp and the woof are defiled by leprosy immediately:<sup>18</sup> this is R. Meir's ruling. But R. Judah maintained: The warp, when it is removed;<sup>19</sup> the wool, immediately; and

bundles of [wet] flax,<sup>20</sup> after bleaching.<sup>21</sup>

MISHNAH. WHATEVER COMES FORTH FROM A TREE [‘EZ] YOU MAY NOT LIGHT [THE SABBATH LAMP] THEREWITH,<sup>22</sup> SAVE FLAX; AND WHATEVER COMES FORTH FROM A TREE CANNOT BE DEFILED WITH THE UNCLEANNESS OF TENTS,<sup>23</sup> EXCEPT LINEN.<sup>24</sup> GEMARA. How do we know that flax is designated tree [‘ez]? Said Mar Zutra, Because Scripture saith, But she had brought them up to the roof, and hid them with the stalks [‘ez] of the flax.<sup>25</sup>

AND WHATEVER COMES FORTH FROM A TREE CANNOT BE DEFILED WITH THE UNCLEANNESS OF TENTS, EXCEPT LINEN. How do we know it?—Said R. Eleazar, The meaning of tent [ohel] is learnt

---

(1) Num. XV, 38; i.e., only wool and linen garments are liable thereto.

(2) And the juxtaposition shows that they are required only in garments of wool or linen. It may be observed that the Talmud regards the deduction from this juxtaposition as an explicit statement, and not merely as something derived by exegesis.

(3) Num. *ibid.* ‘Border’ is superfluous, since the first half of the verse reads, and bid them that they make them fringes in the borders of their garments. Hence it is thus interpreted.

(4) Since this is immediately followed by the precept of fringes, we translate: though a mixture of wool and linen are forbidden, yet ‘thou shalt make thee fringes’, i.e., wool fringes are permitted in a linen garment and vice versa, which contradicts the implication of the other verse.

(5) Lit., ‘acquit’ (the garment of its obligation).

(6) Whatever the material, wool or linen fringes may be inserted.

(7) That the juxtaposition illumines the nature of the fringes, but does not teach that the garment itself must be of wool or linen. For in fact, according to Raba, there is an obligation whatever the material.

(8) V. Yeb., Sonc. ed., p. 15 notes.

(9) In reference to fringes.

(10) *Ibid.* This too is superfluous and indicates extension.

(11) Sc. the fringed garment. — Num. XV, 39.

(12) Lit., ‘fulfil’.

(13) Lit., ‘which is subject to looking in respect to others’.

(14) Sc. ‘wherewith thou coverest thyself’.

(15) Not of wool or linen.

(16) Surely not.

(17) *Supra*, 26a bottom, and note a.l.

(18) After spinning, though given no further treatment.

(19) From the kettle in which it is boiled. *Maim. Neg.* XI, 8 appears to read: when it has been boiled.

(20) *Jast. Rashi*: unspun flax; *Tosaf.*: spun flax.

(21) Thus *Symmachos*, who rules that it is liable to leprous defilement immediately it is spun (this being the reason that it may not be used as a covering of the booth, v. p. 114, n. 8.), agrees with R. Meir.

(22) Using it as a wick.

(23) If a tent or awning of such material overshadows a dead body, it does not become unclean, just as the roof of a house which contains a dead body is not unclean, though all utensils under the same roof or covering are defiled.

(24) If the tent is of linen, that itself is defiled.

(25) *Josh.* II, 6.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 28a

from the Tabernacle. Here it is written, This is the law when a man dieth in a tent [ohel];<sup>1</sup> and there it is written, and he spread the tent [ohel] over the Tabernacle:<sup>2</sup> just as there [the covering] of linen is designated tent, so here too, [a covering] of linen is designated tent.<sup>3</sup> If so, just as there it was twisted

and the thread was doubled sixfold,<sup>4</sup> so here too it must be twisted and its thread doubled sixfold?<sup>5</sup> - The repetition of tent<sup>6</sup> is an extension.<sup>7</sup> If the repetition of tent is an extension, then everything else<sup>8</sup> too should be included? — If so, what avails the gezerah shawah?<sup>9</sup> Yet [perhaps] say, just as there [the Tabernacle was of] boards, so here too [a tent of] boards [is meant]?-Scripture saith, And thou shalt make boards for the tabernacle:<sup>10</sup> the tabernacle<sup>11</sup> is called tabernacle, but the boards are not designated tabernacle. If so, [when it is stated,] and thou shalt make a covering<sup>12</sup> for the tent [ohel],<sup>13</sup> is the covering indeed not designated tent [ohel]? But when R. Eleazar propounded: Can the skin of an unclean animal<sup>14</sup> be defiled by overshadowing<sup>15</sup> the dead?-[What doubt was there] seeing that the skin of a clean animal cannot be defiled,<sup>16</sup> is there a question of the skin of an unclean animal? — There it is different, because Scripture restored it,<sup>17</sup> as it is written, they shall bear the curtains of the tabernacle, and the tent of meeting, its covering and the covering of sealskin that is above it:<sup>18</sup> thus the upper [covering]<sup>19</sup> is assimilated to the lower:<sup>20</sup> just as the lower is designated tent,<sup>21</sup> so is the upper designated tent.

[To revert to] the main text: ‘R. Eleazar propounded: Can the skin<sup>22</sup> of an unclean animal be defiled with the defilement of tents?’<sup>23</sup> What is his problem?<sup>24</sup> -Said R. Adda b. Ahabah: His question relates to the tahash which was in the days of Moses,<sup>25</sup> -was it unclean or clean? R. Joseph observed, What question is this to him? We learnt it! For the sacred work none but the skin of a clean animal was declared fit.

R. Abba objected: R. Judah said: There were two coverings, one of dyed rams’ skins, and one of tahash skins. R. Nehemiah said: There was one covering<sup>26</sup> and it was like a squirrel[‘s].<sup>27</sup> But the squirrel is unclean!-This is its meaning: like a squirrel[‘s], which has many colours, yet not [actually] the squirrel, for that is unclean, whilst here a clean [animal is meant]. Said R. Joseph: That being so, that is why we translate it sasgawna [meaning] that it rejoices in many colours.<sup>28</sup>

Raba said: That the skin of an unclean animal is defiled by overshadowing<sup>29</sup> the dead [is inferred] from the following. For it was taught: [Scripture could state] skin; [by stating or in] skin<sup>30</sup> it extends [the law to] the skin of an unclean animal and to one which was smitten [with leprosy] in the priests hand.<sup>31</sup> If one cuts off [pieces] of all these<sup>32</sup> and makes one [piece] out of them, how do we know [it]?<sup>33</sup> From the verse, ‘or in any thing [meleketh] made of skin’.<sup>34</sup> But this [Raba's statement] can be refuted: as for leprosy, [the reason<sup>35</sup> is] because the warp and the wool is defiled in their case?<sup>36</sup> Rather it is learnt from leprosy. For it was taught: Skin:<sup>37</sup> I know it only of the skin of a clean animal; how do I know it of the skin of an unclean animal? Therefore it is stated, or skin.<sup>38</sup> But this may be refuted: as for reptiles, [the reason is] they defile by the size of a lentil.<sup>39</sup> Let leprosy prove it.<sup>40</sup> And thus the argument revolves: the characteristic of one is not that of the other, and vice versa: the feature common to both is that skin is unclean in their case, and the skin of an unclean animal was assimilated to that of a clean animal: so also do I adduce the tent of the dead, that skin is unclean in its case,<sup>41</sup> and the skin of an unclean animal is assimilated to that of a clean animal.

Raba of Barnesh<sup>42</sup> observed to R. Ashi: But this can be refuted: as for the feature common to both, it is that they defile others in less than the size of an olive:<sup>43</sup> will you say [the same] of the dead, which defiles only by the size of an olive? Rather, said Raba of Barnesh,

(1) Num. XIX, 14.

(2) Ex. XL,19.

(3) The only covering of vegetable growth of the Tabernacle was linen.

(4) Deduced in Yoma 71b.

(5) Otherwise it should not be defiled.

(6) Lit., ‘tent, tent’: ‘tent’ is mentioned three times in Num. XIX, 14 in reference to defilement.

(7) Extending the law to a linen tent even if not made in the same way as the covering of the tabernacle.

(8) Any other material.

- (9) V. Glos.
- (10) Ex. XXVI, 15.
- (11) E.g., the ten curtains on the roof curtains thereof, *ibid* 1.
- (12) Of animal skins.
- (13) *ibid*. 14.
- (14) I.e., which is not fit for food.
- (15) Lit., 'by the uncleanness of tents'.
- (16) On the present hypothesis that the covering, which included ramskins (Ex. XXVI, 14; the ram is a clean animal), is not a tent, hence excluded from Num. XIX, 14. (18) For this is less likely to suffer such defilement, as is shown below, where a superfluous word is necessary to include it, and also in the Sifra, Thazria'.
- (17) To be included in the term 'tent' (*ohel*).
- (18) Num. IV 25.
- (19) The covering of animal skins.
- (20) Viz., the eleven curtains of goats' hair, v. Ex. XVI, 7.
- (21) The 'tent of meeting' is understood to refer not to the Tabernacle as a whole but to these curtains.
- (22) It is so designated in verse 7.
- (23) The wording is not exactly as above, but the sense is.
- (24) How can he think that it is subject to such defilement, seeing that he learns the definition of 'tent' from the Tabernacle (*supra* 27b bottom), where the skins of clean animals alone were used?
- (25) A.V. badger; R.V. seal, Levy, *Worterbuch*: marter, others: badges, sea-dog, seal, cf. Lewysohn, *Zool. d. Tal. I*, 95f. Tahash skins formed one of the coverings of the Tabernacle; verse quoted *supra et passim*.
- (26) Consisting half of rams' skin and half of tahash skins.-I.e., apart from the coverings of linen, etc. and of goats' hair.
- (27) Jast., lit., 'hanging on the tree'. It is doubtful, however, whether a squirrel is meant, as the context shows that a striped (or speckled) animal of many colours is referred to.
- (28) Sas, it rejoices, be-gawwanim, in colours. R. Joseph was an expert in the Targumim (Aramaic translations of the Bible), and given to quoting them.
- (29) Lit., 'by the tent of a dead'.
- (30) Lev. XIII, 48.
- (31) In Heb. **נ** is an extension (Rashi). Even if the skin was not leprous when the priest was sent for, but became affected whilst he was examining it (or after), it is unclean. By analogy, the skin of an unclean animal too is defiled by overshadowing the dead.
- (32) Materials mentioned in the verse, q.v.
- (33) That it is liable to defilement.
- (34) Meleketh, melakah, work, suggests a manufactured article, and is therefore applied to a combination Of materials.
- (35) Sc. the defilement of the skin of an unclean animal.
- (36) Which is not the case with corpse defilement, v. *infra* 64a.
- (37) *Ibid*. XI, 32. This refers to the materials liable to defilement by reptiles.
- (38) Or is an extension. By analogy the same applies to the defilement of the dead.
- (39) V. p. 116, n. 14. But the minimum portion of a human corpse is the size of an olive, which is larger than a lentil. Since the defilement of reptiles is stricter in that respect, it may also be stricter in respect of the skin of an unclean animal.
- (40) The minimum for leprosy is the size of a bean.
- (41) I.e., if it forms a tent,
- (42) In Babylon on the canal of the same name, near the town of Mehasia, and some three parasangs from a synagogue named after Daniel; Obermeyer, *Landschaft*, p. 302.
- (43) A bean too is less.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 28b

it is inferred a *minori* from goats' hair, which is not defiled by leprosy, yet is defiled by overshadowing the dead; then the skin of an unclean animal, which is defiled by leprosy, is surely defiled by overshadowing the dead.

Then when R. Joseph recited, 'For the sacred work none but the skin of a clean animal was considered fit,' for what practical law [did he say it]?<sup>1</sup> -In respect of phylacteries.<sup>2</sup> Of phylacteries it is explicitly stated, that the law of the Lord may be in thy mouth,<sup>3</sup> [meaning] of that which is permitted in thy mouth?<sup>4</sup> Rather in respect of their hide.<sup>5</sup> But Abaye said, The skin of phylacteries is a law of Moses from Sinai?<sup>6</sup> — Rather, it is in respect of tying it with hair and sewing it with its tendons.<sup>7</sup> But that is a law of Moses from Sinai. For it was taught: Rectangular phylacteries<sup>8</sup> are a law of Moses from Sinai: they must be tied with their hair and sewn with their tendons.<sup>9</sup> — Rather it is in respect of their straps.<sup>10</sup> But R. Isaac said, Black straps are a law of Moses from Sinai? Granted that black is traditional, is clean traditional?<sup>11</sup>

What is our conclusion with respect to the tahash which existed in Moses' days? — Said R. Elai in the name of R. Simeon b. Lakish, R. Meir used to maintain, The tahash of Moses' day was a separate species, and the Sages could not decide whether it belonged to the genus of wild beasts or to the genus of domestic animals; and it had one horn in its forehead, and it came to Moses' hand [providentially] just for the occasion,<sup>12</sup> and he made the [covering of the] Tabernacle, and then it was hidden. Now, since he says that it had one horn in its forehead, it follows that it was clean. For R. Judah said, The ox which Adam the first [man] sacrificed had one horn in its forehead, for it is said, and it shall please the Lord better than an ox, or a bullock that hath a horn [sic] and hoofs.<sup>13</sup> But makrin<sup>14</sup> implies two? -Said R. Nahman b. Isaac: Mi-keren<sup>15</sup> is written.<sup>16</sup> Then let us solve thence that it was a genus of domestic animal?<sup>17</sup> — Since there is the keresh,<sup>18</sup> which is a species of beast, and it has only one horn, one can say that it [the tahash] is a kind of wild beast.

**MISHNAH. A WICK [MADE] OF A CLOTH WHICH WAS TWISTED BUT NOT SINGED, -R. ELIEZER SAID: IT IS UNCLEAN, AND ONE MAY NOT LIGHT [THE SABBATH LAMP] THEREWITH; R. AKIBA MAINTAINED: IT IS CLEAN, AND ONE MAY LIGHT THEREWITH."**

**GEMARA.** As for the matter of uncleanness, it is well, [for] they differ in this: R. Eliezer holds that twisting is of no effect, and it remains in its previous condition;<sup>19</sup> while R. Akiba holds that twisting is effective, and it [its previous condition] is indeed annulled. But with reference to lighting, wherein do they differ? — R. Eleazar said in R. Oshaia's name, and R. Adda b. Ahabah said likewise: The reference here is to [a rag] exactly three [fingerbreadths] square;<sup>20</sup> and also to a Festival falling on the eve of the Sabbath. Now, all agree with R. Judah, who maintained, One may fire [an oven, etc.,] with [whole] utensils, but not with broken utensils.<sup>21</sup> Further, all agree with 'Ulla's dictum, viz.: He who lights must light the greater part [of the wick] which protrudes. R. Eliezer holds that twisting is of no avail, and immediately one kindles it slightly it becomes a broken utensil,<sup>22</sup> and when he goes on kindling it,<sup>23</sup> he kindles a broken utensil. But R. Akiba holds that twisting is effective, and it does not bear the character of a utensil, and therefore when he kindles, he kindles a mere piece of wood.<sup>24</sup> R. Joseph observed: This is what I learnt, exactly three [fingerbreadths] square, but did not know in reference to what law.

Now, since R. Adda b. Ahabah explains it in accordance with R. Judah,<sup>25</sup> it follows that he himself holds as R. Judah. Yet did R. Adda b. Ahabah say thus? Surely R. Adda b. Ahabah said:

(1) As a mere historical fact it is of no importance. Hence what is its purpose, seeing that it does not teach that the skin of an unclean animal is not defiled by overshadowing the dead, as one wished to deduce supra a?

(2) That the parchment of these must be made of the skin of a clean animal.

(3) Ex. XIII, 9; the reference is to tefillin (v. Glos.).

(4) Cf. p. 118, n. 2 (on explicitness).

(5) The leather of the capsules in which the parchment is placed. This cannot be deduced from the verse quoted, for 'the law of the Lord' was not written upon them.

(6) The letter shin (שׁ) is stamped out of the leather itself at the side of the capsule. This is part of the Name Shaddai (שׁדׁי) and therefore comes within the meaning of 'the law of the Lord'. — With respect to the meaning of 'a law of Moses from Sinai', some take it literally: this was handed down direct from Moses; others understand it in a more figurative sense: it is traditional, but its exact origin is unknown, and hence ascribed to Moses, who in general is the source of Jewish law. V. Weiss, Dor, I, 71 seq.

(7) The parchment within the phylacteries, on which Biblical passages are written, is rolled up and tied round with animal hair. The receptacles themselves are sewn together with the tendons of animals. Both must be from clean animals.

(8) I.e., the faces of the capsules must be rectangular in shape, the whole forming a cube.

(9) 'Their' meaning of the same animal or species which furnishes the parchment and the leather. Thus they must be all of a clean animal and this is a traditional law.

(10) These must be of the skin of a clean animal.

(11) I.e., is there a tradition that they must be of the skin of a clean animal? Surely not! Hence R. Joseph's teaching is necessary.

(12) Lit., 'garment'.

(13) Ps. LXIX, 32.

(14) E. V. 'that hath horns.'

(15) Than a horn,

(16) I.e., which is normally punctuated **מִקְרָן** (mi-keren), but here **מִקְרִין** makrin. On the identification of this ox with that sacrificed by Adam v. A.Z. 8a.

(17) Viz., an ox or bullock.

(18) Jast.: a kind of antelope, unicorn. (10) The reasons are discussed in the Gemara,

(19) A rag, being part of a garment, is liable to become unclean, a wick does not become unclean. R. Eliezer holds that mere twisting without singeing-this was done to facilitate the lighting-does not make it a wick, and therefore it is still subject to uncleanness.

(20) This is the smallest size liable to defilement (supra 26b); in that sense it is regarded as a whole garment (or utensil).

(21) On Festivals. A whole utensil may be handled on Festivals, and therefore it may be taken for burning. But if a utensil is broken on the Festival so that it can now be used as fuel only, it is regarded as a thing newly-created (nolad v. Glos.)-i.e., a new use for it has just been created-and such may not be handled on Festivals.

(22) Since it was the minimum size originally.

(23) Until the greater part is alight.

(24) I.e., this twisted rag is just like a piece of wood,

(25) That nolad (v. n. 3) is forbidden.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 29a

If a Gentile hollows out a kab<sup>1</sup> in a log, an Israelite may heat [the oven] therewith on a Festival.<sup>2</sup> Yet why? Is it not nolad!-He states [it] according to the views of R. Eliezer and R. Akiba, but does not hold thus himself. Raba said, This is R. Eliezer's reason: Because one must not light [the Sabbath lamp] with an unsinged wick or unsinged rags.<sup>3</sup> Then when R. Joseph recited, Exactly three [fingerbreadths] square, In respect of what law [was it]? — In respect of uncleanness. For we learnt, The three [fingerbreadths] square of which they [the Sages] spoke is exclusive of the hem: this is R. Simeon's view. But the Sages say: Exactly three [fingerbreadths] square.<sup>4</sup>

Rab Judah said in Rab's name: One may fire [an oven, etc.] with [whole] utensils, but not with broken utensils: this is R. Judah's opinion; but R. Simeon permits it.<sup>5</sup> One may fire [it] with dates;<sup>6</sup> but if they are eaten, one may not fire [it] with their stones:<sup>7</sup> that is R. Judah's opinion; but R. Simeon permits it. One may heat with nuts: if they are eaten, one must not heat with their shells: this is R. Judah's ruling; but R. Simeon permits it.

Now, they are [all] necessary. For if we were told the first, R. Judah rules [thus] in that case, because it was a utensil before but only a fragment of a utensil now, and so it is nolad, hence forbidden; but as for dates, since they were stones originally and are stones now, I might argue that it

is well [permitted]. And if we were informed [this] of dates, I might say, [the reason is] because they [the stones] were originally concealed but are now revealed; but as for nutshells, which were uncovered originally and are uncovered still, I might argue that it is well [permitted]. Thus they are necessary.<sup>8</sup>

Now, this [ruling] of Rab was stated not explicitly but by implication. For Rab ate dates and threw the stones into a pan;<sup>9</sup> whereupon R. Hiyya said to him, 'Son of great ancestors!<sup>10</sup> A similar act on Festivals is forbidden.' Did he accept [this ruling] from him or not?-Come and hear: For when Rab came to Babylon,<sup>11</sup> he ate dates<sup>12</sup> and threw the stones to animals. Surely this means Persian [dates]?<sup>13</sup> No: this means Syrian [dates], since they are fit [for handling] on account of their flesh.<sup>14</sup>

R. Samuel b. Bar Hanah said to R. Joseph: According to R. Judah who ruled, One may fire [an oven] with utensils, but not with broken utensils,-immediately one lights with it a little it becomes a broken utensil, and when he stirs [the fuel] he is stirring something that is forbidden?-He acts in accordance with R. Mattenah: For R. Mattenah said in Rab's name: if wood falls from a palm tree into a stove on a Festival, one adds more prepared wood and lights them.<sup>15</sup>

R. Hamnuna said: The reference here [in our Mishnah] is to [a rag] less than three [handbreadths] square,<sup>16</sup> and they taught here some of the leniencies [relating to the law] of rags, both R. Eliezer and R. Akiba following their views. For we learnt: If [material] less than three [handbreadths] square is set aside for stopping a bath, pouring from a pot,<sup>17</sup> or cleaning a mill therewith, whether it is of prepared [material] or not,<sup>18</sup> it is unclean:<sup>19</sup> that is R. Eliezer's view; R. Joshua maintained: Whether it is of prepared [material] or not, it is clean; R. Akiba ruled: If of prepared [material], it is unclean; if of unprepared, it is clean. Now 'Ulla-others state, Rabbah b. Bar Hanah in R. Johanan's name-said: All admit that if it was thrown away on the refuse heap,<sup>20</sup> it is universally agreed that it is clean;<sup>21</sup>

---

(1) A measure; or, a kind of artificial leg.

(2) Though it is nolad,

(3) These do not burn well. Thus R. Eliezer refers to all Sabbaths.

(4) V. Kelim. XXVIII, 7.

(5) He permits nolad.

(6) Since they may be handled as food, they may be handled as fuel.

(7) This and the following are similar to the first, the stones of dates and the shells of nuts being like fragments of utensils.

(8) Reversing the argument, all cases are necessary for R. Simeon's view.

(9) A kind of coal brazier.-This was done on weekdays.

(10) Supra 3b,

(11) Rab was a Babylonian who went to study in Palestine and then returned.

(12) On Festivals.

(13) These become very ripe, so that the whole of the fruit can be removed from the stones. Since he threw them to animals, he evidently held that they might be handled, and could also have used them for fuel. Hence he must have rejected R. Hiyya's view.

(14) The fruit cannot be entirely separated from the stone.

(15) The timber that falls may not be handled by itself, since it was not destined for this before the Festival. Hence a greater quantity of wood set aside for fuel must be added, and both may be handled together. The same must be done here.

(16) He holds that if it is three handbreadths square, it retains the character of a garment and is liable to defilement on all views.

(17) Using this material as a holder.

(18) The meaning is discussed below.

(19) I.e., liable to uncleanness as a garment (begeh), which connotes any material that may be put to a useful purpose.

(20) And then salvaged for one of these purposes.

(21) Since it is less than three handbreadths square, and was also thrown away as worthless, it is certainly not a 'garment', even when salvaged.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 29b

if one placed it in a chest, all agree that it is unclean.<sup>1</sup> They differ only where he hung it on a frame or placed it behind the door: R. Eliezer holds: Since he did not throw it on the refuse heap, he had his mind upon it; why then does he call it 'unprepared'?<sup>2</sup> Because relatively to [placing it in] a chest it is not prepared.<sup>3</sup> While R. Joshua maintains: Since he did not place it in a chest, he has indeed accounted it as nought;<sup>4</sup> and why then does he call it 'prepared'? Because relatively to [throwing it on] a refuse heap it is prepared. But R. Akiba agrees with R. Eliezer where he hangs it on a clothes frame, and with R. Joshua, where he puts it behind the door. Yet R. Akiba retracted in favour of R. Joshua [‘s view]. Whence [is this deduced]?-Said Raba, Since it is stated, A WICK [MADE] OF A CLOTH: why choose to teach A WICK [MADE] OF A CLOTH, teach A WICK OF CLOTH; why a WICK [MADE] OF A CLOTH? [To show] that it is still a cloth.<sup>5</sup>

MISHNAH. A MAN MAY NOT PIERCE AN EGG SHELL, FILL IT WITH OIL, AND PLACE IT OVER THE MOUTH OF A LAMP, IN ORDER THAT IT SHOULD DRIP, AND EVEN IF IT IS OF POT;<sup>6</sup> BUT R. JUDAH PERMITS IT. BUT IF THE POTTER JOINS IT BEFOREHAND, IT IS PERMITTED, BECAUSE IT IS ONE UTENSIL. A MAN MUST NOT FILL A DISH OF OIL, PLACE IT AT THE SIDE OF A LAMP, AND PUT THE WICK END THEREIN IN ORDER THAT IT SHOULD DRAW; BUT R. JUDAH PERMITS IT. GEMARA. Now, they are [all] necessary. For if we were told about an eggshell; there the Rabbis say [that it is forbidden] because since it is not loathsome<sup>7</sup> he will come to take supplies therefrom;<sup>8</sup> but as for an earthen [shell], which is loathsome,<sup>9</sup> I might argue that they agree with R. Judah.<sup>10</sup> While if we were told of an earthen [shell]: [only] there does R. Judah rule thus, but in the other case I might say that he agrees with the Rabbis.<sup>11</sup> And if we were told of these two: R. Judah rules [thus] of these because nothing interposes;<sup>12</sup> but as for a dish, which interposes,<sup>13</sup> I would say that he agrees with the Rabbis. While if we were told of that: [only] there do the Rabbis rule [thus], but in the first two I would say that they agree with R. Judah. Thus they are necessary.

BUT IF THE POTTER JOINS IT BEFOREHAND, IT IS PERMITTED, etc. It was taught: if he joins it with plaster or potter's clay, it is permitted. But we learnt, THE POTTER?<sup>14</sup> -What is meant by POTTER? After the manner of a potter.<sup>15</sup>

It was taught, R. Judah said: We were once spending the Sabbath in the upper chamber of Nithzeh's house in Lydda, when an eggshell was brought, which we filled with oil, perforated, and placed over the mouth of the lamp; and though R. Tarfon and the elders were present, they said nothing to us.<sup>16</sup> Said they [the Sages] to him, Thence [you adduce] proof? The house of Nithzeh is different, because they were most heedful.<sup>17</sup>

Abin of Sepphoris dragged a bench in a stone-paved upper chamber in the presence of R. Isaac b. Eleazar, Said he to him, If I let this pass in silence,<sup>18</sup> as his companions kept silent before R. Judah, harm will ensue: a stone-paved chamber is forbidden on account of an ordinary chamber.<sup>19</sup> The synagogue overseer<sup>20</sup> of Bazrah<sup>21</sup> dragged a bench in front of R. Jeremiah Rabbah. Said he to him, in accordance with whom?<sup>22</sup> [Presumably] R. Simeon!<sup>23</sup> Assume that R. Simeon ruled [thus] in the case of larger ones, since it is impossible otherwise;<sup>24</sup> did he say thus of small ones?<sup>25</sup> Now, he disagrees with 'Ulla, who said: They differ [only] in respect of small ones, but as for large, all agree that it is permitted.

R. Joseph objected: R. Simeon said, A man may drag a couch, chair, or bench, providing that he does not intend making a rut. Thus both large and small [articles] are taught,<sup>26</sup> which is a difficulty

on both views.<sup>27</sup> -'Ulla reconciles it according to his view, and R. Jeremiah Rabbah reconciles it according to his. 'Ulla reconciles it according to his view: the couch is like the chair.<sup>28</sup> While R. Jeremiah Rabbah reconciles it according to his: the chair is like the couch.<sup>29</sup>

Rabbah objected: Clothes merchants sell in their normal fashion, providing that one does not intend [to gain protection] from the sun in hot weather<sup>30</sup> or from the rain when it is raining;<sup>31</sup> but the strictly religious<sup>32</sup> sling them on a staff behind their back.<sup>33</sup> Now here that it is possible to do as the strictly religious, it is the same as small [articles of furniture], yet when one has no intention R. Simeon permits it at the outset? This refutation of R. Jeremiah Rabbah is indeed a refutation. MISHNAH. IF ONE EXTINGUISHES THE LAMP BECAUSE HE IS AFRAID OF GENTILES, ROBBERS, OR AN EVIL SPIRIT,<sup>34</sup> OR FOR THE SAKE OF AN INVALID, THAT HE SHOULD SLEEP, HE IS NOT CULPABLE.<sup>35</sup> IF [BECAUSE] HE WOULD SPARE THE LAMP, THE OIL, OR THE WICK, HE IS CULPABLE. R. JOSE EXEMPTS HIM IN ALL CASES, EXCEPT IN RESPECT OF THE WICK, BECAUSE HE MAKES CHARCOAL.<sup>36</sup>

- (1) He showed that he attributed value to it, hence it is a 'garment'.
- (2) Since he intends to use it, it is 'prepared', i.e., designated for use.
- (3) When he places it in a chest he certainly intends using it; but here he merely ensures that he will have it in case he wants it.
- (4) Not assigning any real worth to it.
- (5) The suggested reading פתילה של בגד implies that a portion of a beged (cloth) is taken, viz., such as itself is not a cloth (in the sense stated in p. 127, n. 9). The actual reading פתילת הבגד implies that a cloth itself is turned into a wick. Since R. Akiba maintains in the Mishnah that it is not liable to uncleanness, he evidently agrees with R. Judah that it is not 'prepared'.
- (6) I.e., even a pot shell may not be used thus.
- (7) The oil in the eggshell is clean.
- (8) On the Sabbath. This is forbidden on account of extinguishing the light. [Though it is not actually extinguished when he removes some oil, it subsequently goes out sooner than it would otherwise have done.]
- (9) The oil in it becomes soiled and unclean.
- (10) There is no fear that one may draw supplies from it.
- (11) Inverting the reasoning.
- (12) Between the lamp and the shell, which is directly over its mouth: hence R. Judah regards it all as one, even when not actually joined.
- (13) Between the lamp and the oil.
- (14) Which implies that it must be professionally done, whereas 'he joins it' denotes an amateur job by the owner.
- (15) I.e., firmly.
- (16) To forbid it.
- (17) And there was no fear of their drawing off oil.
- (18) Lit., 'if I am silent for you'.
- (19) Which is earth-paved; dragging there is prohibited because it forms a rut.
- (20) Rashi: the man who conducts worshippers (assemblies) in and out of the synagogue and supervises the seating of pupils.
- (21) An Idumean town; cf. Isa. XXXIV, 6; LXIII, 1.
- (22) Do you act thus.
- (23) Supra 22a.
- (24) A large bench, table, etc., cannot be lifted but must be dragged.
- (25) Here it was a small one.
- (26) A couch is large; a chair is small.
- (27) For R. Judah forbids both.
- (28) I.e., a small couch is meant.
- (29) A large, heavy chair is meant.
- (30) Lit., 'in the sun'.

(31) The reference is to garments containing the forbidden mixture of wool and linen (v. Deut. XXII, 11) sold to Gentiles. Merchants slung their wares across their shoulders for display, and though some protection is afforded thereby and it is like wearing them, it is permitted.

(32) צנועים 'modest', 'humble', hence punctilious in carrying out religious duties. V. Buchler, Types p. 60ff].

(33) So that they do not actually lie upon them.

(34) V. MGWJ. 11 (1927)pp. 162-165.

(35) For desecrating the Sabbath.

(36) By extinguishing the light he makes kindling material, i.e., prepares the wick for easier lighting.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 30a

GEMARA. Since the second clause teaches, HE IS CULPABLE, it may be inferred that it is R. Judah.<sup>1</sup> Then to what does the first clause refer? if to an invalid dangerously ill, [the Tanna] should have stated, 'it is permitted'?<sup>2</sup> While if to an invalid who is not in danger, he should have stated, He is liable to a sin-offering?<sup>3</sup> -After all, [it refers] to an invalid dangerously sick, and logically he should teach, it is permitted; but because he wishes to teach 'HE IS CULPABLE' in the second clause, he also teaches 'HE IS NOT CULPABLE' in the first. And as for what R. Oshaia taught: If it is for the sake of a sick person, that he should sleep, he must not extinguish it; but if he extinguishes it, he is not liable, though it is forbidden-that refers to one who is not dangerously ill, and agrees with R. Simeon.<sup>4</sup>

This question was asked before R. Tanhum of Neway:<sup>5</sup> What about extinguishing a burning lamp for a sick man on the Sabbath? — Thereupon he commenced and spake:<sup>6</sup> Thou, Solomon, where is thy wisdom and where is thine understanding? It is not enough for thee that thy words contradict the words of thy father David, but that they are self-contradictory! Thy father David said, The dead praise not the Lord;<sup>7</sup> whilst thou saidest, Wherefore I praised the dead which are already dead<sup>8</sup> but yet again thou saidest, for a living dog is better than a dead lion.<sup>9</sup> Yet there is no difficulty. As to what David said: 'The dead praise not the Lord', this is what he meant: Let a man always engage in Torah and good deeds before he dies, for as soon as he dies he is restrained from [the practice of] Torah and good deeds, and the Holy One, blessed be He, finds nought to praise in him. And thus R. Johanan said, What is meant by the verse, Among the dead [I am] free?<sup>10</sup> Once a man dies, he becomes free of the Torah and good deeds. And as to what Solomon said, 'Wherefore I praised the dead that are already dead' for when Israel sinned in the wilderness, Moses stood before the Holy One, blessed be He, and uttered many prayers and supplications before Him, but he was not answered. Yet when he exclaimed, 'Remember Abraham, Isaac, and Israel, thy servants!'<sup>11</sup> he was immediately answered. Did not then Solomon well say, wherefore I praised the dead that are already dead'? Another interpretation: In worldly affairs, when a prince of flesh and blood issues a decree, it is doubtful whether it will be obeyed or not; and even if you say that it is obeyed, it is obeyed during his lifetime but not after his death. Whereas Moses our Teacher decreed many decrees and enacted numerous enactments, and they endure for ever and unto all eternity. Did then not Solomon well say, 'Wherefore I praise the dead, etc.' Another interpretation [of] 'wherefore I praise, etc.' is in accordance with Rab Judah's dictum in Rab's name, viz., What is meant by, Shew me a token for good, that they which hate me may see it, and be ashamed?<sup>12</sup> David prayed before the Holy One, blessed be He, 'Sovereign of the Universe! Forgive me for that sin!'<sup>13</sup> 'It is forgiven thee,' replied He. 'Shew me a token in my lifetime,' he entreated. 'In thy lifetime I will not make it known,' He answered, 'but I will make it known in the lifetime of thy son Solomon.' For when Solomon built the Temple, he desired to take the Ark into the Holy of Holies, whereupon the gates clave to each other. Solomon uttered twenty-four prayers,<sup>14</sup> yet he was not answered. He opened [his mouth] and exclaimed, 'Lift up your heads, O ye gates; and be ye lifted up, ye everlasting doors: And the King of glory shall come in.'<sup>15</sup> They rushed upon him to swallow him up, crying, 'Who is the king of glory?' 'The Lord, strong and mighty,'<sup>16</sup> answered he. Then he repeated, 'Lift up your heads, O ye gates; Yea, lift them up, ye everlasting doors: and the King of glory shall come in. Who is this King

of glory? The Lord of hosts, He is the King of glory. Selah';<sup>17</sup> yet he was not answered. But as soon as he prayed, 'O Lord God, turn not away the face of thine anointed remember the good deeds of David thy servant,'<sup>18</sup> he was immediately answered. In that hour the faces of all David's enemies turned [black] like the bottom of a pot, and all Israel knew that the Holy One, blessed be He, had forgiven him that sin. Did then not Solomon well say, wherefore I praised the dead which are already dead'? And thus it is written, On the eighth day he sent the people away, and they blessed the king, and went into their tents joyful and glad of heart for all the goodness that the Lord had shewed unto David his servant, and to Israel his people.<sup>19</sup> 'And they went unto their tents' [means] that they found their wives clean; 'joyful', because they had enjoyed the lustre of the Divine Presence; 'and glad of heart', because their wives conceived and each one bore a male child; 'for all the goodness that the Lord had shewed unto David his servant', that He had forgiven him that sin; and to Israel his people', for He had forgiven them the sin of the Day of Atonement.<sup>20</sup>

And as to what Solomon said, 'for a living dog is better than a dead lion', — that is as Rab Judah said in Rab's name, viz.; what is meant by the verse, Lord, make me to know mine end, and the measure of my days, what it is; let me know how frail I am.<sup>21</sup> David said before the Holy One, blessed be He, 'Sovereign of the Universe! Lord, make me to know mine end.' 'It is a decree before Me,' replied He, 'that the end of a mortal<sup>22</sup> is not made known.' 'And the measure of my days, what it is' - it is a decree before Me that a person's span [of life] is not made known.' 'Let me know how frail [hadel] I am.'<sup>23</sup> Said He to him. 'Thou wilt die on the Sabbath.' 'Let me die on the first day of the week!'<sup>24</sup> 'The reign of thy son Solomon shall already have become due, and one reign may not overlap another even by a hairbreadth.' 'Then let me die on the eve of the Sabbath!' Said He, 'For a day in thy courts is better than a thousand':<sup>25</sup> better is to Me the one day that thou sittest and engagest in learning than the thousand burnt-offerings which thy son Solomon is destined to sacrifice before Me on the altar.'<sup>26</sup>

(1) The work of extinguishing is not needed per se but merely to effect something else, e.g., to spare the oil, and it is R. Judah who maintains that such work involves liability.

(2) 'He is exempt' implies that it is actually forbidden.

(3) Since there is no danger of life, it is prohibited like any other work.

(4) That no liability is incurred on account of a labour not required for itself, v. n. 4 and infra 93b.

(5) A district in North Palestine (Jast.). MS.M. reads: Nineweh. V. Ta'an., Sonc. ed., p. 64, n. 5.

(6) This formula generally introduces a popular sermon, which preceded the answering of the question. Such follows here.

(7) Ps. CXV, 17.

(8) Eccl. IV, 2.

(9) Ibid. IX, 4.

(10) Ps. LXXXVIII, 6 (E.V. 5: (Cast off among the dead).

(11) Ex. XXXII, 13.

(12) Ps. LXXXVI, 17.

(13) Sc. of Bathsheba.

(14) Heb. **רננות** songs. In Solomon's prayer (I Kings VIII, 23-53) expressions of entreaty (**רנה** song; **תפלה**, prayer; and **תחינה**, supplication) occur twenty-four times.

(15) Ps. XXIV, 7.

(16) Ibid. 8,

(17) Ibid. 9f.

(18) 11 Chron. VI, 42.

(19) I Kings VIII, 66.

(20) Which they had kept as a Feast instead of a Fast. V. vv. 2 and 65: the fourteen days must have included the tenth of the seventh month, which is the Day of Atonement; v. M.K. 9a.

(21) Ps. XXXIX, 5 (E.V. 4).

(22) Lit., 'flesh and blood'.

(23) Translating: Let me know when I will cease (to be), fr. hadal, to cease.

(24) The following day, so that the usual offices for the dead may be performed, some of which are forbidden on the Sabbath.

(25) Ps. LXXXIV, 11 (E.V. 10).

(26) Thus your life is too precious for a single day to be renounced.—Study itself is regarded in Judaism as an act of worship — indeed, the greatest, though only when it leads to piety; cf. Pe'ah I, 1.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 30b

Now, every Sabbath day he would sit and study all day.<sup>1</sup> On the day that his soul was to be at rest,<sup>2</sup> the Angel of death stood before him but could not prevail against him, because learning did not cease from his mouth. 'What shall I do to him?' said he. Now, there was a garden before his house; so the Angel of death went, ascended and soughed in the trees. He [David] went out to see: as he was ascending the ladder, it broke under him. Thereupon he became silent [from his studies] and his soul had repose. Then Solomon sent to Beth Hamidrash: My father is dead and lying in the sun; and the dogs of my father's house are hungry; what shall I do? They sent back, Cut up a carcass and place it before the dogs; and as for thy father, put a loaf of bread or a child upon him and carry him away.<sup>3</sup> Did then not Solomon well say, for a living dog is better than a dead lion?<sup>4</sup> And as for the question which I asked before you,<sup>5</sup> — a lamp is designated lamp, and the soul of man is called a lamp:<sup>6</sup> better it is that the lamp of flesh and blood be extinguished before the lamp of the Holy One, blessed be He.<sup>7</sup>

Rab Judah son of R. Samuel b. Shilath said in Rab's name: The Sages wished to hide the Book of Ecclesiastes,<sup>8</sup> because its words are self-contradictory; yet why did they not hide it? Because its beginning is religious teaching<sup>9</sup> and its end is religious teaching. Its beginning is religious teaching, as it is written, What profit hath man of all his labour wherein he laboureth under the sun?<sup>10</sup> And the School of R. Jannai commented: Under the sun he has none, but he has it [sc. profit] before the sun.<sup>11</sup> The end thereof is religious teaching, as it is written, Let us hear the conclusion of the matter, fear God, and keep his commandments: for this is the whole of man.<sup>12</sup> What is meant by, 'for this is the whole of man'?—Said R. Eleazar, The entire world was created only for the sake of this [type of] man. Simeon b. 'Azzai—others state, Simeon b. Zoma—said: The entire world was created only to be a companion to this man.

And how are its words self-contradictory?—It is written, anger is better than play,<sup>13</sup> but it is written, I said of laughter, It is to be praised.<sup>14</sup> It is written, Then I commended joy;<sup>15</sup> but it is written, and of joy [I said] What doeth it?" There is no difficulty: 'anger is better than laughter': the anger which the Holy One, blessed be He, displays to the righteous in this world is better than the laughter which the Holy One, blessed be He, laughs with the wicked in this world.<sup>16</sup> 'And I said of laughter, it is to be praised': that refers to the laughter which the Holy One, blessed be He, laughs with the righteous in the world to come. 'Then I commended joy': this refers to the joy of a precept.<sup>17</sup> 'And of joy [I said], what doeth it': this refers to joy [which is] not in connection with a precept.<sup>18</sup> This teaches you that the Divine Presence rests [upon] man] neither through gloom,<sup>19</sup> nor through sloth, nor through frivolity, nor through levity, nor through talk, nor through idle chatter,<sup>20</sup> save through a matter of joy in connection with a precept, as it is said, But now bring me a minstrel. And it came to pass, when the minstrel played, that the hand of the Lord came upon him.<sup>21</sup>

Rab Judah said: And it is likewise thus for a matter of halachah.<sup>22</sup> Raba said: And it is likewise thus for a good dream.<sup>23</sup> But that is not so, for R. Giddal said in Rab's name: If any scholar sits before his teacher and his lips do not drip bitterness,<sup>24</sup> they shall be burnt, for it is said, his lips are as lilies [shoshanim], dropping liquid myrrh [mor'ober].<sup>25</sup> read not mor'ober, but mar'ober [dropping bitterness]; read not shoshanim but sheshonin [that study]?<sup>26</sup> There is no difficulty: the former applies to the teacher; the latter to the disciple. Alternatively, both refer to the teacher, yet there is no

difficulty: the one means before he commences; the other, after he commences. Even as Rabbah before he commenced [his discourse] before the scholars used to say something humorous, and the scholars were cheered; after that he sat in awe and began the discourse.

The Book of Proverbs too they desired to hide, because its statements are self-contradictory. Yet why did they not hide it? They said, Did we not examine the Book of Ecclesiastes and find a reconciliation? So here too let us make search. And how are its statements self-contradictory?-It is written, Answer not a fool according to his folly;<sup>27</sup> yet it is also written, Answer a fool according to his folly?<sup>28</sup> There is no difficulty: the one refers to matters of learning;<sup>29</sup> the other to general matters. Even as a certain person came before Rabbi and said to him, 'Your wife is my wife and your children are mine.'<sup>30</sup> 'Would you like to drink a glass of wine?' asked he. He drank and burst.

A certain man came before R. Hiyya and said to him, 'Your mother is my wife and you are my son! Would you like to drink a glass of wine?' asked he. He drank and burst.

R. Hiyya observed: Rabbi's prayer was in-so-far effective that his sons were not made illegitimate.<sup>31</sup> For when Rabbi prayed he used to say, May it be Thy will, O Lord our God, to save me this day from the impudent and from impudence.<sup>32</sup>

'Matters of learning'-what is that?-As R. Gamaliel sat and lectured, Woman is destined to bear every day, for it is said, the woman conceived and beareth simultaneously.<sup>33</sup> But a certain disciple scoffed at him, quoting, 'there is no new thing under the sun.'<sup>34</sup> Come, and I will show you its equal in this world,<sup>35</sup> he replied. He went forth and showed him a fowl. On another occasion R. Gamaliel sat and lectured, Trees are destined to yield fruit every day, for it is said, and it shall bring forth boughs and bear fruit:<sup>36</sup> just as the boughs [exist] every day, so shall there be fruit every day. But a certain disciple scoffed at him, saying, but it is written, 'there is no new thing under the sun!' Come, and I will show you its equal in this world, replied he. He went forth and showed him the caper bush.<sup>37</sup> On another occasion R. Gamaliel sat and expounded, Palestine is destined to bring forth cakes and wool robes, for it is said, There shall be an handful of corn in the land.<sup>38</sup> But a certain disciple scoffed at him, quoting, 'there is no new thing under the sun!' 'Come, and I will show you their equal in this world,' replied he. He went forth and showed him morels and truffles;<sup>39</sup> and for silk robes [he showed him] the bark of a young palm-shoot.<sup>40</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: A man should always be gentle like Hillel, and not impatient like Shammai. It once happened that two men

---

(1) The angel of death cannot approach one who is studying the Torah; Sot. 21a.

(2) A euphemism for death.

(3) V. infra 156b.

(4) For the sake of the living dogs it was permitted to handle the carcass without further ado, yet the great king David might not be handled this! Or, the answer concerning the dogs was given precedence over that concerning David.

(5) Supra a. This was said in a spirit of humility, instead of 'which you asked before me.'

(6) Prov. XX, 27: the soul of man is the lamp of the Lord.

(7) Where life is endangered, the lamp may certainly be extinguished.

(8) V. supra p. 55, n. 2. Weiss, Dor, 1, p. 212 conjectures that this was at the time of the Synod in the upper chamber of Hanania b. Hezekiah b. Garon (v. p. 54, n. 1), when it was desired to 'hide' Ezekiel too. This activity was occasioned by the spread of books of Hellenistic tendencies, in consequence of which existing material was closely scrutinized as to its fitness.

(9) Lit., 'words of the Torah'.

(10) Eccl. 1, 3.

(11) I.e., one profits if he toils in the Torah, which existed before the sun; Pes. 54a; Ned. 39b.

(12) Ibid. XII, 13.

- (13) Ibid. VII, 3.
- (14) Ibid. II, 2.
- (15) Ibid. VIII, 15. (12) Ibid. II, 2.
- (16) The latter is an idiom for prosperity and well being: the sufferings inflicted upon the righteous are preferable to the prosperity conferred upon the wicked.
- (17) The celebrations of such, e.g., a marriage.
- (18) The Rabbis frowned upon this. But in all probability this does not apply to a simple and harmless gathering, but to attendance at theatres and circuses, at which the Jewish authorities looked askance, perhaps because they originated in idolatry and also because images of royalty were placed there. — Lev. R. XXXIV. The early Christians too were opposed to this, Tertullian (*De Spectaculis*, X) describing the theatre as a place of sexual immorality.
- (19) Judaism does not encourage asceticism; cf. Ned. 10a.
- (20) Or, vain pursuits.
- (21) II Kings III, 15. Maharsha observes that the verse is quoted merely to show that the Divine Presence does not rest on a man plunged in gloom, Elisha requiring the minstrel to dissipate the gloom occasioned by Jehoram's visit.
- (22) Serious study must be preceded by some light-hearted conversation.
- (23) If one goes to sleep in good spirits, he has happy dreams.
- (24) Caused by his awe and reverence.
- (25) Cant. V, 13.
- (26) Translating: the lips of those who study drop bitterness.—This shows that one must not study light-heartedly.
- (27) Prov. XXVI, 4.
- (28) Ibid. 5.
- (29) Then he may be answered.
- (30) Thus accusing his wife of adultery and his children of illegitimacy,
- (31) The man's miraculous death proved his accusation unfounded. [The text is not clear. Var. lec.; that he was not made (accused to be) illegitimate unlike R. Hiyya, who was declared by the man to be his son; only the character of Rabbi's son was impugned but not of Rabbi himself].
- (32) Private prayers were added after the Eighteen Benedictions (v. p. 32, n. 3); Elbogen, *Der Judische Gottesdienst*, p. 75. This prayer has become incorporated in the daily liturgy. Weiss, *Dor*, II, 192 conjectures, though on insufficient grounds, that it was occasioned by the opposition he met with among the Rabbis.
- (33) Jer. XXXI, 7. (E.V. 8: the woman with child and her that travaileth with child ,together).
- (34) Eccl. I, 9.
- (35) 'This world' is here contrasted with the destined future of change, while generally it is contrasted with the 'world to come'. Whether these two are synonymous it is difficult to say; v. Sanh. p. 601, n. 3. But perhaps the phrase here means, 'the world under present conditions.'
- (36) Ezek. XVII, 23.
- (37) Jast: of which the various products are eaten successively; v. B.B. 28b.
- (38) Ps. LXXII, 16. Rashi: this implies, corn as wide as a handbreadth, i.e., cakes as wide. The Hebrew *pissath bar* may also be translated pure wool (or, silken) garments'.
- (39) Which resemble cakes.
- (40) This has a downy, silk-like substance on the inside.

## **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 31a**

made a wager with each other, saying, He who goes and makes Hillel angry shall receive four hundred zuz. Said one, 'I will go and incense him.' That day was the Sabbath eve, and Hillel was washing his head. He went, passed by the door of his house, and called out, 'Is Hillel here, is Hillel here?'<sup>1</sup> Thereupon he robed and went out to him, saying, 'My son, what do you require?' 'I have a question to ask,' said he. 'Ask, my son,' he prompted. Thereupon he asked: 'Why are the heads of the Babylonians round?'<sup>2</sup> 'My son, you have asked a great question,' replied he: 'because they have no skillful midwives.' He departed, tarried a while, returned, and called out, 'Is Hillel here; is Hillel here?' He robed and went out to him, saying, 'My son, what do you require?' 'I have a question to ask,' said he. 'Ask, my son,' he prompted. Thereupon he asked: 'Why are the eyes of the

Palmyreans<sup>3</sup> bleared?’ ‘My son, you have asked a great question, replied he: ‘because they live in sandy places.’ He departed, tarried a while, returned, and called out, ‘Is Hillel here; is Hillel here?’ He robed and went out to him, saying, ‘My son, what do you require?’ ‘I have a question to ask,’ said he. ‘Ask, my son,’ he prompted. He asked, ‘Why are the feet of the Africans [negroes] wide?’ ‘My son, you have asked a great question,’ said he; ‘because they live in watery marshes.’<sup>4</sup> ‘I have many questions to ask,’ said he, ‘but fear that you may become angry.’ Thereupon he robed, sat before him and said, ‘Ask all the questions you have to ask,’ ‘Are you the Hillel who is called the nasi<sup>5</sup> of Israel?’ ‘Yes,’ he replied. ‘If that is you,’ he retorted, may there not be many like you in Israel. ‘ ‘ Why, my son?’ queried he. ‘Because I have lost four hundred zuz through you,’ complained he. ‘Be careful of your moods,’ he answered. ‘Hillel is worth it that you should lose four hundred zuz and yet another four hundred zuz through him, yet Hillel shall not lose his temper.’

Our Rabbis taught: A certain heathen once came before Shammai and asked him, ‘How many Torah<sup>6</sup> have you?’ ‘Two,’ he replied: ‘the Written Torah and the Oral Torah.’<sup>7</sup> ‘I believe you with respect to the Written, but not with respect to the Oral Torah; make me a proselyte on condition that you teach me the Written Torah [only].’<sup>8</sup> [But] he scolded and repulsed him in anger. When he went before Hillel, he accepted him as a proselyte. On the first day, he taught him, Alef, beth, gimmel, dalet;<sup>9</sup> the following day he reversed [them ] to him. ‘But yesterday you did not teach them to me thus,’ he protested. ‘Must you then not rely upon me?’<sup>10</sup> Then rely upon me with respect to the Oral [Torah] too.’<sup>11</sup>

On another occasion it happened that a certain heathen came before Shammai and said to him, ‘Make me a proselyte, on condition that you teach me the whole Torah while I stand on one foot.’ Thereupon he repulsed him with the builder's cubit which was in his hand.<sup>12</sup> When he went before Hillel, he said to him, ‘What is hateful to you, do not to your neighbour:<sup>13</sup> that is the whole Torah, while the rest is the commentary thereof; go and learn it.’ On another occasion it happened that a certain heathen was passing behind a Beth Hamidrash, when he heard the voice of a teacher<sup>14</sup> reciting, And these are the garments which they shall make; a breastplate, and an ephod.<sup>15</sup> Said he, ‘For whom are these?’ ‘For the High Priest,’ he was told. Then said that heathen to himself, ‘I will go and become a proselyte, that I may be appointed a High Priest.’ So he went before Shammai and said to him, ‘Make me a proselyte on condition that you appoint me a High Priest.’ But he repulsed him with the builder's cubit which was in his hand. He then went before Hillel, who made him a proselyte. Said he to him, ‘Can any man be made a king but he who knows the arts of government? Do you go and study the arts of government!’<sup>16</sup> He went and read. When he came to, and the stranger that cometh nigh shall be put to death,<sup>17</sup> he asked him, ‘To whom does this verse apply?’ ‘Even to David King, of Israel,’ was the answer. Thereupon that proselyte reasoned within himself a fortiori: if Israel, who are called sons of the Omnipresent,<sup>18</sup> and who in His love for them He designated them, Israel is my son, my firstborn,<sup>19</sup> yet it is written of them, ‘and the stranger that cometh nigh shall be put to death’: how much more so a mere proselyte, who comes with his staff and wallet! Then he went before Shammai and said to him. ‘Am I then eligible to be a High Priest; is it not written in the Torah, ‘and the stranger that cometh nigh shall be put to death?’ He went before Hillel and said to him, ‘O gentle Hillel; blessings rest on thy head for bringing me under the wings of the Shechinah!’<sup>20</sup> Some time later the three met in one place; said they, Shammai's impatience sought to drive us from the world, but Hillel's gentleness brought us under the wings of the Shechinah.<sup>21</sup>

Resh Lakish said, What is meant by the verse, and there shall be faith in thy times, strength, salvation, wisdom and knowledge?<sup>22</sup> ‘Faith’ refers to the Order of Seeds; thy times, the Order of Festivals; strength, the Order of Women; salvation, the Order of Nezikin;<sup>23</sup> wisdom, the Order of Sacrifices; and knowledge, to the Order of Purity.<sup>24</sup> Yet even so the fear of the Lord is his treasure.<sup>25</sup>

Raba said, When man is led in for Judgment<sup>26</sup> he is asked, Did you deal faithfully [i.e., with

integrity], did you fix times for learning, did you engage in procreation, did you hope for salvation, did you engage in the dialectics of wisdom, did you understand one thing from another.<sup>27</sup> Yet even so, if ‘the fear of the Lord is his treasure,’ it is well: if not, [it is] not [well]. This may be compared to a man who instructed his agent, ‘Take me up a kor of wheat in the loft,’ and he went and did so. ‘Did you mix in a kab of humton?’<sup>28</sup> he asked him, ‘No,’ replied he. ‘Then it were better that you had not carried it up,’ he retorted. The School of R. Ishmael taught: A man may mix a kab of humton in a kor of grain, and have no fear.<sup>29</sup>

Rabbah b. R. Huna said: Every man who possesses learning without

- 
- (1) Insolently, without the courtesy of a title.
  - (2) Hillel himself was a Babylonian.
  - (3) V. p. 91, n. 8.
  - (4) Hence their feet must be wide to enable them to walk there, just as ducks’ feet are webbed.
  - (5) Patriarch, the religious head of the people.
  - (6) Torah, pl. Toroth, is generally, though incorrectly, translated ‘law’. It means rather a system of teaching; v.R.T.Herford, *The Pharisees*, pp-53ff.
  - (7) The Written Torah is the Pentateuch; the Oral Torah is the whole body of Rabbinical and traditional teaching thereon. This was originally not committed to writing (for the reasons v. Weiss, Dor, 111, 24b; and Kaplan, *Redaction of the Talmud*, ch. XIX), and hence designated the Oral Torah. Weiss, op. cit. I, p. 1, n. 1. observes that Hillel was the first man to whom the use of the term **תורה שבעל פה** ‘Oral Law’ is found ascribed.
  - (8) Of teaching him.
  - (9) The first four letters of the Hebrew alphabet.
  - (10) As to what the letters are.
  - (11) There must be a certain reliance upon authority before anything can be learnt at all. Cf. M. Farbridge, *Judaism and the Modern Mind*, chs. VII and VIII.
  - (12) Rashi: a cubit to measure off the amount of work done by a builder.
  - (13) The golden Rule; cf. Lev. XIX, 18: but thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.- V. Hertz, *Leviticus*, pp.22 or 223, and cf. R. T. Herford, *Talmud and Apocrypha*, p. 148.
  - (14) Lit., ‘a scribe’.
  - (15) Ex. XXVIII, 4.
  - (16) The laws appertaining to the functions of a High Priest.
  - (17) Num. I, 51.
  - (18) Deut. XIV, 11.
  - (19) Ex. IV, 22.
  - (20) V. Glos.
  - (21) From these stories it would appear that proselytes were eagerly accepted by Hillel; v. Kid., Sonc. ed., p. 313, n. 3.
  - (22) Isa. XXXIII, 6.
  - (23) V. n. 9.
  - (24) These are the six orders into which the Talmud is divided. Faith is applied to Seeds, because it requires faith in the Almighty to sow with the assurance of a crop (J.T.); ‘times’ as meaning Festivals is self-explanatory; hosen, here translated ‘strength’, is derived by Rashi from a root meaning to inherit, and thus identified with the Order of Women, because heirs are created through women; Nezikin treats of civil law, knowledge of which saves men (i.e., brings him ‘salvation’) from encroaching upon his neighbour’s rights or allowing his own to be filched away; the last two Orders are very intricate and require deep understanding, and are therefore identified with wisdom and knowledge.
  - (25) Ibid. Learning without piety is valueless.
  - (26) In the next world.
  - (27) That is Raba’s interpretation of the verse; he too translates ‘hosen’ as inheritance, and thus applies it to procreation (v. preceding note), and understands ‘knowledge’ as the process of inferring the unknown from the known.
  - (28) last.: a sandy soil containing salty substances and used for the preservation of wheat.
  - (29) Of dishonesty, when he sells the whole as grain, because that proportion is necessary for its preservation. One kab = one hundred and eightieth of a kor.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 31b

the fear of Heaven is like a treasurer who is entrusted with the inner keys but not with the outer: how is he to enter? R. Jannai proclaimed: Woe to him who has no courtyard yet makes a gate for same!<sup>1</sup> Rab Judah said, The Holy One, blessed be He, created His world only that men should fear Him,<sup>2</sup> for it is said, and God hath done it, that men should fear before Him.<sup>3</sup>

R. Simon and R. Eleazar<sup>4</sup> were sitting, when R. Jacob b. Aha came walking past. Said one to his companion, 'Let us arise before him, because he is a sin-fearing man.' Said the other, 'Let us arise before him, because he is a man of learning.' 'I tell you that he is a sin-fearing man, and you tell me that he is a man of learning!' retorted he.<sup>5</sup> It may be proved that it was R. Eleazar who observed that he was a sin-fearing man. For R. Johanan said in R. Eleazar's name:<sup>6</sup> The Holy One, blessed be He, has nought else in His world but<sup>7</sup> the fear of Heaven alone, for it is said, And now, Israel, what doth the Lord thy God requires of thee, but to fear the Lord thy God?<sup>8</sup> and it is written, And unto man he said, Behold [hen], the fear of the Lord, that is wisdom, and in Greek one is hen.<sup>9</sup> That proves it.<sup>10</sup>

R. 'Ulla expounded: Why Is it written, Be not much wicked?<sup>11</sup> must one not be much wicked, yet he may be a little wicked! But if one has eaten garlic and his breath smells, shall he eat some more garlic that his breath may [continue to] smell?<sup>12</sup>

Raba son of R. 'Ulla expounded: What is meant by, For there are no pangs [harzuboth] in their death: but their strength is firm [bari] ulam?<sup>13</sup> The Holy One, blessed be He, said, it is not enough for the wicked that they do not tremble and are not grief-stricken before the day of death, but their hearts are as firm as an edifice.<sup>14</sup> And that is what Raba said, What is meant by, This their way is their confidence [kesel]?<sup>15</sup> The wicked know that their way is to death, but they have fat on their loins [kislam].<sup>16</sup> But lest you think that it is their forgetfulness, therefore it is stated, and they approve their end with their own mouths.<sup>15</sup>

IF HE WOULD SPARE THE LAMP, etc. With whom does R. Jose agree? If with R. Judah,<sup>17</sup> then one should be liable for the others too; and if with R. Simeon,<sup>18</sup> he should be exempt even for[sparing] the wick?-Said 'Ulla, After all, he agrees with R. Judah; yet R. Jose holds that demolishing in order to rebuild on the same site is destroying, but if it is in order to rebuild elsewhere, it is not destroying.<sup>19</sup> Said Rabbah to him, Consider; all forms of labour are derived from the Tabernacle,<sup>20</sup> yet there it was taking down in order to rebuild elsewhere?<sup>21</sup> It was different there, answered he; for since it is written, At the commandment of the Lord they encamped, [and at the commandment of the Lord they journeyed],<sup>22</sup> it was like demolishing in order to rebuild on the same site.

But R. Johanan maintained: After all, he agrees with R. Simeon, yet why is the case of a wick different? As R. Hamnuna-others state, R. Adda b. Ahabah-said: This refers to a wick which needs singeing,<sup>23</sup> and in such a case even R. Simeon agrees since he renders an object fit.<sup>24</sup> Raba said, This may be inferred too, for it is stated, BECAUSE HE MAKES CHARCOAL, and not, because a charcoal is formed.<sup>25</sup> This proves it.

MISHNAH. FOR THREE SINS WOMEN DIE IN CHILDBIRTH: BECAUSE THEY ARE NOT OBSERVANT OF [THE LAWS OF] NIDDAH, HALLAH,<sup>26</sup> AND THE KINDLING OF THE [SABBATH] LIGHTS.<sup>27</sup>

GEMARA. What is the reason of niddah?-Said R. Isaac: She transgressed through the chambers of her womb, therefore she is punished through the chambers of her womb. That is right of niddah, but what can be said of hallah and the kindling of lights? — As a certain Galilean lectured before R.

Hisda: The Holy One, blessed be He, said: I put a rebi'ith of blood in you;<sup>28</sup> therefore I commanded you concerning blood.<sup>29</sup>

- 
- (1) Learning is a gate whereby one enters the court of piety. Woe to him who prepares the entry without the court itself!
- (2) By 'fear' not dread but awe and reverence is to be understood, proceeding out of man's realization of God's essential perfection. This reverence, and the attempt to attain something of that perfection which it inculcates, is man's highest aim in life, and that is probably the meaning of this dictum; cf. Maim. (Guide, III, 52.
- (3) Eccl. III, 14.
- (4) in the Yalkut, 'Ekeb, 855 the reading is: Rabbi and R. Eleazar b. Simeon.
- (5) The former is a greater attribute.
- (6) This would be R. Eleazar b. Pedath, R. Johanan's younger contemporary; he is hardly likely to have quoted him. Hence the Yalkut's version given in p. 142, n. 7 is preferable, and the reading is: R. Johanan in the name of R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon.
- (7) i.e., cherishes nothing so highly.
- (8) Deut. X, 12.
- (9) Thus translating: the fear of the Lord is one, unique (in God's affections).
- (10) Sc. R. Eleazar's (or, R. Eleazar b. Simeon's) view.
- (11) Eccl. VII, 17.
- (12) i.e., having sinned a little, do not think that you must go on sinning.
- (13) Ps. LXXIII, 4.
- (14) Regarding harzuboth as a combination of hared (trembling) and 'azeb (grief-stricken) and translating ulam, a hall, edifice.
- (15) Ps. XLIX, 14.
- (16) Which close their understanding. The loins (reins) were regarded as the seat of understanding.
- (17) That one is liable for work not needed in itself, v. p. 131, n. 4
- (18) V. supra 12a.
- (19) One is not liable for desecrating the Sabbath when his work is destructive; but if he demolishes a house in order to rebuild, it is regarded as constructive. Now, extinguishing a wick, thereby destroying its light, is the equivalent of demolishing a house; if the purpose is to save the wick to be used again later, it is analogous to demolishing a house to build on the same site, since it is the wick which is extinguished and the wick which is to be relit. But if the purpose is to save the oil or the lamp, it is analogous to demolishing a house in order to rebuild elsewhere, for whereas the wick is extinguished, it is the oil or lamp that is saved for subsequent use.
- (20) infra 49b.
- (21) The Tabernacle was only taken down when they had to journey onwards, and it was re-erected on their new camping pitch.
- (22) Num. IX, 23.
- (23) In order to burn clearer.
- (24) For its purpose, and thus it is a labour needed for itself, which involves liability.
- (25) The text implies that by extinguishing it he intends making charcoal, i.e., to make it more ready for relighting, and thus must apply to a wick which needs singeing.
- (26) On the terms v. Glos.
- (27) [In time before Sabbath sets in, v. Strashun].
- (28) Rebi'ith=one log=one fourth of a kab, and was held to be the smallest quantity of blood within a human being on which life in be supported.
- (29) Not to shed it: Gen. IX. 5f.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 32a

I designated you the first;<sup>1</sup> wherefore I commanded you concerning the first.<sup>2</sup> The soul which I placed in you is called a lamp, wherefore I commanded you concerning the lamp.<sup>3</sup> If ye fulfil them, 'tis well; but if not, I will take your souls.

And why particularly in childbirth?-Raba said, When the ox is fallen, sharpen the knife. Abaye said, Let the bondmaid increase her rebellion: it will all be punished by the same rod. R. Hisda said, Leave the drunkard alone: he will fall of himself. Mar 'Ukba said, When the shepherd is lame, and the goats are fleet, at the gate of the fold are words, and in the fold there is the account. R. Papa said, At the gate of the shop there are many brothers and friends; at the gate of loss<sup>4</sup> there are neither brothers nor friends.<sup>5</sup>

And when are men examined?-Said Resh Lakish: When they pass over a bridge.<sup>6</sup> A bridge and nothing else?-Say, that which is similar to a bridge. Rab would not cross a bridge where a heathen was sitting; said he, Lest judgment be visited upon him, and I be seized together with him. Samuel would cross a bridge only when a heathen was upon it, saying, Satan has no power over two nations [simultaneously]. R. Jannai examined [the bridge] and then crossed over. R. Jannai [acted] upon his views, for he said, A man should never stand in a place of danger and say that a miracle will be wrought for him, lest it is not. And if a miracle is wrought for him, it is deducted from his merits.<sup>7</sup> R. Hanin said, Which verse [teaches this]? I am become diminished<sup>8</sup> by reason of all the deeds of kindness and all the truth.<sup>9</sup> R. Zera would not go out among the palm-trees on a day of the strong south wind.<sup>10</sup>

R. Isaac the son of Rab Judah said: Let one always pray for mercy not to fall sick; for the falls sick he is told, Show thy merits [rights] and be quit.<sup>11</sup> Said Mar 'Ukba, Which verse [teaches this]? If any man fall mimmenu;<sup>12</sup> It is from him [mimmenu] that proof must be brought.<sup>13</sup> The School of R. Ishmael taught: 'If any man [hanofel] fall from thence': this man was predestined to fall since the six days of Creation, for lo! he has not [yet] fallen, and the Writ [already] calls him nofel [a faller].<sup>14</sup> But reward [zekut] is brought about through a person of merit [zakkai], and punishment [hobah] through a person of- guilt.<sup>15</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: if one falls sick and his life is in danger,<sup>16</sup> he is told, Make confession, for all who are sentenced to death make confession. When a man goes out into the street, let him imagine that he is given in charge of an officer;<sup>17</sup> when he has a headache, let him imagine that he is put in irons; when he takes to bed, let him imagine that he ascended the scaffold to be punished. For whoever ascends the scaffold to be punished, if he has great advocates he is saved, but if not he is not saved. And these are man's advocates: repentance and good deeds. And even if nine hundred and ninety-nine argue for his guilt, while one argues in his favour, he is saved, for it is said, If there be with him an angel, an advocate, one among a thousand, To shew unto man what is right for him; Then he is gracious unto him, and saith, Deliver him from going down to the pit, etc.<sup>18</sup> R. Eliezer the son of R. Jose the Galilean said: Even if nine hundred and ninety-nine parts of that angel are in his disfavour and one part is in his favour, he is saved, for it is said, 'an advocate, one part in a thousand'.

Our Rabbis taught: For three sins women die in childbirth. R. Eleazar said: women die young.<sup>19</sup> R. Aha said, As a punishment for washing their children's napkins<sup>20</sup> on the Sabbath. Others say, Because they call the holy ark a chest.

It was taught, R. Ishmael b. Eleazar said: On account of two sins 'amme ha-arez<sup>21</sup> die: because they call the holy ark a chest, and because they call a synagogue beth-'am.<sup>22</sup>

It was taught, R. Jose said: Three death scrutineers were created in woman; others state: Three causes<sup>23</sup> of death: niddah, hallah, and the kindling of the [Sabbath] lights. One agrees with R. Eleazar, and the other with the Rabbi's.<sup>24</sup>

It was taught, R. Simeon b. Gamaliel said: The laws of hekdesch, terumoth<sup>25</sup> and tithes are indeed essential parts of the law,

- (1) Jer. II, 3: Israel was holiness unto the Lord, the first-fruits of his increase.
- (2) Sc. the first portion of the dough, which is hallah; Num. XV, 20.
- (3) Sc. the Sabbath lights.
- (4) Rashi. Levi, Worterbuch s.v. **זינא** conjectures that **בי זינא** should be read instead of **זינא זינא**: he translates as Rashi: where there is loss. Jast.: at the prison gate, Krauss in T.A. II, p. 699, n. 435 appears to translate: at the toll-gate, and this is a reference to the severity with which tolls were exacted.
- (5) These are a series of proverbs, the general tenor of which is that when danger is near, one's faults are remembered and punished. Childbirth is dangerous, and that is when a woman is punished for her transgressions. — Mar 'Ukba's proverb means: the shepherd waits until the goats are by the gate of the fold or pen, and then rebukes and punishes them.
- (6) That involves danger, and then they are liable to be punished for their misdeeds,
- (7) The miracle is a reward for some of his merits, and so he has now less to his credit.
- (8) I.e., I have less merit to my credit.
- (9) Gen, XXXII, 10.
- (10) Aruch: east wind.
- (11) I.e., he must prove by what merit he is entitled to regain his health.
- (12) Deut. XXII, 8.
- (13) Of merit, that he is entitled to recover from his injuries.
- (14) The lit. translation of the verse is: if the faller falls. But before he starts falling he should not be designated the faller.
- (15) And this man who builds a house without a parapet is guilty therein, and he is used as the Divine instrument for fulfilling the other man's destiny to fall as a punishment.
- (16) Lit., 'inclines to death'.
- (17) To be bought to trial.
- (18) Job. XXXIII, 23f.
- (19) For these three sins. The variants involve but a change of vocalization in the Hebrew text.
- (20) Lit., 'excrement'.
- (21) Pl. of 'am ha-arez, q.v. Glos,
- (22) Lit., 'house of the people'-a contemptuous designation.
- (23) Cf. n. 2..
- (24) 'Death scrutineers' connotes sins which scrutinize a woman when she is in danger, sc. at childbirth; thus this agrees with the Rabbis, 'Causes' implies avenues to premature death, thus agreeing with R. Eleazar's dictum, 'women die young'-The translation of the first follows Rashi. last.: breaches through which death enters, i.e., sins for which one is visited with death.
- (25) V. Glos.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 32b

and they were entrusted to the ignorant.<sup>1</sup>

It was taught, R. Nathan said: A man's wife dies in punishment for [his unfulfilled] vows, for it is said. If thou, hast not wherewith to pay [thy vows], why should he take away thy bed [i.e., wife] from under thee?<sup>2</sup> Rabbi said, For the sin of [unfulfilled] vows one's children die young, for it is said, Suffer not thy mouth to cause thy flesh to sin, neither say thou, before the angel, that it was an error: wherefore should God be angry at thy voice, and destroy the work of thine hands.<sup>3</sup> What is the work of a man's hands? Say, it is a man's sons and daughters.

Our Rabbis taught: Children die as a punishment for [unfulfilled] vows: this is the view of R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon. R. Judah the Nasi said: For the sin of neglect of Torah [study]. As for the view that it is for the sin of vows, it is well, even as we have said. But on the view that it is for the sin of neglect of Torah, what verse [teaches this]? — For it is written, Have I smitten your children for nought? They received no instruction!<sup>4</sup> R. Nahman b. Isaac said: The view that it is for the sin of vows is also [deduced] from this: For vain [utterance] have I smitten your children, i.e., on account of vain (neglected) vows.<sup>5</sup> Consider: R. Judah the Nasi is identical with Rabbi, whereas Rabbi said that it is for the sin of vows? — He said that after he had heard it from R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon.<sup>6</sup>

R. Hiyya b. Abba and R. Jose<sup>7</sup> differ therein: one maintained: It is for the sin of [neglect of] mezuzah;<sup>8</sup> while the other held that it is for the sin of neglect of Torah. On the view that it is for the sin of mezuzah: a verse is interpreted with its precedent, but not with its ante-precedent verse. While on the view that it is for the sin of neglect of Torah: a verse is interpreted with its precedent and its ante-precedent.<sup>9</sup> R. Meir and R. Judah differ therein: One maintains, It is for the neglect of mezuzah, while the other holds that it is for the neglect of fringes.<sup>10</sup> Now, as for the view that it is for the neglect of mezuzah, it is well, for it is written, ‘and thou shalt write them upon the door posts [mezuzoth] of thine house’, which is followed by, ‘that your days may be multiplied, and the days of your children’. But what is the reason of the view that it is for the neglect of fringes?—Said R. Kahana—others state, Shila Mari: because it is written, Also in thy skirts is found the blood of the souls of the innocent poor.<sup>11</sup> R. Nahman b. Isaac said, The view that it is for the neglect of mezuzah is also [learnt] from this: did I not find them like caves?<sup>12</sup> [which means] that they made their entrances like caves.<sup>13</sup>

Resh Lakish said: He who is observant of fringes will be privileged to be served by two thousand eight hundred slaves, for it is said, Thus saith the Lord of hosts: In those days it shall come to pass, that ten men shall take hold, out of all the languages of the nations shall even take hold of the skirt of him that is a Jew, saying, We will go with you, etc.<sup>14</sup>

(Mnemonic: Hate, Hallah, Terumah, Robbed, Law, Oath, Shedding, Uncovering, Folly.)<sup>15</sup> It was taught, R. Nehemiah said: As a punishment for causeless hate strife multiplies in a man's house, his wife miscarries, and his sons and daughters die young.

R. Eleazar b. R. Judah said: Because of the neglect of hallah there is no blessing in what is stored, a curse is sent upon prices,<sup>16</sup> and seed is sown and others consume it, for it is said, I also will do this unto you: I will visit you with terror [behalah], even consumption and fever, that shall consume the eyes, and make the soul to pine away. and ye shall sow your seed in vain, for your enemies shall eat it:<sup>17</sup> read not behalah but be-hallah.<sup>18</sup> But if they give it, they are blessed, for it is said, ye shall also give unto the priest the first of your dough, to cause a blessing to rest on thine house.<sup>19</sup>

As a punishment for the neglect of terumoth and tithes the heavens are shut up from pouring down dew and rain, high prices are prevalent, wages are lost, and people pursue a livelihood but cannot attain it,<sup>20</sup> for it is written: Drought [ziyyah] and heat [hom] consume the snow waters: So doth the grave those which have sinned.<sup>21</sup> How does this imply it?—The School of R. Ishmael taught: On account of the things which I commanded you in summer<sup>22</sup> but ye did them not, the snowy waters shall rob you in winter.<sup>23</sup> But if they render them, they are blessed, for it is said, Bring ye the whole tithe into the storehouse, that there may be meat in mine house, and prove me now herewith, saith the Lord of Hosts, if I will not open you the windows of heaven, and pour you out a blessing, that there shall not be room enough to receive it [‘ad beli day].<sup>24</sup> What is meant by ‘ad beli day?—Said Rami b. Hama: Until your lips are exhausted<sup>25</sup> through saying, ‘Enough!’ [day].

For the crime of robbery locusts make invasion, famine is prevalent, and people eat the flesh of

their sons and daughters, for it is said, Hear this word, ye kine of Bashan, that are in the mountain of Samaria, which oppress the poor, which crush the needy.<sup>26</sup> (Said Raba, E.g., these women of Mahoza,<sup>27</sup>

---

(1) No supervisors were appointed to ensure that the ignorant observe them. Rashi: haberim (q.v. Glos.) eat the bread of the ignorant and assume that the priestly dues have been rendered. Likewise, they use their movables without fearing that they may have dedicated them as hekdesch and rendered them forbidden for secular use.

(2) Prov. XXII, 27.

(3) Eccl. V, 5.

(4) Jer. II, 30.

(5) The Heb. is la-shaw, which bears this meaning too. Cf. Deut. V, 11: Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain (la-shaw).

(6) But the compiler of this Baraita quoted his former view.

(7) Wilna Gaon emends this to R. Ammi or R. Assi.

(8) V. Glos.

(9) V. Deut. XI, 19-21: And ye shall teach them your children ... and thou shalt write them upon the door posts of thine house (mezuzoth) ... that your days may be multiplied. and the days of your children. One maintains: the promise 'and the days of your children' is made conditional upon the immediately preceding command, and thou shalt write them (sc. mezuzah); the other holds that it refers to the previous verse too, viz., and ye shall teach them your children.

(10) Num. XV, 38.

(11) Jer. II, 34: 'in thy skirts'-i.e., in the neglect of fringes, which are inserted in the skirts of one's garment: 'the innocent poor,' i.e., the children who die guiltlessly.

(12) E.V.: I have not found it at the place of breaking in.

(13) Without mezuzoth.

(14) Zech. VIII, 23, 'Skirt' is regarded as referring to the fringe (cf. n. 2.). There are four fringes, and traditionally there are seventy languages: we thus have  $70 \times 10 \times 4 = 2800$ .

(15) Catch words of the themes that follow, as an aid to memory.

(16) What is stored — grain, wine, oil, etc. does not keep, with the result that prices rise.

(17) Lev. XXVI, 16.

(18) On account of (the neglect of) hallah.

(19) Ezek. XLIV, 30.

(20) Cf. Ab. V. 8.

(21) Job. XXIV, 19.

(22) Viz., the rendering of terumoth and tithes.

(23) I.e., there will be no rain, etc. Ziyah (E.V. drought) is thus connected with ziwah (he commanded), and hom (E.V. heat) with summer.

(24) Mal. III, 10.

(25) Yibelu, connected here with beli.

(26) Amos. IV, 1. The proof lies in the sequel, quoted below.

(27) The famous town on the Tigris not far from Ktesifon, where Raba possibly founded the academy (Weiss, Dor, 111, 202) with himself as head, which was recognized as one of the foremost in Babylon; Obermeyer, p. i 66. (i 2.) Thus they rob their husbands; or, demanding food and producing nothing in return, they may force their husbands to robbery. - Women were expected to do a certain amount of labour, e.g., spinning; Keth. 59b, cf. Prov. XXXI, 13, 19. It would appear that Raba was not very popular in Mahoza (cf. Sanh. 99b); such sentiments may be either partially the cause, or Raba's reaction.

## **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 33a**

who eat without working). And it is [further] written, I have smitten you with blasting and mildew: the multitude of your gardens and your vineyards and your fig trees and your olive trees hath the palmerworm devoured.<sup>1</sup> and it is also written, That which the palmerworm hath left hath the locust eaten; and that which the locust hath left hath the cankerworm eaten; and that which the cankerworm

hath left hath the caterpillar eaten;<sup>2</sup> and it is written, And one shall snatch on the right hand, and be hungry, and he shall eat on the left hand, and they shall not be satisfied; they shall eat every man the flesh of his own arm.<sup>3</sup> Read not, the flesh of his own arm [zero'o], but, the flesh of his own seed [zar'o].

As a punishment for delay of judgment,<sup>4</sup> perversion of judgment,<sup>5</sup> spoiling of judgment,<sup>6</sup> and neglect of Torah, sword and spoil increase, pestilence and famine come, people eat and are not satisfied, and eat their bread by weight, for it is written, and I will bring a sword upon you, that shall execute the vengeance of the covenant:<sup>7</sup> now 'covenant' means nothing else but Torah, as it is written, But for my covenant of day and night [I had not appointed the ordinances of heaven and earth];<sup>8</sup> and it is written, When I break your staff of bread, ten women shall bake your bread in one oven, and they shall deliver your bread again by weight;<sup>9</sup> and it is written, because, even because they rejected my judgments.<sup>10</sup>

For the crime of vain oaths, false oaths,<sup>11</sup> profanation of the Divine Name,<sup>12</sup> and the desecration of the Sabbath, wild beasts multiply, [domestic] animals cease, the population decreases, and the roads become desolate, for it is said, And if by these things [be-eleh] ye will not be reformed unto me;<sup>13</sup> read not be-eleh but be-alah;<sup>14</sup> and it is written, and I will send the beast of the field among you, etc.<sup>15</sup> Now, in respect to false oaths it is written, And ye shall not swear by my name falsely, so that you profane [we-hillalta] the name of thy God;<sup>16</sup> and of the profanation of the Name it is written, and that they profane not [ye-hallelu] my holy name;<sup>17</sup> and of the profanation of the Sabbath it is written, every one that profaneth it [mehallelehah] shall surely be put to death:<sup>18</sup> and [the punishment for] profanation is learnt<sup>19</sup> from a false oath.<sup>20</sup>

Through the crime of bloodshed the Temple was destroyed and the Shechinah departed from Israel, as it is written, So ye shall not pollute the land wherein ye are; for blood, it polluteth the land ... And thou shalt not defile the land which ye inhabit, in the midst of which I dwell.-<sup>21</sup> hence, if ye do defile it, ye will not inhabit it and I will not dwell in its midst.<sup>22</sup>

As a punishment for incest,<sup>23</sup> idolatry, and non-observance of the years of release and jubilee<sup>24</sup> exile comes to the world, they [the Jews] are exiled, and others come and dwell in their place, for it is said, for all these abominations have the men of the land done, etc.;<sup>25</sup> and it is written, and the land is defiled,- therefore do I visit the in iniquity thereof upon it;<sup>26</sup> and it is written, that the land vomit not you out also, when ye defile it.<sup>27</sup> Again, with respect to idolatry it is written, and I will cast your carcasses [upon the carcasses of your idols];<sup>28</sup> and it is written, And I will make your cities a waste, and will bring your sanctuaries into desolation etc....<sup>29</sup> and you will I scatter among the nations.<sup>30</sup> Further, in reference to release and jubilee years it is written, Then shall the land enjoy her sabbaths, as long as it lieth desolate, and ye be in your enemies' land, etc.;<sup>31</sup> and it is written, As long as it lieth desolate it shall have rest.<sup>32</sup>

As a punishment for obscenity,<sup>33</sup> troubles multiply, cruel decrees are proclaimed afresh, the youth of Israel's enemies<sup>34</sup> die, and the fatherless and widows cry out and are not answered; for it is said, Therefore shall the Lord not rejoice over the young men, neither shall he have compassion over their fatherless and their widows: for every one is profane and an evil-doer, and every mouth speaketh folly. For all is his anger is not turned away, but his hand is stretched out still.<sup>35</sup> What is meant by, 'but his hand is stretched out still'?-Said R. Hanan b. Rabbah: All know for what purpose a bride enters the bridal canopy, yet against whomsoever who speaks obscenely [thereof], even if a sentence of seventy years' happiness had been sealed for him,<sup>36</sup> it is reversed for evil.

Rabbah b. Shila said in R. Hisda's name: He who puts his mouth to folly,<sup>37</sup> Gehenna is made deep for him, as it is said, A deep pit is for the mouth [that speaketh] perversity.<sup>38</sup> R. Nahman b. Isaac said, Also [for] one who hears and is silent,<sup>39</sup> for it is said, he that is abhorred of the Lord<sup>40</sup> shall fall

therein.<sup>41</sup>

R. Oshaia said: He who devotes himself<sup>42</sup> to sin, wounds and bruises break out over him, as it is said, Stripes and wounds are for him that devoteth himself to evil.<sup>43</sup> Moreover, he is punished by dropsy, for it is said, and strokes reach the innermost parts of the belly.<sup>44</sup> R. Nahman b. Isaac said: Dropsy is a sign of sin.

Our Rabbis taught: There are three kinds of dropsy: that [which is a punishment] of sin is thick; that caused by hunger is swollen; and what is caused by magic is thin.<sup>45</sup> Samuel the Little<sup>46</sup> suffered through it. 'Sovereign of the Universe!' he cried out, who will cast lots?'<sup>47</sup> [Thereupon] he recovered. Abaye suffered from it. Said Raba, I know of Nahmani<sup>48</sup> that he practises hunger.<sup>49</sup> Raba suffered from it. But was it not Raba himself who said, More numerous are those slain by delayed calls of nature<sup>50</sup> than the victims<sup>51</sup> of starvation?<sup>52</sup> -Raba was different, because the scholars compelled him [to practise restraint] at the set times [for lectures].

Our Rabbis taught: There are four signs:-[i] Dropsy is a sign of sin; [ii] jaundice is a sign of causeless hatred; [iii] poverty is a sign of conceit;<sup>53</sup> croup<sup>54</sup> is a sign of slander.<sup>55</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: Croup comes to the world

---

(1) Prov. XXXI, 9.

(2) Joel I, 4.

(3) Isa. IX, 19.

(4) Lit., 'affliction of judgment'-through unnecessary delay in executing judgment.

(5) Intentionally, through bias or partiality.

(6) Giving erroneous verdicts through carelessness and insufficient deliberation; cf. Aboth, I, 2.

(7) Lev. XXVI, 25.

(8) Jer. XXXIII, 25. 'The covenant of day and night' is understood to refer to the Torah, which should be studied day and night; v. Ned. 32.

(9) Ibid. XXVI, 26.

(10) Ibid. 43.

(11) Rashi: the first is swearing what is obviously untrue; the second is an ordinary false oath which can deceive. Cf. Aboth, Sonc. ed., p. 47, n. 11.

(12) Any unworthy action which reflects discredit upon Judaism since Judaism is blamed for it'-is regarded as profanation of the Divine Name. Cf. Aboth, V, 9, and IV, 4.

(13) Ibid. 23.

(14) the consonants are the same. The verse then reads: and if ye will not be reformed unto me in the matter of (false) oaths.

(15) Lev. XXVI, 22.

(16) Ibid. XIX, 12.

(17) Ibid. XXII, 2.

(18) Ex. XXXI, 14.

(19) Lit., 'and profanation, profanation is learnt'. I.e., the statement made in respect to one profanation holds good for the others too.

(20) just as this is punished by the sending of wild beasts, etc. (Lev. XXVI, 22), so are the others.

(21) Num. XXXV, 33f.

(22) It may be remarked that the destruction of the Temple is regarded here as synonymous with exile from the country.

(23) Which includes adultery.

(24) V. Lev. XXV, 1ff.

(25) Ibid. XVIII, 27; 'abominations' refers to incest, of which the whole passage treats.

(26) Ibid. 25.

(27) Ibid. 28.

- (28) Ibid. XXVI, 30.
- (29) Ibid. 31.
- (30) Ibid. 33.
- (31) Lev. XXVI, 34.
- (32) Ibid. 35.
- (33) Lit., 'folly of the mouth'.
- (34) A euphemism for the youth of Israel. It was held inauspicious even merely to express a possible mishap, on the score of 'open not thy mouth to Satan'.
- (35) Isa. IX, 16.
- (36) This derives from the idea that there is a book of Life, in which man's destiny is recorded; cf. Ned., Sonc. ed., p. 62, n. 7.
- (37) Speaks lewdly.
- (38) Prov. XXII, 14. Lit., 'strange (things)'.-Gehenna, as an equivalent of hell, takes its name from the place where children were once sacrificed to Moloch, viz., ge ben hinnom, the valley of the son of Hinnom, to the south of Jerusalem. (Josh. XV, 8; II Kings XXIII, 10; Jer. II, 23; VII, 31-32; XIX, 6).
- (39) Does not protest.
- (40) Viz., who hears it without protesting.
- (41) Prov. XXII, 14.
- (42) Either: makes himself empty from all other purposes; or, polishes himself up, i.e., prepares himself.
- (43) Ibid. XX, 30.
- (44) Ibid.
- (45) Jewish magic is mentioned in Deut. XVIII, 10-11, in a passage forbidding its practice. But its potency was generally recognized. V. J.E. Arts, 'Magic', and 'Demonology'.
- (46) A Tanna, contemporary of R. Gamaliel I.
- (47) To see from what cause I am suffering-I will be accused of sin.
- (48) A nickname of Abaye, who was brought up in the house of Rabbah b. Nahmani.
- (49) This may indicate that Abaye was an ascetic. Judaism generally was opposed to asceticism (cf. Ned. 10a: he who deprives himself of what he may legitimately enjoy is called a sinner); nevertheless, in times of stress or for particular reasons Rabbis resorted to fasting (B.M. 85a), and private fasts were practised from early times: Judith VIII, 6; 1 Macc. III, 47.
- (50) Lit., 'pot'.
- (51) Lit., 'swollen'.
- (52) Now, Raba evidently disapproved of Abaye's fasting; also, he himself warned against trifling with nature's calls. How then did he come to dropsy — sin being ruled out?—Presumably its symptoms precluded the assumption that he was a victim of witchcraft.
- (53) In Kid. 49b it is explained that this refers to poverty of knowledge, which results when one is too conceited to learn from others.
- (54) **אִסְכְּרָה**, or perhaps 'Diphtheria'.
- (55) Each is the punishment for the other.

### Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 33b

on account of [neglect of] tithes.<sup>1</sup> R. Eleazar b. R. Jose said: On account of slander. Said Raba-others maintain, R. Joshua b. Levi-what verse [teaches this]? But the king shall rejoice in God: Everyone that sweareth by him shall glory; For the mouth of them that speak lies shall be stopped [yissaker].<sup>2</sup> The scholars propounded: Does R. Eleazar son of R. Jose say, [Only] on account of slander, or perhaps on account of slander too? — Come and hear: For when our Rabbis entered the 'vineyard' in Yabneh,<sup>3</sup> R. Judah, R. Eleazar son of R. Jose and R. Simeon were present, and this question was raised before them: why does this affliction commence in the bowels and end in the throat? Thereupon R. Judah son of R. Ila'i, the first speaker on all occasions<sup>4</sup> answered and said: Though the kidneys counsel, the heart gives understanding,<sup>5</sup> and the tongue gives form,<sup>6</sup> yet the mouth completes it. R. Eleazar son of R. Jose answered: Because they eat unclean food therewith. 'Unclean

food!' can you think so?<sup>7</sup> Rather [say] because they eat unfit food.<sup>8</sup> R. Simeon answered and said, As a punishment for the neglect of study.<sup>9</sup> Said they to him. Let women prove it!<sup>10</sup> -That is because they restrain their husbands [from study]. Let Gentiles prove it!<sup>11</sup> -That is because they restrain Israel. Let children prove it! — That is because they make their fathers to neglect [study].<sup>12</sup> Then let school-children prove it!-There it is as R. Gorion. For R. Gorion-others state, R. Joseph son of R. Shemaiah-said: When there are righteous men in the generation, the righteous are seized [by death] for the [sins of the] generation; when there are no righteous in a generation, school-children are seized for the generation.<sup>13</sup> R. Isaac b. Ze'iri others state, R. Simeon b. Neizra-said: Which verse [teaches this]? If thou know not, O thou, fairest among women, Go thy way forth by the footsteps of the flock, etc.,<sup>14</sup> and we interpret this as [referring to] the goats which are taken in pledge for the [debts of the] shepherds. Thus this proves that he said on account of slander too. This proves it.

Now, why is he [R. Judah son of R. Ila'i] called the first speaker on all occasions?-For R. Judah, R. Jose, and R. Simeon were sitting, and Judah, a son of proselytes, was sitting near them. R. Judah commenced [the discussion] by observing, 'How fine are the works of this people!<sup>15</sup> They have made streets, they have built bridges, they have erected baths.' R. Jose was silent. R. Simeon b. Yohai answered and said, 'All that they made they made for themselves; they built market-places, to set harlots in them; baths, to rejuvenate themselves; bridges, to levy tolls for them.' Now, Judah the son of proselytes went and related their talk,<sup>16</sup> which reached<sup>17</sup> the government. They decreed: Judah, who exalted [us], shall be exalted,<sup>18</sup> Jose, who was silent, shall be exiled to Sepphoris;<sup>19</sup> Simeon, who censured, let him be executed.

He and his son went and hid themselves in the Beth Hamidrash,[and] his wife brought him bread and a mug of water and they dined.<sup>20</sup> [But] when the decree became more severe he said to his son, Women are of unstable temperament: she<sup>21</sup> may be put to the torture and expose us.'<sup>22</sup> So they went and hid in a cave. A miracle occurred and a carob-tree and a water well were created for them. They would strip their garments and sit up to their necks in sand. The whole day they studied; when it was time for prayers they robed, covered themselves, prayed, and then put off their garments again, so that they should not wear out. Thus they dwelt twelve years in the cave.<sup>23</sup> Then Elijah came and stood at the entrance to the cave and exclaimed, Who will inform the son of Yohai that the emperor is dead and his decree annulled?<sup>24</sup> So they emerged. Seeing a man ploughing and sowing, they exclaimed, 'They forsake life eternal and engage in life temporal!' Whatever they cast their eyes upon was immediately burnt up. Thereupon a Heavenly Echo came forth and cried out, 'Have ye emerged to destroy My world: Return to your cave!'<sup>25</sup> So they returned and dwelt there twelve months, saying, 'The punishment<sup>26</sup> of the wicked in Gehenna is [limited to] twelve months.'<sup>27</sup> A Heavenly Echo then came forth and said, 'Go forth from your cave!' Thus, they issued: wherever R. Eleazar wounded,<sup>28</sup> R. Simeon healed. Said he to him, 'My son! You and I are sufficient for the world.'<sup>29</sup> On the eve of the Sabbath before sunset they saw an old man holding two bundles of myrtle and running at twilight. What are these for?' they asked him. 'They are in honour of the Sabbath,' he replied.<sup>30</sup> 'But one should suffice you?'-One is for 'Remember-' and one for 'Observe.'<sup>31</sup> Said he to his son, 'See how precious are the commandments to Israel.' Thereat their minds were tranquilized. R. Phinchas b. Ya'ir his son-in-law heard [thereof] and went out to meet him. He took him into the baths and massaged<sup>32</sup> his flesh. Seeing the clefts in his body<sup>33</sup> he wept and the tears streamed from his eyes. 'Woe to me that I see you in such a state!' he cried out. 'Happy are you that you see me thus,' he retorted, 'for if you did not see me in such a state you would not find me thus [learned].'<sup>34</sup> For originally, when R. Simeon b. Yohai raised a difficulty, R. Phinehas b. Ya'ir would give him thirteen answers, whereas subsequently when R. Phinehas b. Ya'ir raised a difficulty, R. Simeon b. Yohai would give him twenty-four answers.

Since a miracle has occurred, said he, let me go and amend something, for it is written, and Jacob came whole<sup>35</sup> [to the city of Shechem],<sup>36</sup> which Rab interpreted. Bodily whole [sound], financially whole, and whole in his learning. And he was gracious to the city.,<sup>37</sup> Rab said: He instituted coinage

for them.<sup>38</sup> Samuel said: He instituted markets for them; R. Johanan said: He instituted baths for them. Is there ought that requires amending? he<sup>39</sup> asked. There is a place of doubtful uncleanness,<sup>40</sup> he was informed,

- 
- (1) Rashi: one who eats untithed food (tebel) is liable to death by a divine visitation, which takes the form of croup. Having sinned through his throat (eating), he is punished through his throat.
  - (2) Ps. LXIII, 12. Yissaker is connected here with askera, croup.
  - (3) The famous town north west of Jerusalem, the seat of the Sanhedrin and R. Johanan b. Zakkai's academy after the destruction of the Temple. Sittings were held in a 'vineyard', i.e., members sat in rows similar to vines in a vineyard.
  - (4) The reason is given below, p. 56.
  - (5) 'Counsel' and 'understanding' were ascribed to these two organs respectively. Rashi in Ber. 61a s.v. **והלל** quotes: Ps. XVI, 7: Yea, my kidney (E.V. reins) admonish me in the night seasons, and Isa. VI, 10: and he understands with his heart.
  - (6) To the words. Lit., 'cuts'.
  - (7) That does not merit so heavy a punishment, particularly as only terumah and sacred food are forbidden when defiled.
  - (8) I.e., untithed.
  - (9) Which is likewise performed with the mouth.
  - (10) Who are not bidden to study (Kid. 29b), and yet suffer from croup. (cf. Sot. III, 4).
  - (11) Who are not bidden to study the Torah, and are yet subject to it.
  - (12) By childish demands on their time;-a harsh doctrine, but it is abandoned.
  - (13) This is not to be confused with the doctrine of vicarious atonement, which is rejected by Judaism.
  - (14) Cant. I, 8. The Midrash and the Targum interpret the whole of this poem as a dialogue between God and Israel, This verse is explained: If you do not understand how to keep God's commandments, go and learn them for the sake of the flocks, sc. your children, who otherwise may die on your account.
  - (15) The Romans.
  - (16) Rashi: to his parents, without evil intent.
  - (17) Lit., 'and they were heard by'.
  - (18) With the privilege of being the first to speak on all occasions.
  - (19) In Upper Galilee.
  - (20) Lit., 'they wrapped (bread)'; a term derived from the custom of eating bread with a relish wrapped in it.
  - (21) His wife.
  - (22) The context shows that he was not censuring women for constitutional instability, but feared their weakness.
  - (23) Notwithstanding its miraculous elements this story is substantially true. R. Simeon b. Yohai was persecuted very much by the Roman authorities; this explains his anti-Gentile (i.e., Roman) utterances, which are not illustrative of the Talmud as a whole.
  - (24) Elijah the Prophet was believed to appear frequently to men; cf, supra 13b.
  - (25) This story is a protest against super piety and an assertion that practical work is necessary for the world. Their return to the cave is thus depicted as a punishment, not a meritorious deed.
  - (26) Lit., 'judgment'.
  - (27) On 'Gehenna' v. p. 153, n. 8. Judaism rejects on the whole the idea of eternal punishment, for punishment is regenerative, not vindictive, and therefore must terminate; v. M. Joseph, Judaism as Creed and Life, p. 145.
  - (28) With a glance of his eyes.
  - (29) Not to be taken literally.
  - (30) Their fragrance is to beautify the Sabbath and lend cheer to it.-Contrary to the opinion of many, the Sabbath, in spite of its prohibitions, is and has been 'a day of delight' and spiritual nourishment to millions of observant Jews, not a day of gloom; v. Shechter, Studies in Judaism, p. 296.
  - (31) Ex. XX, 8. Remember the Sabbath day; Deut. V, 12: Observe the Sabbath day.
  - (32) Lit., 'dressed'.
  - (33) Caused by the sand,
  - (34) He felt that all his sufferings were compensated for by the knowledge he had gained. R. Simeon b. Yohai was one of the few Rabbis who devoted himself entirely to learning, 'his study being his profession' (supra 11a) not interrupting it even for prayer.

(35) E. V. 'in peace'.

(36) Gen. XXXIII, 18.

(37) Ibid.; Wa-yihan is thus derived from hanan, to be gracious. E.V.: and he encamped before the city.

(38) In place of barter.

(39) R. Simeon b. Yohai.

(40) A grave or human bones having been lost there.

## **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 34a**

and priests have the trouble of going round it. Said he: Does any man know that there was a presumption of cleanness here?<sup>1</sup> A certain old man replied, Here [R. Johanan] b. Zakkai cut down lupines of terumah. So he did likewise. Wherever it (the ground) was hard he declared it clean, while wherever it was loose he, marked it out. Said a certain old man. The son of Yohai has purified a cemetery! Said he, Had you not been with us, even if you have been with us but did not vote,<sup>2</sup> you might have said well. But now that you were with us and voted with us,<sup>3</sup> It will be said, [Even] whores paint one another; how much more so scholars!<sup>4</sup> He cast his eye upon him, and he died. Then he went out into the street and saw Judah, the son of proselytes: 'That man is still in the world!' he exclaimed. He cast his eyes upon him and he became<sup>5</sup> a heap of bones.

MISHNAH. ON THE EVE OF THE SABBATH JUST BEFORE NIGHT<sup>6</sup> A MAN MUST SAY THREE THINGS IN HIS HOUSE: HAVE YE RENDERED TITHES?<sup>7</sup> HAVE YE PREPARED THE 'ERUB?<sup>8</sup> KINDLE THE [SABBATH] LAMP. WHEN IT IS DOUBTFUL, WHETHER IT IS NIGHT<sup>9</sup> OR NOT,<sup>10</sup> THAT WHICH IS CERTAINLY [UNTITHED] MAY NOT BE TITHED, UTENSILS MAY NOT BE IMMERSSED,<sup>11</sup> AND THE LIGHTS MAY NOT BE KINDLED. BUT DEM'AI<sup>12</sup> MAY BE TITHED,<sup>13</sup> AN 'ERUB MAY BE PREPARED, AND HOT FOOD MAY BE STORED AWAY.<sup>14</sup>

GEMARA. Whence do we know it?-Said R. Joshua b. Levi, Scripture saith, And thou, shalt know that thy tent is in peace; and thou shalt visit thy habitation, and shalt not err.<sup>15</sup>

Rabbah son of R. Huna said: Although the Rabbis said, a man MUST SAY THREE THINGS, etc., yet they must be said with sweet reasonableness, so that they may be accepted from him. R. Ashi observed: I had not heard this [statement] of Rabbah son of b. R. Huna, but understood<sup>16</sup> it by logic.

This is self contradictory. You say, ON THE EVE OF THE SABBATH JUST BEFORE NIGHT A MAN MUST SAY THREE THINGS IN HIS HOUSE: only just before night, but not when it is doubtful whether it is night or not;<sup>17</sup> then you teach, WHEN IT IS DOUBTFUL, WHETHER IT IS NIGHT OR NOT ... AN 'ERUB MAY BE PREPARED? (Mnemonic: Self, Pruning, Bird, Cord, Silk.)<sup>18</sup> — Said R. Abba in the name of R. Hiyya b. Ashi in Rab's name: There is no difficulty: the one refers to 'erub of boundaries; the other to the 'erub of courtyards.<sup>19</sup> Now Raba said: If two men said to one person, 'Go forth and place an 'erub for us', and he placed an 'erub for one while it is yet day, and for the other he made the 'erub at twilight, and the 'erub of him for whom he placed it by day was eaten at twilight, and the 'erub of him for whom he placed it at twilight was eaten after nightfall, both acquire [their] 'erub.<sup>20</sup> What will you: if twilight is day, the second should acquire, but not the first; while if twilight is night, the first should acquire, but not the second?-Twilight is doubtful,<sup>21</sup> and a doubt in respect to a Rabbinical law is judged leniently.<sup>22</sup>

Raba said: Why was it said, One must not store [food] after nightfall [even] in a substance that does not add heat?<sup>23</sup> For fear lest he make it boil.<sup>24</sup> Said Abaye to him: if so, let us forbid it at twilight too?-The average pot is at the boil, he replied.<sup>25</sup>

Raba also said:

- 
- (1) Before the doubt arose, was there a time when this place was assumed to be clean, so that it enjoyed the status of cleanness? (11) I.e., he planted them while *terumah* and cut them down after they had grown. (12) As unclean. In the *Pesikta* and *1. Shab. VII* it is stated that a miracle happened and the dead floated upwards (v. Rashi). (13) Derisively.
- (2) Lit., 'you were not counted'. — R. Simeon b. Yohai had acted in accordance with the decision of the majority of the Rabbis.
- (3) In favour of this.
- (4) Surely they should pay regard to each other's honour.
- (5) Lit., 'he made him'.
- (6) Lit., with darkness (setting in),
- (7) Of the food we are to eat on the Sabbath,
- (8) V. *Glos.* The 'erub referred to is for courtyards; v. p. 18, n. 7.
- (9) Lit., 'dark'.
- (10) I.e., at twilight.
- (11) Made fit for use by means of *tebillah* (immersion) in a ritual bath (*mikveh*). Both these acts render objects fit for use, which is forbidden at twilight.
- (12) V. *Glos.*
- (13) Because the probability is that tithes have already been rendered, and thus this tithing does not really make it fit.
- (14) To retain its heat.
- (15) *Job V. 24, She'eltoth 63* explains: if an 'erub has not been prepared, so that the carrying of utensils is forbidden, or if the lights have not been kindled, or the tithes rendered, so that the food may not be eaten, the resultant inconvenience and lack of cheer are inimical to the peace of the household.
- (16) Lit., 'adduced'. V. *Marginal Gloss.*
- (17) Which implies that there is no purpose in his saying it then, since an 'erub may not be prepared then.
- (18) These indicate statements made in the *Tractate* by R. Abba in the name of R. Hiyya on Rab's authority. Doubt arose as to the authorship of some of these, and so this mnemonic was given. 'Self' indicates the present passage, 'This is self contradictory'. For the others v. *infra 73b* (pruning); *107a* (bird), *113a* (cord) and *124b* (silk). — *Maharsha*,
- (19) V. p. 18, n. 7. The limitation of boundaries was held to be either Biblical or partaking of the nature of a Scriptural law; therefore the 'erub, whereby that limitation is extended, really makes the territory beyond these boundaries accessible on the Sabbath, and consequently its preparation is forbidden at twilight, when the Sabbath may have commenced, although where it was prepared at twilight, it is effective. But the prohibition of carrying between houses and courtyards was merely a measure of stringency; hence the 'erub permits only what might have been permitted in any case, and so it may be prepared at twilight.
- (20) 'Acquire their 'erub' means that the 'erub confers upon on them the rights for which it is set. Now, an 'erub must be prepared by day and be still in existence when the Sabbath commences, otherwise it is invalid. Now, in respect of the first, whose 'erub was placed by day and eaten at twilight, twilight is regarded as night, i.e., the commencement of the Sabbath, when the 'erub was still in existence. Whilst in respect of the second twilight is regarded as day, so that it was placed the day. — *Rashi*: the reference is to the 'erub of boundaries which, though it may not be set at the outset at twilight, is nevertheless effective. *Tosaf.*: the 'erub of courtyards is meant.
- (21) Whether it is day or night.
- (22) The law of 'erub is Rabbinical, as stated above.
- (23) The *Mishnah* states that storing away food is permitted at twilight, whence it follows that it is forbidden after nightfall. And the reference must be to a substance which does not add heat, for if it does, food may not be stored in it even by day (*infra 47b*).
- (24) When he comes to put it away, he may find it cold and heat up it first, which is the equivalent of cooking on the Sabbath.
- (25) At twilight, because it has only just been removed from the fire.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 34b

Why was it said that one must not put away [food] in a substance which adds heat, even by day? For

fear lest he put it away in hot ashes containing a burning coal. Said Abaye to him, Then let him put it away!<sup>1</sup> -[That is forbidden] for fear lest he rake the coals.<sup>2</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: As to twilight [period] it is doubtful whether it is partly day and partly night, or the whole of it [belongs to the] day, or the whole of it night: [therefore] it is cast upon the stringencies of both days.<sup>3</sup> And what is twilight? From sunset as long as the face of the east has a reddish glow: when the lower [horizon] is pale<sup>4</sup> but not the upper, it is twilight; [but] when the upper [horizon] is pale and the same as the lower, it is night: this is the opinion of R. Judah. R. Nehemiah said: For as long as it takes a man to walk half a mil<sup>5</sup> from sunset. R. Jose said: Twilight is as the twilight of an eye, one entering and the other departing,<sup>6</sup> and it is impossible to determine it. The Master said: 'One applies to it the stringencies of both days.' In respect of what [point of] law?-Said R. Huna son of R. Joshua, In respect of uncleanness. Even as we learnt: if he saw [discharges] on two days at twilight, he is doubtful in respect of uncleanness and sacrifice: if he sees [a discharge] one day at twilight, he is doubtful in respect of uncleanness.<sup>7</sup>

This is self-contradictory. You say, 'What is twilight? From sunset as long as the face of the east has a reddish glow.' Hence, if the lower horizon is pale but not the upper, it is night.<sup>8</sup> Then it is taught, 'When the lower [horizon] is pale but not the upper, it is twilight'?-Rabbah answered in the name of Rab Judah in Samuel's name: Combine [them] and learn: What is twilight? From sunset as long as the face of the east has a reddish glow, And if the lower [horizon] is pale but not the upper, that too is twilight. But when the upper horizon is pale and the same as the lower, it is night. While R. Joseph answered in the name of Rab Judah in Samuel's name, This is what he teaches: From sunset as long as the face of the east has a reddish glow, it is day; if the lower [horizon] is pale but not the upper, it is twilight; when the upper is pale and the same as the lower, it is night.

Now, they follow their views. For it was stated: How long is the period of twilight?-Rabbah said in the name of Rab Judah in Samuel's name. Three parts of a mil.<sup>9</sup> What is meant by, 'three parts of a mil'? Shall we say, three half mils? Then let him say, 'A mil and a half'? While if it is three thirds of a mil, let him say, 'One mil'? Hence it must mean three quarters of a mil. While R. Joseph said in the name of Rab Judah in Rab's name: Two parts of a mil. What is 'two parts of a mil'? Shall we say, two halves: let him say, 'One mil'? while if it means two quarters of a mil; let him say, 'half a mil'. Hence

---

(1) Even in such, since it is yet day.

(2) In the evening.

(3) This is explained infra.

(4) I.e., dark, no longer red.

(5) = Two thousand cubits = 112,037'316 cm, i.e., about three fourths of an English mile; v. J.E. XII, 487,

(6) Night enters and day departs in the twinkling of an eye.

(7) If a zab (q.v. Glos.) has two discharges on one day or on two consecutive days, or one discharge spread over parts of two days, e.g., the end of one and the beginning of the next, which likewise counts as two discharges, he becomes unclean for seven days, as a zab. If he has three discharges (taking into account that one discharge spread over two days ranks as two), he incurs a sacrifice in addition. Now, if he has discharges for a short period at twilight on Sunday and Monday there are the following possibilities: — (i) The twilight of both were either day or night, so that he had two discharges on two consecutive days, viz., Sunday and Monday or Monday and Tuesday, the night belonging to the following day, which render him unclean, but not liable to a sacrifice; (ii) the first twilight period was day, while the second was night, so that his two discharges were on Sunday and Tuesday, and he is not unclean for seven days, because the discharges were not on consecutive days; and (iii) the first twilight period was day (Sunday) and the second embraced the end of one day (Monday) and the beginning of the night (Tuesday), so that he had three discharges on three consecutive days, and therefore incurs a sacrifice.-On account of these doubts he is unclean for seven days and must bring a sacrifice, which, however, may not be eaten. Similarly, if he has one discharge at twilight, it is doubtful whether it counts as one or two.

(8) For 'the face of the east' includes the lower horizon.

(9) As long as it takes to walk this.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 35a

it must mean two thirds of a mil. What is the difference between them?-One half of a sixth.<sup>1</sup>

Now, it is the reverse in respect of a bee-hive.<sup>2</sup> For Rabbah said: A bee-hive of two kors capacity<sup>3</sup> may be moved; of three kors capacity, may not be moved. But R. Joseph said: Three kors capacity also is permitted; four kors is forbidden.<sup>4</sup>

Abaye said: I asked it of Mar<sup>5</sup> at the time of action,<sup>6</sup> and he did not permit one [to move] even a two-kors size. With whom [does that agree]?-With the following Tanna. For we learnt: A receptacle of stubble, or of staves, and the cistern of an Alexandrian boat, though they have rims and contain forty se'ahs in liquid measure which is two kors in dry measure,<sup>7</sup> are clean.<sup>8</sup> Abaye observed: This proves that the heap [in dry measures] is a third. Abaye saw Raba gazing at the West.<sup>9</sup> Said he to him, But it was taught, 'As long as the face of the east has a reddish glow?' Do you think that the face of the east is meant literally? he replied. [It means] the face which casts a red glow upon the east,<sup>10</sup> and your token is a window.<sup>11</sup>

'R. Nehemiah said: For as long as it takes a man to walk half a mil from sunset.' R. Hanina said: One who wishes to know R. Nehemiah's period should leave the sun on the top of the Carmel,<sup>12</sup> descend, dip in the sea, and reascend, and this is R. Nehemiah's period. R. Hiyya said: One who wishes to see Miriam's well should ascend to the top of the Carmel and gaze, when he will observe a kind of sieve in the sea, and that is Miriam's well. Rab said: A moveable well is clean,<sup>13</sup> and that is Miriam's well.<sup>14</sup>

Rab Judah said in Samuel's name: At twilight, as defined by R. Judah, unclean priests may perform tebillah.<sup>15</sup> According to whom? Shall we say, according to R. Judah [himself]? but it is doubtful!<sup>16</sup> But if it means twilight, as defined by R. Judah, according to R. Jose; [why state] priests may perform tebillah then-it is obvious!<sup>17</sup> -I might think that twilight, as defined by R. Jose, is a continuation of R. Judah's; [therefore] we are told that R. Judah's twilight ends and then R. Jose's commences.

Rabbah b. Bar Hanah said in R. Johanan's name: The halachah is as R. Judah in respect to the Sabbath, and the halachah is as R. Jose in respect to terumah. Now, as for the halachah being as R. Judah in respect to the Sabbath, it is well: this is in the direction of stringency.<sup>18</sup> But in respect of terumah, what is it? Shall we say, for tebillah?<sup>19</sup> it is doubtful!<sup>20</sup>

---

(1) Rabbah's period is one twelfth of a mil longer than R. Joseph's; above too Rabbah gives a longer period than R. Joseph. — In the East night comes more quickly than in the West.

(2) Rashi. Jast.: a loose wicker-work used for making bee-hives, etc.

(3) One kor = thirty se'ahs = 395,533'2 cu.cent; J.E. XII, 489 (Table).

(4) A utensil may be moved on the Sabbath. Rabbah maintains that if it is more than two kors in capacity it ceases to be a utensil, while R. Joseph holds that it is a utensil up to three kors. Thus R. Joseph's standard here is larger than Rabbah's, while in respect to twilight it is smaller.

(5) The Master-i.e., Rabbah.

(6) When I actually wished to move it.

(7) Two kors — sixty se'ahs. A utensil held more in dry measure, because it could be heaped up.

(8) These are too large to rank as utensils, and only utensils are liable to uncleanness; V. 'Er., Sonc. ed., 14b notes.

(9) To see whether the reddish glow was still discernible.

(10) By reflection hence the west.

- (11) Through which light enters and irradiates the opposite wall.
- (12) I.e., when the sun is going down and its dying rays illumine the top of the mountain.
- (13) Its waters cannot become unclean and it is fit for ritual purification (tebillah).
- (14) According to the Rabbis the well miraculously followed Israel for Miriam's sake; Ta'an. 9a.
- (15) V. Glos. Its purpose was to cleanse them and permit them to eat sacred food. Sunset had to follow the tebillah before they might do so, but Rab Judah holds that twilight, as defined by R. Judah, is day, and therefore sunset does follow it.
- (16) Whether it is day or night. It may be night already, in which case the tebillah is not followed by sunset.
- (17) R. Judah's twilight period is certainly earlier than that of R. Jose which is but the twinkling of an eye.
- (18) All those things which are forbidden Friday at twilight are forbidden at the earlier time stated by R. Judah.
- (19) That priests may perform tebillah during twilight as defined by R. Judah, because the halachah is as R. Jose that it is still day then.
- (20) Since he rules that the halachah is as R. Judah in respect to the Sabbath, he must regard R. Judah's view as possibly correct.

### Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 35b

— Rather it is in respect of the eating of terumah, viz., the priests may not eat terumah until twilight, as defined by R. Jose, ends.<sup>1</sup>

Rab Judah said in Samuel's name: When [only] one star [is visible], it is day; when two [appear], it is twilight; three, it is night. It was taught likewise: When one star [is visible], it is day; when two [appear], it is twilight; three, it is night. R. Jose b. Abin<sup>2</sup> said: Not the large stars, which are visible by day, nor the small ones, which are visible only at night, but the medium sized.

R. Jose son of R. Zebida said: If one performs work at two twilights,<sup>3</sup> he incurs a sin-offering, whatever view you take.<sup>4</sup>

Raba said to his attendant: You, who are not clear in the Rabbinical standards, light the lamp when the sun is at the top of the palm trees.<sup>5</sup> How is it on a cloudy day? — In town, observe the fowls; in the field, observe the ravens or arone.<sup>6</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: Six blasts were blown on the eve of the Sabbath. The first, for people to cease work in the fields; the second, for the city and shops to cease [work]; the third, for the lights to be kindled: that is R. Nathan's view. R. Judah the Nasi said: The third is for the tefillin to be removed.<sup>7</sup> Then there was an interval for as long as it takes to bake a small fish, or to put a loaf in the oven,<sup>8</sup> and then a teki'ah, teru'ah, and a teki'ah were blown,<sup>9</sup> and one commenced the Sabbath. Said R. Simeon b. Gamaliel, What shall we do to the Babylonians who blow a teki'ah and a teru'ah, and commence the Sabbath in the midst of the teru'ah?<sup>10</sup> (They blow a teki'ah and a teru'ah [only]: but then there are five?-Rather they blow a teki'ah, repeat the teki'ah, and then blow a teru'ah and commence the Sabbath in the midst of the teru'ah.) — They retain their fathers' practice.<sup>11</sup>

Rab Judah recited to R. Isaac, his son: The second is for the kindling of the lights. As which [Tanna]? Neither as R. Nathan nor as R. Judah the Nasi!-Rather [read] 'the third is for the kindling of the lights'. As which [Tanna]? — As R. Nathan.

The School of R. Ishmael taught: Six blasts were blown on the eve of the Sabbath. When the first was begun, those who stood in the fields ceased to hoe, plough, or do any work in the fields, and those who were near [to town] were not permitted to enter [it] until the more distant ones arrived, so that they should all enter simultaneously.<sup>12</sup> But the shops were still open and the shutters were lying.<sup>13</sup> When the second blast began, the shutters were removed and the shops closed. Yet hot [water] and pots still stood on the range. When the third blast was begun, what was to be removed<sup>14</sup>

was removed, and what was to be stored away<sup>15</sup> was stored away, and the lamp was lit.<sup>16</sup> Then there was an interval for as long as it takes to bake a small fish or to place a loaf in the oven; then a teki'ah, teru'ah and a teki'ah were sounded, and one commenced the Sabbath. R. Jose b. R. Hanina said: I have heard that if one comes to light after the six blasts he may do so, since the Sages gave the hazzan of the community<sup>17</sup> time to carry his shofar<sup>18</sup> home.<sup>19</sup> Said they to him, If so, your rule depends on [variable] standards.<sup>20</sup> Rather the hazzan of the community had a hidden place on the top of his roof, where he placed his shofar, because neither a shofar nor a trumpet may be handled [on the Sabbath].<sup>21</sup> But it was taught: A shofar may be handled, but not a trumpet?<sup>22</sup> -Said R. Joseph: There is no difficulty: The one refers to an individual[‘s]; the other to a community[‘s]. Said Abaye to him, And in the case of an individual's, what is it fit for?-It is possible to give a child a drink therewith?

- 
- (1) Only then is it evening for certain, but not at the end of R. Judah's period.
- (2) So the text as amended by Bah.
- (3) Of Friday and Saturday. It means either during the whole of both twilights or at exactly the same point in each (Tosaf. 34b s.v. **פפ**)
- (4) Whether twilight is day or night, he has worked on the Sabbath.
- (5) I.e., by day.
- (6) Fowls and ravens retire to roost at night: hence the lamp should be lit before. Arone is a plant whose leaves turn eastward by day and westward by night (Rashi). MS.M. reads: in marsh-land observe arone (Jast.: name of certain plants growing in marshes which close their leaves at nightfall).
- (7) In Talmudic times they were worn all day; but they are not worn on the Sabbath.
- (8) The word literally means to cause it to cleave, because the loaf was pressed to the side of the oven.
- (9) Teki'ah is a long blast; teru'ah, a series of very short blasts, all counted as one. These three were blown in rapid succession.
- (10) I.e., hard on the heels of(or, immediately they hear) the teru'ah.
- (11) This was a very ancient custom; v. Neh. XIII, 19 and Halevi, Dorothe, I, 3, pp. 336f.
- (12) To protect the more distant ones from the suspicion of continuing their work after the first blast.
- (13) The shutters were placed on trestles during the day to serve as stalls.
- (14) For the evening meal.
- (15) For the next day.
- (16) Lit., 'and the lighter lit'.
- (17) V. p. 41, n. 7.
- (18) The ram's horn, on which these blasts were produced.
- (19) The shofar was blown on the top of a high roof, and R. Jose b. Hanina assumed that the hazzan then took it home.
- (20) The commencement of the Sabbath will depend on the distance of that roof from his house.
- (21) A shofar was curved, whereas a trumpet was straight.
- (22) The shofar, being curved, could be used for taking up a drink of water; this being permitted, its handling too (even without that use) is permitted.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 36a

Then in the case of a community[‘s] too, it is fit for giving a drink to a poor child?<sup>1</sup> Moreover, as to what was taught: 'Just as a shofar may be moved, so may a trumpet be moved': with whom does that agree?-Rather [reply thus]; there is no difficulty: one agrees with R. Judah, one with R. Simeon, and one with R. Nehemiah;<sup>2</sup> and what indeed is meant by 'shofar', a trumpet,<sup>3</sup> in accordance with R. Hisda. For R. Hisda said: The following three things reversed their designations after the destruction of the Temple: [i] trumpet [changed to] shofar, and shofar to trumpet. What is the practical bearing thereof? in respect of the shofar [blown] on New Year.<sup>4</sup> [ii] 'Arabah [willow] [changed to] zafzafah and zafzafah to 'Arabah. What is the practical bearing thereof?-In respect of the lulab<sup>5</sup> [iii] Pathora<sup>6</sup> [changed to] pathorta<sup>7</sup> and pathorta to Pathora. What is the practical bearing thereof?-In respect of buying and selling.<sup>8</sup> Abaye observed: We too can state: Hoblila [changed to] be kasse and be kasse

to hoblila.<sup>9</sup> What is the practical bearing thereof? In respect of a needle which is found in the thickness of the beth hakosoth,<sup>10</sup> which if [found] on one side, it [the animal] is fit [for food]; [if through both sides,<sup>11</sup> it [the animal] is terefah.<sup>12</sup> R. Ashi said, We too will state: Babylon [changed to] Borsif and Borsif to Babylon.<sup>13</sup>

- 
- (1) The community has to look after him, and therefore the community's shofar may be used for this purpose.
  - (2) (i) R. Judah holds that a shofar may be moved, since it can be put to a permitted use, but not a trumpet. This can be used only in a way that is forbidden on the Sabbath, sc. drawing a blast, and is therefore mukzeh (q.v. Glos.), the handling of which R. Judah prohibits on the Sabbath, (ii) R. Simeon holds that mukzeh may be handled, hence both may be moved. (iii) R. Nehemiah holds that a utensil may be handled only for its normal use: hence both are forbidden:
  - (3) In the first Baraitha, once it is stated that a shofar may not be moved, though it can be put to a permitted use, a trumpet need not be mentioned. Hence it is stated that the language changed in the course of time, 'shofar' and 'trumpet' reversing their meaning. Thus the first Baraitha first states that a trumpet may not be handled, and then adds that the same applies even to a shofar.
  - (4) V. Lev. XXIII, 24; Num. XXIX, 1. This must be blown on what is popularly called a trumpet, which is really a shofar (ram's horn).
  - (5) The palm-branch; V. Lev. XXIII, 40. For the willow (Heb. 'arabah), what is now called zafzafah must be taken.
  - (6) A small money-changer's table, counter.
  - (7) A large table.
  - (8) If one orders a pathora it now means a large table.
  - (9) Hoblila is the second stomach in ruminants; be kasse the first. But nowadays the terms have reversed their meanings.
  - (10) I.e., the be kasse.
  - (11) I.e., penetrating both sides of the wall.
  - (12) Unfit for food. Abaye states that this law applies only to what is now called hoblila.
  - (13) The town Babylon is on the Euphrates, and Borsif is on an arm of the Euphrates. V. Obermeyer, P. 314 and map.

## **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 36b**

What is the practical difference? — In respect of women's bills of divorce.<sup>1</sup>

### CHAPTER III

MISHNAH. IF A [DOUBLE]<sup>2</sup> STOVE IS HEATED WITH STUBBLE OR RAKINGS, A POT MAY BE PLACED THEREON;<sup>3</sup> WITH PEAT OR WOOD, ONE MAY NOT PLACE [A POT THERE] UNTIL, HE SWEEPS IT<sup>4</sup> OR COVERS IT WITH ASHES.<sup>5</sup> BETH SHAMMAI MAINTAIN: HOT WATER, BUT NOT A DISH;<sup>6</sup> BUT BETH HILLEL RULE; BOTH HOT WATER AND A DISH. BETH SHAMMAI MAINTAIN: ONE MAY REMOVE [IT], BUT NOT PUT [IT] BACK; BUT BETH HILLEL RULE: ONE MAY PUT [IT] BACK TOO.

GEMARA. The scholars propounded: Does this, ONE MAY NOT PLACE, mean one must not put [it] back,<sup>7</sup> yet it is permitted to keep [it there],<sup>8</sup> even if it [the stove] is neither swept nor covered with ashes: and who is the authority thereof? Hananiah. For it was taught, Hananiah said: 'Whatever is as the food of the son of Derusai<sup>9</sup> may be kept on the stove, even if it is neither swept nor covered with ashes'<sup>10</sup> Or perhaps we learnt about keeping [it there], and that is [permitted] only if it is swept or covered with ashes, but not otherwise: how much more so with respect to putting it back!-Come and hear! For two clauses are taught in our Mishnah: BETH SHAMMAI MAINTAIN: HOT WATER, BUT NOT A DISH; BUT BETH HILLEL RULE: BOTH HOT WATER AND A DISH. BETH SHAMMAI MAINTAIN: ONE MAY REMOVE [IT], BUT NOT PUT [IT] BACK; BUT BETH HILLEL, RULE: ONE MAY PUT [IT] BACK TOO. Now, if you say that we learnt about keeping [it there], it is well, for this is what he [the Tanna] teaches: IF A STOVE IS HEATED WITH STUBBLE OR RAKINGS, a pot may be kept thereon; WITH PEAT OR WOOD, one may not keep [a pot] there UNTIL, HE SWEEPS IT OR COVERS IT WITH ASHES. And what may be

kept there? BETH SHAMMAI MAINTAIN: HOT WATER, BUT NOT A DISH; BUT BETH HILLEL. RULE: BOTH HOT WATER AND A DISH. And just as they differ in respect to keeping it there, so do they differ in respect to putting it back, where BETH SHAMMAI MAINTAIN: ONE MAY REMOVE [IT], BUT NOT PUT [IT] BACK; BUT BETH HILLEL- RULE: ONE MAY PUT [IT] BACK TOO. But if you say that we learnt about putting it back, then this is what he teaches: IF A STOVE IS HEATED WITH STUBBLE OR RAKINGS, A POT MAY BE PUT BACK THEREON; WITH PEAT OR WOOD, one must not put it back UNTIL, HE SWEEPS IT OR COVERS IT WITH ASHES. And what may be put back? BETH SHAMMAI MAINTAIN: HOT WATER, BUT NOT A DISH; BUT BETH HILLEL, RULE: BOTH HOT WATER AND A DISH. BETH SHAMMAI MAINTAIN: ONE MAY REMOVE [IT], BUT NOT PUT [IT] BACK;<sup>11</sup> BUT BETH HILLEL, RULE: ONE MAY PUT [IT] BACK TOO. Then what is the purpose of this addition?<sup>12</sup> —

- 
- (1) The name of the towns in which the husband and wife are residing must be written in divorces. With respect to Babylon and Borsipha, the names as after the change must be written.
- (2) A stove which held two pots.
- (3) On the eve of the Sabbath, the reference being to a cooked dish.
- (4) Clear of burning pieces.
- (5) Otherwise it adds heat, which is forbidden; v. supra 34a.
- (6) Only the former may be placed there after it is swept; but not the latter, because he may wish it to boil more, forget himself, and rake the coals or logs.
- (7) After the commencement of the Sabbath.
- (8) From the eve of the Sabbath.
- (9) A third cooked.
- (10) V. supra 20a, q.v. notes.
- (11) Presumably referring to a dish, since Beth Shammai permit the replacing of hot water.
- (12) It has already been stated in the previous clause, 'BUT NOT A DISH'.

### **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 37a**

After all, I can tell you that we learnt about replacing it, but the text is defective, and this is what he [the Tanna] teaches: IF A STOVE IS HEATED WITH STUBBLE OR RAKINGS, A POT may be placed thereon; WITH PEAT OR WOOD, one must not replace it UNTIL HE SWEEPS IT OR COVERS IT WITH ASHES; but as for keeping it there, that is permitted even if it is neither swept nor covered with ashes. Yet what may be kept there? BETH SHAMMAI MAINTAIN; HOT WATER, BUT NOT A DISH; WHILE BETH HILLEL RULE: BOTH HOT WATER AND A DISH. And as to this replacing, of which I tell you,<sup>1</sup> it is not an agreed ruling, but [the subject of] a controversy between Beth Shammai and Beth Hillel. For BETH SHAMMAI MAINTAIN: WE MAY REMOVE [IT], BUT NOT REPLACE [IT]; BUT BETH HILLEL RULE: WE MAY REPLACE [IT] TOO. Come and hear: For R. Helbo said in the name of R. Hama b. Goria in Rab's name: We learnt this only of the top [of the stove]; but within it is forbidden. Now, if you say that we learnt about replacing it, it is well: hence there is a difference between the inside and the top.<sup>2</sup> But if you say that we learnt about keeping it there, what does it matter whether it is within or on top?—Do you think that R. Helbo refers to the first clause? He refers to the last: BUT BETH HILLEL RULE: WE MAY REPLACE [IT] TOO, Whereon R. Helbo said in the name of R. Hama b. Goria in Rab's name: We learnt this only of the top; but within it is forbidden.

Come and hear: If two stoves that are joined, one being swept or covered with ashes, whilst the other is not, we may keep [aught] upon the one that is swept or covered with ashes<sup>3</sup> but not upon the one that is not swept or covered with ashes. And what may be kept there? Beth Shammai maintain: Nothing at all; while Beth Hillel rule: Hot water, but not a dish. If one removes it, all agree that he must not replace it: that is R. Meir's view. R. Judah said: Beth Shammai maintain: Hot water, but not

a dish; while Beth Hillel rule: Both hot water and a dish. Beth Shammai maintain: We may remove, but not replace it; while Beth Hillel rule: We may replace it too. Now, if you say that we learnt about keeping [it] there, it is well; with whom does our Mishnah agree? R. Judah. But if you say that we learnt about replacing, who is the authority of our Mishnah? neither R. Judah nor R. Meir! [For] if R. Meir, there is a difficulty on Beth Shammai's view in one respect,<sup>4</sup> and on Hillel's in two?<sup>5</sup> If R. Judah, [the case of a stove that is] swept or covered with ashes is difficult!<sup>6</sup> -After all, I can tell you that we learnt about replacing it, but our Tanna agrees with R. Judah in one respect and disagrees with him in another. He agrees with R. Judah in one respect, viz., in respect to hot water, and a dish, and removing and replacing [them]. But he disagrees with him in another. For whereas our Tanna holds that keeping them [there is permitted] even if it is neither swept nor covered with ashes, R. Judah maintains that even keeping [them there] is [permitted] only if it is swept or covered with ashes, but not otherwise.

The scholars propounded: May one lean [a pot] against it?<sup>7</sup> on the inside and top thereof it is forbidden, but leaning against it may be permitted; or perhaps, there is no difference?-Come and hear: If two stoves are joined, one being swept and covered with ashes, whilst the other is neither swept nor covered with ashes: we may keep [aught] upon the one that is swept or covered with ashes, but not upon the one that is not swept or covered with ashes, though the heat reaches it from the other.<sup>8</sup> Perhaps there it is different, because since it is elevated, the air affects it.<sup>9</sup> Come and hear: For R. Safra said in R. Hiyya's name: If it [the stove] was covered with ashes, yet blazed up again, one may lean [a pot] against it, keep [a pot] upon it, remove [it] thence and replace [it]. This proves that even leaning is [permitted] only when it is covered with ashes, but not otherwise. Yet according to your reasoning, when he states, 'one may remove [it] thence,' [does this imply] only if covered with ashes, but not otherwise?<sup>10</sup> But [you must answer,] removing is mentioned on account of replacing; so here too, leaning is stated on account of keeping.<sup>11</sup> How compare! There, since removing and replacing refer to the same place, removing is stated on account of replacing; but here, the leaning is in one place whereas the keeping is in another! What is our decision thereon?-Come and hear: If a stove is heated with peat or wood, one may lean [a pot] against it, but must not keep [it there] unless it is swept or covered with ashes. If the coals have died down,<sup>12</sup> or thoroughly beaten flax is placed upon it, it is as though covered with ashes.<sup>13</sup>

R. Isaac b. Nahmani said in R. Oshaia's name: If he covered it with ashes yet it blazed up again, one may keep upon it hot water that has [previously] been heated as much as is required, or a dish which has been boiled all it needs.

---

(1) That it is permissible provided the stove is swept.

(2) It is intelligible that a pot may not be replaced within the oven, even after it is swept or covered with ashes, since the heat there is naturally greater than on top (Ri in Tosaf).

(3) Though heat reaches it from the second stove.

(4) In our Mishnah they permit hot water to be kept there even if it is not swept or covered with ashes, whilst here they permit nothing.

(5) In the Mishnah they permit hot water and a dish to be kept there even if it is unswept, etc., whilst here it is stated that if it is swept hot water only may be kept there, and nothing at all if it is unswept. Again, in the Mishnah they state that it may be replaced if it is swept, whereas here it is taught that all agree that it may not be replaced.

(6) Here it is stated that nothing at all may be kept there, while in the Mishnah either hot water alone or a dish too may be kept there according to Beth Shammai and Beth Hillel respectively.

(7) Sc. a stove that is unswept etc.

(8) Our problem is similar, and this shows that it is permitted.

(9) The pot stands on the stove and is surrounded by air, which cools it, and therefore the heat from the other stove is disregarded. But leaning against an unswept stove, without air interposing, may be forbidden.

(10) Surely not!

(11) Yet covering with ashes may not be required for leaning.

(12) Not being entirely extinguished, but burning dully and feebly.

(13) Thus for leaning it need not be swept, etc.

### **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 37b**

Then this proves that when it shrinks<sup>1</sup> and is improved thereby, it is permitted?<sup>2</sup> -[No.] There it is different, because he covered it with ashes. If so, why state it?-It is necessary [to state it, because] it blazed up again. You might argue, since it blazed up again, it reverts to its original state;<sup>3</sup> hence he informs us [that it is not so].<sup>4</sup>

Rabbah b. Bar Hanah said in R. Johanan's name: If he covered it with ashes, yet it blazed up again; one may keep upon it hot water, if that has been heated all it needs, or a dish which has been boiled all it needs, even if they are coals of broom.<sup>5</sup> Then this proves that when it shrinks and is improved thereby it is permitted?-[No.] Here it is different, because he covered it with ashes. If so, why state it? It is necessary [to state it where] it blazed up again. Then it is identical with the first [dictum]?-It is necessary [to state it] of coals of broom.

R. Shesheth said in R. Johanan's name: If a stove is fired with peat or wood, hot water insufficiently heated, and a dish insufficiently cooked, may be kept upon it. But if he [the owner] moved [them], he must not replace [them] before he sweeps or covers [it] with ashes. Thus he holds that we learnt our Mishnah with respect to replacing, but keeping is permitted even if it is not swept or covered with ashes.<sup>6</sup> Said Raba: We learnt both: We learnt with respect to keeping: 'Bread may not be set in an oven before nightfall, nor a cake set upon coals, unless its surface can form a crust while it is yet day'.<sup>7</sup> Hence if its surface formed a crust, it is permitted.<sup>8</sup> With respect to replacing we also learnt: BETH HILLEL RULE: WE MAY REPLACE TOO. Now Beth Hillel permit it only when it is swept or covered with ashes, but not if it is neither swept nor covered with ashes.<sup>9</sup> -R. Shesheth indeed informs us of the deduction of the Mishnah.<sup>10</sup>

R. Samuel b. Judah said in R. Johanan's name: If a stove is fired with peat or wood, one may keep upon it a dish sufficiently cooked or hot water which is sufficiently heated, even if it [the dish] shrinks and is improved thereby. Said one of the Rabbis to R. Samuel b. Judah. But Rab and Samuel both maintain: If it shrinks and is improved thereby it is forbidden?<sup>11</sup> -He answered him: Do I then not know that R. Joseph said in Rab Judah's name in Samuel's name: If it shrinks and is improved thereby it is forbidden? I tell it to you<sup>12</sup> according to R. Johanan. R. 'Ukba of Mesene<sup>13</sup> said to R. Ashi: You, who are near to Rab and Samuel, do act as Rab and Samuel; but we will act according to R. Johanan.<sup>14</sup> Abaye asked R. Joseph, What about keeping [a pot on the stove]?<sup>15</sup> — He answered him, It is indeed kept for Rab Judah, and he eats thereof! Put Rab Judah aside, said he, for since he is in danger,<sup>16</sup> it may be done for him even on the Sabbath. What about keeping it for me and you? — in Sura,<sup>17</sup> he replied, they do keep it. For R. Nahman b. Isaac is most particular,<sup>18</sup> and yet they keep it for him and he eats.

R. Ashi said: I was standing before R. Huna, when he ate a fish pie which they had kept [on the stove] for him. And I do not know whether it is because he holds that if it shrinks and is improved thereby it is permitted, or because since it contains flour paste it deteriorates in shrinking. R. Nahman said: If it shrinks and is improved thereby, it is forbidden;<sup>19</sup> if it shrinks and deteriorates, it is permitted. This is the general rule of the matter: whatever contains flour paste, shrinks and deteriorates, except a stew of turnips, which though containing flour paste shrinks and improves. Yet that is only if it contains meat; but if it contains no meat, it shrinks and deteriorates. And even if it contains meat, we say thus only if it is not intended for guests; but if it is intended for guests, it deteriorates in the shrinking.<sup>20</sup> Pap of dates, daysa,<sup>21</sup> and a dish of dates shrink and deteriorate.

R. Hiyya b. Abba was asked:

---

(1) Through cooking.

(2) Rashi: the reference must be to a dish which improves the longer it is kept on the stove, for if it deteriorates, it may obviously be kept there, as we certainly need not fear that the owner may rake up the coals, and the dictum is superfluous. Ri: the reference is presumably to the average dish, which improves with shrinking.

(3) And the dish may not be kept there.

(4) For by covering it with ashes he showed that he did not desire any further shrinkage.

(5) Rotherm is a species of broom growing in the desert (Jast.), which retains its heat longer than other coals and is slower to go out.

(6) V. supra 37a.

(7) V. supra 19b.

(8) To keep it there, though the oven is not swept, etc.

(9) What need then of R. Johanan's dictum?

(10) This is the answer: R. Shesheth informs us that the Mishnah refers to replacing (v. Tosaf. a.l.). Though Raba takes that for granted, the matter was in doubt (supra 36b).

(11) To keep it on the stove.

(12) That it is permitted.

(13) In Babylon: it is the island formed by the Euphrates, the Tigris, and the Royal Canal.

(14) Though they too were much nearer to the academies of Rab and Samuel than to R. Johanan's, the communities of Mesene preferred the authority of Palestine; v. Obermeyer, p. 204.

(15) If the stove is unswept.

(16) He suffered from bulimy, and had to eat hot food.

(17) A town on the Euphrates, where Rab founded his famous academy.

(18) Rashi. Or perhaps, a master of practice (Jast.), i.e., thoroughly versed in correct practice.

(19) To keep it on the stove.

(20) When intended for personal consumption it is cut up into small pieces before being placed in the pot, and so the fat pervades the whole and prevents deterioration. But when intended for guests it is cut up in large chunks; since the fat cannot pervade the whole the shrinking causes it to deteriorate.

(21) A dish of pounded grain.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 38a

What<sup>1</sup> if one forgot a pot on the stove and [thus] cooked it on the Sabbath? He was silent and said nothing to them [his questioners]. On the morrow he went out and lectured to them: If one cooks [food] on the Sabbath unwittingly, he may eat [it]; if deliberately, he may not eat [it];<sup>2</sup> and there is no difference. What is meant by, 'and there is no difference'?-Rabbah and R. Joseph both explain it permissively: only he who cooked it, thus performing an action, may not eat if it was deliberate; but this one<sup>3</sup> who did no action may eat even if it was deliberate. R. Nahman b. Isaac explained it restrictively: only one who cooks may eat if it was done unwittingly, because he will not [thereby] come to dissemble;<sup>4</sup> but this one, who may come to dissemble,<sup>5</sup> may not even eat if it was unwitting.

An objection is raised: if one forgot a pot on the stove and [thus] cooked it on the Sabbath: unwittingly, he may eat [thereof]; if deliberately, he may not eat. When is that said? In the case of hot water insufficiently heated or a dish insufficiently cooked; but as for hot water sufficiently heated or a dish sufficiently cooked, whether unwitting or deliberate, he may eat [thereof]: thus said R. Meir. R. Judah said: Hot water sufficiently heated is permitted, because it boils away<sup>6</sup> and is thus harmed;<sup>7</sup> a dish sufficiently cooked is forbidden, because it shrinks and is thereby improved, and whatever shrinks and is thereby improved, e.g., cabbage, beans, and mincemeat, is forbidden; but whatever shrinks and thereby deteriorates, is permitted. At all events, a dish insufficiently cooked is mentioned.<sup>8</sup> As for R. Nahman b. Isaac, it is well, there is no difficulty: here<sup>9</sup> it is before [the enactment of] the preventive measure;<sup>10</sup> there<sup>11</sup> it is after the preventive measure.<sup>12</sup> But [on the view of] Rabbah and R. Joseph who explain it permissively, if before the preventive measure,<sup>13</sup>

'deliberate' is a difficulty;<sup>14</sup> if after the preventive measure, even unwitting' too is a difficulty.<sup>15</sup> That is [indeed] a difficulty.

What was the preventive measure?-For R. Judah b. Samuel said in the name of R. Abba in the name of R. Kahana in Rab's name: At first it was ruled: One who cooks [food] on the Sabbath unwittingly, he may eat [thereof], if deliberately, he may not eat; and the same applies to one who forgets.<sup>16</sup> But when those who intentionally left [it there] grew numerous, and they pleaded, We had forgotten [it on the stove], they [the Sages] retraced their steps and penalized him who forgot.

Now, R. Meir is self-contradictory, and R. Judah is [likewise] self-contradictory?<sup>17</sup> -R. Meir is not self-contradictory: the one means at the outset; the other, if done.<sup>18</sup> R. Judah too is not self-contradictory: there it means that it [the stove] was swept or covered with ashes;<sup>19</sup> here, that it was not swept or covered with ashes.

The scholars propounded: What if one transgressed and deliberately left it? Did the Rabbis penalize him or not?-Come and hear: For Samuel b. Nathan said in R. Hanina's name: When R. Jose went to Sepphoris, he found hot water which had been left on the stove, and did not forbid it to them; [he also found] shrunken eggs,<sup>20</sup> and forbade them to them. Surely it means for that Sabbath?<sup>21</sup> -No: for the following Sabbath.<sup>22</sup> Now, this implies that shrunken eggs go on shrinking and are thereby improved?-Yes. For R. Hama b. Hanina said: My Master and I were once guests in a certain place, and eggs shrunk to the size of crab-apples were brought before us, and we ate many of them.

**BETH HILLEL RULE: ONE MAY REPLACE [IT] TOO.** R. Shesheth said: On the view of him who maintains

- 
- (1) On the view that it is forbidden to keep food on an unswept stove.
  - (2) This is a Mishnah. 'And there is no difference' is R. Hiyya b. Abba's addition in answer to the question.
  - (3) Sc. who left the pot on the stove. 'If one cooks' means by placing it on the stove.
  - (4) I.e., cook deliberately and pretend that it was unwitting. Since cooking is Biblically forbidden, one is not suspected of evading the prohibition.
  - (5) If it may be eaten when it is inadvertently left on the stove and cooked, he may leave it there deliberately and pretend forgetfulness, for the prohibition of leaving a pot on the stove is only Rabbinical.
  - (6) Lit., 'shrinks'.
  - (7) By the loss. Hence there is no fear of raking up the coals to make it boil more.-'Sufficiently heated' means to boiling point.
  - (8) And a distinction is drawn between inadvertence and a deliberate act. This contradicts both views supra.
  - (9) In the Baraitha quoted.
  - (10) Stated infra.
  - (11) R. Nahman's interpretation of R. Hiyya b. Abba's ruling.
  - (12) The prohibition stated by R. Nahman is only a preventive measure of the Rabbis, and the Baraitha states the law prior thereto.
  - (13) I.e., if R. Hiyya b. Abba's ruling was stated before the preventive measure was enacted.
  - (14) The Baraitha states that it is forbidden, whilst he ruled that it is permitted.
  - (15) Because the Baraitha which states that it is permitted in that case was taught before the preventive measure.
  - (16) A dish on the stove, and it is cooked.
  - (17) V. supra 37a. There R. Meir forbids a dish, even if sufficiently cooked, whilst here he permits it. On the other hand, R. Judah permits there a dish if sufficiently cooked, whilst here he forbids it. — The views they both give there of Beth Hillel's ruling must be regarded as their own too, since the halachah is always as Beth Hillel.
  - (18) On 37a the question is what may be done at the outset; there R. Meir rules that one must not leave a dish on the stove, even if it was sufficiently cooked before the Sabbath. But here he rules that if it was so left it is permitted.
  - (19) Then the dish is permitted.
  - (20) Eggs boiled or roasted down to a small size.

(21) He forbade them to eat the eggs on that Sabbath. This answers the question.

(22) He told them not to leave the eggs on the stove for the future.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 38b

that one may replace it, [it is permitted] even on the Sabbath.<sup>1</sup> And R. Oshaia too holds that ONE MAY REPLACE IT TOO means even on the Sabbath. For R. Oshaia said: We were once standing before R. Hiyya Rabbah, and we brought up a kettle of hot water for him from the lower to the upper storey, mixed the cup for him,<sup>2</sup> and then replaced it, and he said not a word to us. R. Zerika said in the name of R. Abba in R. Taddai's name: We learnt this only if they<sup>3</sup> are still in his hand: but if he set them down on the ground, it is forbidden.<sup>4</sup> R. Ammi observed: R. Taddai who acted [thus] acted for himself [only].<sup>5</sup> But thus did R. Hiyya say in R. Johanan's name: Even if he set them down on the ground, it is permitted. R. Dimi and R. Samuel b. Judah differ therein, and both [state their views] in R. Eleazar's name: One says: If they are still in his hand, it is permitted; on the ground, it is forbidden. While the other maintains: Even if he placed them on the ground, it is still permitted. Hezekiah<sup>6</sup> observed in Abaye's name: As to what you say that if it is still in his hand it is permitted, — that was said only where it was his [original] intention to replace them; but if it was not his intention to replace them, it is forbidden. Hence it follows that [if they are] on the ground, even if it was his intention to replace them, it is forbidden. Others state: Hezekiah observed in Abaye's name: As to what you say that if they are on the ground it is forbidden, that was said only if it was not his [original] intention to replace them; but if it was his intention to replace them, it is permitted. Hence it follows that [if they are] in his hand, even if it was not his intention to replace them, it is permitted.

R. Jeremiah propounded: What if he hung them on a staff or placed them on a couch?<sup>7</sup> R. Ashi propounded: What if he emptied them from one kettle to another? The questions stand over.

MISHNAH. IF AN OVEN WAS HEATED WITH STUBBLE OR RAKINGS, ONE MUST NOT PLACE [A POT, ETC.,] EITHER INSIDE OR ON TOP.<sup>8</sup> IF A KUPPAH<sup>9</sup> WAS HEATED WITH STUBBLE OR RAKINGS, IT IS LIKE A DOUBLE STOVE;<sup>10</sup> WITH PEAT OR TIMBER, IT IS LIKE AN OVEN,

GEMARA. IF AN OVEN WAS HEATED: R. Joseph thought to explain INSIDE AND ON TOP literally, but as for leaning [a pot against it], that is well. Abaye objected to him: IF A KUPPAH WAS HEATED WITH STUBBLE OR RAKINGS, IT IS LIKE A DOUBLE STOVE; WITH PEAT OR TIMBER, IT IS LIKE AN OVEN, and is forbidden. Hence if it were like a [double] stove, it would be permitted. To what is the reference: Shall we say, on its top? Then under what circumstance? Shall we say that it is not swept or covered with ashes? Is the top of a stove permitted when it is not swept or covered with ashes? Hence it must surely mean to lean against it; yet it is taught, IT IS LIKE AN OVEN, and forbidden? — Said R. Adda b. Ahabah: Here the reference is to a kuppah that is swept or covered with ashes, and an oven that is swept or covered with ashes: IT IS LIKE AN OVEN, in that though it is swept or covered with ashes, the top is forbidden; for if it were like a [double] stove, if swept or covered with ashes, it would be well.<sup>11</sup>

It was taught in accordance with Abaye: If an oven is heated with stubble or rakings, one may not lean [a pot, etc.,] against it, and [placing on] the top goes without saying,<sup>12</sup> and in the inside goes without saying; and it goes without saying [when it is heated] with peat or wood. If a kuppah is heated with stubble or rakings, one may lean [a pot] against it, but not place [it] on top;<sup>13</sup> [but if it is heated] with peat or wood, one must not lean [a pot] against it.

R. Aha son of Raba asked R. Ashi: How is this kuppah regarded? If like a [double] stove, even with peat or wood too?<sup>14</sup> If like an oven, neither with stubble or rakings?<sup>15</sup> He answered: Its heat is greater than a [double] stove's but less than an oven's.<sup>16</sup> What is a kuppah and what is a [double]

stove [kirah]?-Said R. Jose b. Hanina: A kuppah has room for placing one pot; a [double] stove [kirah] has room for placing two pots. Abaye — others state, R. Jeremiah — said: We learnt likewise: If a [double] stove [kirah] is divided along its length, it is clean; along its breadth, it is unclean; [if] a kuppah [is divided], whether along its length or along its breadth, it is clean.<sup>17</sup>

MISHNAH. ONE MUST NOT PLACE AN EGG AT THE SIDE OF A BOILER FOR IT TO BE ROASTED,<sup>18</sup> AND ONE MUST NOT BREAK IT INTO A [HOT] CLOTH;<sup>19</sup> BUT R. JOSE PERMITS IT. AND ONE MAY NOT PUT IT AWAY IN [HOT] SAND OR ROAD DUST FOR IT TO BE ROASTED. IT ONCE HAPPENED THAT THE PEOPLE OF TIBERIAS DID THIS: THEY CONDUCTED A PIPE OF COLD WATER THROUGH AN ARM OF THE HOT SPRINGS.<sup>20</sup> SAID THE SAGES TO THEM: IF ON THE SABBATH,<sup>21</sup> IT IS LIKE HOT WATER HEATED ON THE SABBATH, AND IS FORBIDDEN BOTH FOR WASHING AND FOR DRINKING; IF ON A FESTIVAL, IT IS LIKE WATER HEATED ON A FESTIVAL, WHICH IS FORBIDDEN FOR WASHING BUT PERMITTED FOR DRINKING.

GEMARA. The scholars propounded: What if one does roast<sup>22</sup> it?—Said R. Joseph: If one roasts it, he is liable to a sin-offering. Mar son of Rabina said, We learnt likewise:

- 
- (1) Rashi: not only Friday evening, but on the morrow too.
  - (2) Wine was not drunk neat but diluted.
  - (3) The pot or hot water.
  - (4) To replace them on the stove.
  - (5) Being stricter than necessary.
  - (6) Var. lec.: Rab Hezekiah.
  - (7) That is intermediate between retaining them in his hand and placing them on the ground.
  - (8) The oven (tannur) had a broad base and narrowed at the top. It thereby retained more heat than a stove (kirah); hence the prohibition even if it is beated with stubble or rakings only.
  - (9) Jast.: a small stove or brazier.
  - (10) I.e., the ordinary stove which held two pots; v. 38b.
  - (11) I.e., permitted.
  - (12) That it is forbidden.
  - (13) Wilna Gaon emends: and may place (it) on top.
  - (14) It should be permitted, if it is swept or covered with ashes.
  - (15) Should it be permitted.
  - (16) Hence it occupies an intermediate position.
  - (17) When the kirah is divided along its length it cannot be used at all, hence it ceases to be a utensil and is clean (cf p. 163, n. 9); but when divided along its breadth, each portion can be used for one pot, and it is therefore subject to uncleanness. Since a kuppah has room for only one pot, whichever way it is divided it ceases to be a utensil and is clean.
  - (18) Lit., 'that it should be rolled'.
  - (19) To be roasted thus (Rashi). Others: he must not cause it to crack by wrapping it in a hot cloth and rolling it; v. Tosaf. Yom. Tob. a.l.
  - (20) Tiberias possesses thermal springs. This was done before the Sabbath.
  - (21) I.e., the water which is drawn from the pipe on the Sabbath.
  - (22) Lit., 'roll'.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 39a

That which came into hot water before the Sabbath<sup>1</sup> may be steeped in hot water on the Sabbath;<sup>2</sup> but whatever did not come into hot water before the Sabbath, may be rinsed with hot water on the Sabbath,<sup>3</sup> except old salted [pickled] fish and the colias of the Spaniards,<sup>4</sup> because their rinsing completes their preparation.<sup>5</sup> This proves it.

AND HE MUST NOT BREAK IT INTO A [HOT] CLOTH. Now, as to what we learnt: 'A dish may be placed in a pit, in order that it should be guarded, and wholesome water into noisome water,<sup>6</sup> for it to be cooled, or cold water in the sun, for it to be heated'<sup>7</sup> shall we say that that agrees with R. Jose, but not with the Rabbis? Said R. Nahman: In the sun, all agree that it is permitted;<sup>8</sup> in a fire-heated object,<sup>9</sup> all agree that it is forbidden.<sup>10</sup> Where do they differ? Concerning a sun-heated object.<sup>11</sup> One Master holds that we forbid a sun-heated object on account of a fire-heated object; whilst the other Master holds that we do not forbid it.

AND ONE MAY NOT PUT IT AWAY IN [HOT] SAND. Now, let R. Jose differ here too? — Rabbah said: It is a preventive measure, lest one come to hide it in hot ashes.<sup>12</sup> R. Jose said: Because he may move earth [sand] from its place.<sup>13</sup> Wherein do they differ?-In respect of crushed earth.<sup>14</sup>

An objection is raised: R. Simeon b. Gamaliel said: An egg may be rolled [roasted] on a hot roof<sup>15</sup> but not on boiling lime.<sup>16</sup> As for the view that it is forbidden lest he hide it in hot ashes, it is well: there is nought to fear (here).<sup>17</sup> But on the view that it is because he may move earth from its place, let us forbid it?-The average roof has no earth.

Come and hear: IT ONCE HAPPENED THAT THE PEOPLE OF TIBERIAS DID THUS: THEY CONDUCTED A PIPE OF COLD WATER THROUGH AN ARM OF THE HOT SPRINGS etc. On the view that it is forbidden lest he hide it in hot ashes, it is well: hence this is similar to hiding.<sup>18</sup> But on the view that it is because he may move earth from its place, what can be said?<sup>19</sup> -Do you think that the incident of Tiberias refers to the second clause?<sup>20</sup> It refers to the first clause: ONE MUST NOT BREAK IT INTO A [HOT] CLOTH; BUT R. JOSE PERMITS IT; and the Rabbis argued thus with R. Jose: but in the incident of the people of Tiberias, it was a sun-heated object,<sup>21</sup> yet the Rabbis forbade it? That was a product of fire, he retorted, because they<sup>22</sup> pass over the entrance to Gehenna.<sup>23</sup> R. Hisda said:

- 
- (1) I.e., anything which was boiled before the Sabbath.
  - (2) To soften it. It is not regarded as preparing the food in any way, since it was already prepared before the Sabbath.
  - (3) But not steeped.
  - (4) Jast.: A species of tunny fish.
  - (5) The phrase implies that it is 'work' in the full sense of the term, involving the doer in a sin-offering. The same applies to an egg placed at the side of a boiler and roasted.
  - (6) A vessel of hot water may be placed in a pool of stagnant cold water.
  - (7) V. infra 146b.
  - (8) Because it is unusual to cook thus, and there is no fear that it will lead to cooking by fire.
  - (9) Sc. a cloth.
  - (10) Because it can be confused with the fire itself, and if that is permitted, people will roast directly on the fire.
  - (11) A cloth heated by the sun.
  - (12) Which is definitely forbidden as cooking; hence R. Jose admits the interdict here.
  - (13) He may have insufficient sand, and scoop out more, which itself is forbidden; therefore R. Jose agrees. — The Mishnah treats of sand scooped out before the Sabbath, and even then it is forbidden.
  - (14) In a large quantity. R. Joseph's reason does not operate, hence it will be permitted; but Rabbah's reason still holds good.
  - (15) Heated by the sun.
  - (16) Heated by the fire.
  - (17) In the case of a hot roof, since the egg is not hidden in anything.
  - (18) The cold water is kept in the pot.
  - (19) That does not apply here; why did they forbid it?
  - (20) The prohibition of putting an egg in hot sand, etc.
  - (21) He thought that the thermal springs were hot through the sun.
  - (22) The springs.

(23) And are heated by the fires of hell! On Gehenna v. p. 153, n. 8. [Maim. Mishnah Commentary Nega'im IX, 1: It is said that the springs (of Tiberias) are hot because they pass a sulphur source.]

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 39b

On account of the incident of what the people of Tiberias did and the Rabbis forbade them, [the practice of] putting away [aught] in anything that adds heat, even by day,<sup>1</sup> has no sanction.<sup>2</sup> 'Ulla said: The halachah agrees with the inhabitants of Tiberias.<sup>3</sup> Said R. Nahman to him, The Tiberians have broken their pipe long ago!<sup>4</sup>

IT ONCE HAPPENED THAT THE PEOPLE OF TIBERIAS DID THIS: [etc.] which washing [is meant]? Shall we say, of the whole body; is only hot water heated on the Sabbath forbidden, whereas hot water heated on the eve of the Sabbath is permitted? Surely it was taught: As to hot water which was heated on the eve of the Sabbath, on the morrow [Sabbath day] one may wash his face, hands, and feet in it, but not his whole body. Hence [it must refer to] his face, hands, and feet. Then consider the second clause: IF ON A FESTIVAL, IT IS LIKE WATER HEATED ON A FESTIVAL, WHICH IS FORBIDDEN FOR WASHING BUT PERMITTED FOR DRINKING. Shall we say that we learnt an anonymous [Mishnah] in accordance with Beth Shammai? For we learnt, Beth Shammai maintain: A man must not heat water for [washing his] feet, unless it is fit for drinking; but Beth Hillel permit it!<sup>5</sup> -Said R. Ika b. Hanina: The reference is to the sousing<sup>6</sup> of the whole body, and it agrees with the the following Tanna. For it was taught: A man must not souse the whole of his body, whether with hot or with cold water:<sup>7</sup> this is R. Meir's view; but R. Simeon permits it. R. Judah said: It is forbidden with hot water, but permitted with cold. R. Hisda said: They differ only in respect to a vessel;<sup>8</sup> but if [the water is] in the earth,<sup>9</sup> all agree that it is permitted. But the case of the people of Tiberias was in respect to the earth,<sup>10</sup> yet the Rabbis forbade them?-Rather if stated, it was thus stated: They differ only in respect to earth [-heated water]; but as for a vessel, all agree that it is prohibited.

Rabbah b. Bar Hanah said in R. Johanan's name: The halachah is as R. Judah. Said R. Joseph to him, Did you hear this explicitly, or [learn it] by deduction? What is the deduction? For R. Tanhum said in the name of R. Johanan in the name of R. Jannai in Rabbi's name: Wherever you find two disputing and a third compromising, the halachah is as the words of the compromiser, except in the case of the leniencies relating to rags,<sup>11</sup> Where though R. Eliezer is stringent and R. Joshua is lenient and R. Akiba makes a compromise, the halachah is not as the words of the compromiser. Firstly, because R. Akiba was a disciple;<sup>12</sup> moreover, R. Akiba indeed

---

(1) I.e., before the Sabbath.

(2) Lit , 'has ceased'.

(3) Their action is permitted.

(4) They themselves retracted. Thus all agree now that it is forbidden.

(5) The reference is to Festivals.-Thus our Mishnah would appear to agree with Beth Shammai, whereas it is a principle throughout the Talmud that Beth Hillel's view is always halachah, and no anonymous Mishnah is taught according to the former.

(6) Not washing-sousing is more lenient.

(7) On the Sabbath. 'Hot water' means even if it was heated before the Sabbath.

(8) I.e., if the water is in a vessel. Obviously it was heated by fire, and one seeing it may think that it was heated on the Sabbath. Hence it was forbidden.

(9) E.g., a spring.

(10) The water was heated by being passed through a natural hot-water spring.

(11) V. supra 29a.

(12) His principal teacher was R. Eliezer, but he studied under R. Joshua too (Ab. R.N.; Ned. 50a).-From Raba (fourth century) and onwards the halachah is always as the later view, hence, generally speaking as the disciple; but before that

it was always as the teacher. V. Asheri: 'Er. I, 4.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 40a

retracted in favour of R. Joshua.<sup>1</sup> Yet what if it is by deduction?-Perhaps that<sup>2</sup> is only in the Mishnah, but not in a Baraitha? — I heard it explicitly, said he to him.

It was stated: if hot water is heated on the eve of the Sabbath, — Rab said: On the morrow one may wash his whole body in it, limb by limb; while Samuel ruled: They [the Sages] permitted one to wash his face, hands, and feet only.

An objection is raised: If hot water is heated on the eve of the Sabbath, on the morrow one may wash his face, hands, and feet therein, but not his whole body. This refutes Rab?-Rab can answer you: Not his whole body at once, but limb by limb. But he [the Tanna] states, his face, hands, and feet?-[It means] similar to the face, hands, and feet.<sup>3</sup> Come and hear: It was permitted to wash only one's face, hands, and feet [on the Sabbath] in water heated on the eve of the Sabbath? — Here too [it means] similar to the face, hands, and feet.

It was taught in accordance with Samuel: If hot water is heated on the eve of the Sabbath, on the morrow [the Sabbath day] one may wash his face, hands, and feet therein, but not his whole body limb by limb; and with water heated on a Festival it goes without saying.<sup>4</sup> Rabbah recited this ruling of Rab in the following version: If hot water is heated on the eve of the Sabbath,-Rab said, On the morrow one may wash his whole body in it,<sup>5</sup> but must omit one limb. He raised against him all the [above] objections. He is [indeed] refuted.<sup>6</sup>

R. Joseph asked Abaye, Did Rabbah act in accordance with Rabis ruling? I do not know, he replied. What question is this: it is obvious that he did not act, for he was refuted? He did not hear them.<sup>7</sup> But if he had not heard them he certainly acted [thus]! For Abaye said: In all matters the Master [sc. Rabbah] acted in accordance with Rab, except in these three where he did as Samuel: [viz.,] one may light from lamp to lamp, one can detach [the fringes] from one garment for [insertion in] another, and the halachah is as R. Simeon in respect to dragging.<sup>8</sup> -He followed Rab's restrictions, but not his leniencies.

Our Rabbis taught: If the holes of a bath-house are plugged<sup>9</sup> on the eve of the Sabbath, one may bathe therein immediately after the conclusion of the Sabbath; if on the eve of a Festival, one may enter on the morrow,<sup>10</sup> sweat, and go out and have a souse bath<sup>11</sup> in the outer chamber.<sup>12</sup> Rab Judah said: it once happened at the baths of Bene Berak<sup>13</sup> that the holes were plugged on the eve of a Festival: on the morrow R. Eleazar b. 'Azariah and R. Akiba entered, sweated therein, went out, and had a souse bath in the outer chamber, but the warm water was covered over with boards.<sup>14</sup> When the matter came before the Sages, they said: Even if the warm water is not covered with boards.<sup>15</sup> But when transgressors grew in number, they began forbidding it.<sup>16</sup> One may stroll through the baths of large cities and need have no fear.<sup>17</sup>

What is [this reference to] transgressors? For R. Simeon b. Pazzi said in the name of R. Joshua b. Levi on the authority of Bar Kappara: At first people used to wash in pit water heated on the eve of the Sabbath; then bath attendants began to heat the water on the Sabbath, maintaining that it was done on the eve of the Sabbath. So [the use of] hot water was forbidden, but sweating was permitted. Yet still they used to bathe in hot water and maintain, We were perspiring. So sweating was forbidden, yet the thermal springs of Tiberias were permitted. Yet they bathed in water heated by fire and maintained, We bathed in the thermal springs of Tiberias. So they forbade the hot springs of Tiberias but permitted cold water. But when they saw that this [series of restriction] could not stand,<sup>18</sup> they permitted the hot springs of Tiberias, whilst sweating remained in status quo.<sup>19</sup>

Raba said: He who violates [even] a Rabbinical enactment, may be stigmatized a transgressor.<sup>20</sup>  
According to whom?

- 
- (1) Supra 29b.
  - (2) Sc. Johanan's rule on compromise.
  - (3) I.e., limb by limb.
  - (4) One may certainly not wash his whole body therein on the Festival.
  - (5) This, in view of the reservation that follows, must mean simultaneously (Rashi).
  - (6) As the answer given previously that it means similar to the face, etc., does not apply to his version in which he permits the whole body simultaneously, v. n. 2.
  - (7) Rabbah did not know of these refutations. Or possibly, he did not accept them; cf. Kaplan, Redaction of the Talmud, p. 138.
  - (8) V. supra 22a, q.v. notes.
  - (9) So that its steam should not be lost.
  - (10) I.e., the Festival day.
  - (11) Of cold water or water warmed on Sabbath eve, v. supra 39b.
  - (12) But not in the inner chamber where people wash, lest it be said that he washed his whole body, which is forbidden.
  - (13) Near Jaffa, the seat of R. Akiba's academy: v. Josh. XIX, 45.
  - (14) I.e., and they had no fear that the water in which they soused might have been heated by the heat of the baths. (Rashi). [Aliter: they took a souse in cold water, and the hot water in the bath house was covered to prevent the shower-bath water getting warm, v. Tosaf. a.l.]
  - (15) It is permitted.
  - (16) A steam bath on Sabbath.
  - (17) He may stroll through, not to sweat, and need not fear that he will be suspected of an unlawful purpose.
  - (18) They could not be enforced, being regarded as too onerous for the masses.
  - (19) Forbidden. — It is not clear whether these subterfuges were resorted to because the Rabbis might punish non-observance, or because public opinion condemned the open desecration of the Sabbath, even in respect of Rabbinical enactments.
  - (20) Without fear of proceedings for libel.

### **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 40b**

According to this Tanna.<sup>1</sup> 'One may stroll through the baths of large cities, and need have no fear.'  
Raba said: Only in large cities, but not in villages. What is the reason? Since they are small, their heat is great.<sup>2</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: A man may warm himself at a big fire, go out, and have a souse in cold water; providing that he does not have a souse in cold water [first] and then warm himself at the fire, because he warms the water upon him.

Our Rabbis taught: A man may heat a cloth on the Sabbath to place it on his stomach, but must not bring a hot water bottle<sup>3</sup> and place it on his stomach on the Sabbath;<sup>4</sup> and this is forbidden even on weekdays, because of its danger.<sup>5</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: A man may bring a jug of water and stand it in front of a fire; not for it to become warm, but for its coldness to be tempered. R. Judah said: A woman may bring a cruse of oil and place it in front of the fire; not for it to boil, but to become lukewarm. R. Simeon b. Gamaliel said: A woman may smear her hand with oil, warm it at a fire, and massage her infant son without fear.<sup>6</sup>

The scholars propounded: What is the first Tanna's view on oil? — Rabbah and R. Joseph both

interpret it permissively; R. Nahman b. Isaac interprets it restrictively. Rabbah and R. Joseph both interpret it permissively: Oil, even if the hand shrinks from it,<sup>7</sup> is permitted, the first Tanna holding that oil is not subject to [the prohibition of] cooking. Then R. Judah comes to say that oil is subject to cooking, but making it lukewarm is not cooking [boiling] it; whereupon R. Simeon b. Gamaliel comes to say that oil is subject to cooking, and making it lukewarm is tantamount to cooking in its case. R. Nahman b. Isaac interprets it restrictively: oil, even if the hand does not shrink from it, is forbidden, the first Tanna holding that oil is subject to [the prohibition of] cooking, and making it lukewarm is cooking it; then R. Judah comes to say that oil is subject to cooking, but making it lukewarm is not boiling it; whereupon R. Simeon b. Gamaliel comes to say: oil is subject to boiling, and making it lukewarm is tantamount to boiling it.<sup>8</sup> Then R. Simeon b. Gamaliel is identical with the first Tanna? — They differ in respect to a back-handed manner.<sup>9</sup>

Rab Judah said in Samuel's name: Both in the case of oil and water, if the hand shrinks from it,<sup>10</sup> it is forbidden;<sup>11</sup> if the hand does not shrink from it, it is permitted. And how is 'the hand shrinking from it' defined?—Said Rahaba: if an infant's belly is scalded [by it].

R. Isaac b. Abdimi said: I once followed Rabbi into the baths, and wished to place a cruse of oil for him in the bath.<sup>12</sup> Whereupon he said to me, Take [some water] in a second vessel<sup>13</sup> and put [the cruse of oil in it]. Three things are inferred from this: [i] Oil is subject to [the prohibition of] boiling; [ii] a second vessel cannot boil; [iii] making it lukewarm is boiling it.<sup>14</sup> But how might he [Rabbi] act thus? Did not Rabbah b. Bar Hanah say in R. Johanan's name: One may meditate [on the words of the Torah] everywhere, except at the baths or a privy?<sup>15</sup> And should you answer, He said it to him in secular language,<sup>16</sup> —surely Abaye said: Secular matters may be uttered in the Holy language, whereas sacred matters must not be uttered in secular language. — Restraining one from transgression is different. The proof is: Rab Judah said in Samuel's name: It once happened that a disciple of R. Meir followed him into the baths and wished to swill the ground for him, but he said to him, One may not swill;<sup>17</sup> [then he wished] to oil the ground for him, but he said to him, One may not oil. This proves that restraining one from transgression is different; so here too, restraining one from transgression is different.

Rabina said: This proves that if one cooks in the hot waters of Tiberias on the Sabbath, he is liable. For the incident of Rabbi happened after the decree,<sup>18</sup> yet he said to him, Take [some water] in a second vessel and put [the cruse of oil in it].<sup>19</sup> But that is not so? For R. Hisda said: If one cooks in the hot springs of Tiberias on the Sabbath, he is exempt? — By 'liable' he too meant flagellation for disobedience.<sup>20</sup>

R. Zera said: I saw R. Abbahu swimming in a bath, but I do not know whether he lifted [his feet] or not.<sup>21</sup> Is it not obvious that he did not 'lift' [his feet]? For it was taught: One must not swim in a pool full of water, even if it stands in a courtyard.<sup>22</sup> There is no difficulty: in the one case

---

(1) Who refers to the above as transgressors for evading Rabbinical enactments,

(2) And even a stroll through them causes sweating.

(3) Kumkumos is a kind of kettle; obviously something in the nature of an open hot water bottle is meant here.

(4) Rashi: in case it spills, and so he will have bathed on the Sabbath.

(5) Of scalding. — Needless self-endangering of life is forbidden.

(6) Of desecrating the Sabbath.

(7) I.e., even if it becomes so hot that one involuntarily withdraws his hand when he touches it.—In respect to Sabbath prohibitions, as also in respect to certain laws concerning the mixing of forbidden with permitted commodities, this is recognized as the last stage before boiling.

(8) Since a higher temperature is not required. Hence he permits it only when the oil is smeared on one's hand, which is an unusual way of heating it, but it may not be put in front of the fire in a cruse.

(9) An idiom for doing anything in an unusual way. R. Simeon permits it, while the first Tanna forbids it.

- (10) I.e., the hand put in it is spontaneously withdrawn.
- (11) They may not be placed in front of a fire to reach temperature.
- (12) This was in the hot springs of Tiberias, which was finally permitted; supra a.-He wished to warm the oil before use.
- (13) A vessel into which a boiling mass has been poured, opposed to כלי ראשון, a first vessel, containing the mass direct from the fire. The water was drawn direct from the spring into the bath (it was a bath naturally constructed in the ground), which is regarded as a first vessel. It is a Talmudic principle that a first vessel, if the mass in it is still seething, can cook or boil something placed in it, but a second vessel, even if very hot, cannot do this. He therefore told him to pour water out of the bath into a second vessel, and then place the oil in it, to avoid boiling.
- (14) For he did not intend more than this, and yet Rabbi forbade him to place it in the bath itself. In the second vessel it would not even become lukewarm, but merely have its coldness tempered.
- (15) Hence Rabbi should not have thought of the religious aspect of the act in the bath.
- (16) Probably: in a phraseology not usually associated with learning. This might indicate that the language of learning as incorporated in the Mishnah was an artificial one; scholars, however, are opposed to that view; v. Segal, Mishnaic Hebrew Grammar, Introduction; S. D. Luzatto in 'Orient. Lit.' 1846, col. 829; 1847, cols. 1 et seq.
- (17) Lest the water form ruts, which is forbidden.
- (18) Forbidding sweating in ordinary (artificially heated) baths. Hence this must have happened in the natural thermal baths of Tiberias.
- (19) But he forbade him to put it directly in the first vessel (v. p. 188, n. 6.), which proves that boiling even in naturally hot water involves liability.
- (20) Punishment decreed by the Rabbis, as opposed to stripes, ordained by Biblical law.
- (21) I.e., he did not know whether he was actually swimming or merely bathing.
- (22) Where there is no fear of splashing water for a distance of four cubits in public ground.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 41a

it [the pool] has no embankments; in the other case it has.<sup>1</sup>

R. Zera also said: I saw R. Abbahu put his hand near his buttocks,<sup>2</sup> but do not know whether he touched them or not. It is obvious that he did not touch them, for it was taught, R. Eliezer said: He who holds his membrum and passes water is as though he brought a flood upon the world?<sup>3</sup> — Said Abaye: It was accounted as [analogous to] a marauding band. For we learnt: If a marauding band enters a town<sup>4</sup> in peace-time, open barrels [of wine] are forbidden,<sup>5</sup> closed barrels are permitted; in war time, both are permitted, because they have no time to make nesek.<sup>6</sup> Thus we see, since they are afraid,<sup>7</sup> they do not make nesek; so here too, since he is in fear, he will not come to meditate [impure thoughts]. And what fear is there here?—The fear of the river.

But that is not so? For R. Abba said in the name of R. Huna in Rab's name: He who puts his hand near his buttocks is as though he denied the covenant of Abraham?<sup>8</sup> There is no difficulty: the one means when he descends [into the river];<sup>9</sup> the other refers to when he ascends.<sup>10</sup> Just as Raba used to bend over; R. Zera would stand upright. The scholars of the college of R. Ashi, when they descended, they stood upright, [but] when they ascended they bent over.

R. Zera was evading Rab Judah. For he [R. Zera] desired to emigrate<sup>11</sup> to Palestine, whereas Rab Judah said, He who emigrates from Babylon to Palestine violates a positive command, for it is said, They shall be carried to Babylon, and there they shall be.<sup>12</sup> Said he, I will go, hear a teaching from him, return and emigrate. He went and found him standing at the baths and saying to his attendant, Bring me natron,<sup>13</sup> bring me a comb,<sup>14</sup> open your mouths and expel the heat,<sup>15</sup> and drink of the water of the baths. Said he, Had I come to hear nought but this, it would suffice me. As for 'bring me natron, bring me a comb,' it is well: he informs us that secular matters may be said in the Holy Tongue. 'Open your mouths and expel the heat' too is as Samuel. For Samuel said: Heat expels heat.<sup>16</sup> But 'drink the water of the baths' — what is the virtue of that?—For it was taught: If one eats without drinking, his eating is blood,<sup>17</sup> and that is the beginning of stomach trouble. If one eats

without walking four cubits [after it], his food rots,<sup>18</sup> and that is the beginning of a foul smell.<sup>19</sup> One who has a call of nature yet eats is like an oven which is heated up on top of its ashes,<sup>20</sup> and that is the beginning of perspiration odour. If one bathes in hot water and drinks none, he is like an oven heated without but not within. If one bathes in hot water and does not have a cold shower bath, he is like iron put into fire but not into cold water.<sup>21</sup> If one bathes without anointing,<sup>22</sup> he is like water [poured] over a barrel.<sup>23</sup>

**MISHNAH. IF A MILIARUM IS CLEARED [OF ITS] COALS,<sup>24</sup> ONE MAY DRINK FROM IT ON THE SABBATH. BUT AS TO AN ANTIKI,<sup>25</sup> EVEN IF ITS COALS HAVE BEEN CLEARED ONE MAY NOT DRINK FROM IT.<sup>26</sup>**

**GEMARA.** What is meant by 'IF A MILIARUM IS CLEARED OF ITS] COALS'?—A Tanna taught: the water is within and the coals are without.<sup>27</sup> Antiki: Rabbah said: [It means a vessel suspended] between fire places [heated bricks]; R. Nahman b. Isaac said: [It means a vessel suspended] within a cauldron-like vessel.<sup>28</sup> He who defines it [as a vessel suspended] within a cauldron-like vessel, all the more so a vessel between fire places;<sup>29</sup> whereas he who defines it as [a vessel] between fire places, — but not one within a cauldron-like vessel.<sup>30</sup> It was taught in accordance with R. Nahman: From an antiki, even when cleared of coals and covered with ashes, one may not drink, because its copper heats it.<sup>31</sup>

**MISHNAH. IF A BOILER IS REMOVED, ONE MAY NOT POUR COLD WATER THEREIN TO HEAT IT, BUT ONE MAY POUR IT [WATER] THEREIN [THE BOILER] OR INTO A GOBLET IN ORDER TO TEMPER IT.<sup>32</sup>**

**GEMARA.** What does this mean? — Said R. Adda b. Mattenah, This is its meaning: in the case of a boiler from which the hot water is removed, one must not pour into it a little [cold] water in order to heat it, but he may pour in a large quantity of [cold] water to temper it.

---

(1) Rashi: in the former case it is like a river; hence forbidden (the prohibition in Bez. 36b refers to a river); in the latter case it is like a large utensil, hence permitted.

(2) When bathing in the river; this was a gesture of decency.

(3) Because lust is inflamed.

(4) And they may have touched or moved open barrels of wine, thus rendering them forbidden.

(5) V. preceding note.

(6) Lit., 'make a libation'. That is the reason of the interdict mentioned in n. 4, because the heathen is suspected of having dedicated the wine to his deity,

(7) To put their minds to such things.

(8) As though he were ashamed of being circumcised.

(9) As his face is towards the river, a gesture of decency is not needed.

(10) His face is towards the people, and so he can cover his circumcision in modesty.

(11) Lit., 'ascend'.

(12) Jer. XXVII, 22. — Weiss, Dor, III, p. 188, maintains that R. Zera's desire to emigrate was occasioned by dissatisfaction with Rab Judah's method of study; it is vigorously combated by Halevi, Doroth, II pp. 421 et seq. The sequel of this story, as also of the similar one in Ber. 24b, shows that he prized Rab Judah's teaching very highly indeed; Rab Judah's prohibition of emigration was merely a reflex of his great love for Babylon, though his love for Palestine too was extraordinarily great: v. Ber. 43a.

(13) For cleansing.

(14) These were said in pure Hebrew.

(15) Rashi: let the heat of the baths enter and the heat of perspiration be driven out.

(16) V. n. 4.

(17) I.e., harmful.

(18) Is not properly digested.

- (19) Issuing from the mouth.
- (20) New fuel being added without the ashes of the old being cleared out.
- (21) To temper it.
- (22) Anointing with oil is and was practised in hot countries; T.A. I, 229 and 233.
- (23) Which is poured all over the barrel, but does not enter it.
- (24) Lit., 'a cauldron that is swept out' — before the Sabbath.
- (25) The Gemara discusses what this is.
- (26) The antiki retains its heat more effectively than the miliarum and therefore adds heat on Sabbath to the water it contains, which makes it forbidden.
- (27) This explains מוֹלִיָּאָר (miliarum). It is a large vessel on the outside of which a receptacle for coals is attached. Thus it would be something like the old-type Russian samowar.
- (28) The vacant space beneath being filled with coals. — Jast.
- (29) The ruling of the Mishnah will certainly apply to the latter too.
- (30) The ruling of the Mishnah will not apply to the latter, which in his opinion is the same as a miliarium.
- (31) Thus it adds heat, which is forbidden.
- (32) This is discussed in the Gemara.

### Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 41b

But does he not harden it?<sup>1</sup> -This agrees with R. Simeon, who ruled: That which is unintentional is permitted.<sup>2</sup> Abaye demurred to this: Is it then stated, A BOILER from which the water IS REMOVED: Surely it is stated, IF A BOILER IS REMOVED? Rather said Abaye, this is the meaning: If a boiler is removed [from the fire] and it contains hot water, one must not pour therein a little water to heat it [the added water], but he may pour a large quantity of [cold] water therein to temper it.<sup>3</sup> But if the water is removed from a boiler, no water at all may be poured therein, because that hardens it; this agreeing with R. Judah, who maintains: [Even] that which is un-intentional is forbidden.

Rab said: They taught [that it is permitted] only to temper [the water]; but if it is to harden [the metal], it is forbidden. Whereas Samuel ruled: Even if to harden it, it is still permitted. If the primary purpose is to harden it, can it be permitted!<sup>4</sup> Rather if stated, it was thus stated: Rab said: They taught this only where there is [merely] a sufficient quantity to temper it; but if there is enough to harden it, it is forbidden.<sup>5</sup> Whereas Samuel maintained: Even if there is a sufficient quantity to harden it,

---

(1) Sc. The metal of the boiler, by pouring cold water into it while it is hot. This itself is forbidden on the Sabbath.

(2) Supra 22a, 29b.

(3) I.e., reduce its heat.

(4) Surely not.

(5) Rashi; Rab explains the Mishnah as R. Adda b. Mattanah, viz., that the water was removed from the boiler. Thereon Rab observes: though a large quantity of water may be poured into it, it must nevertheless be insufficient to harden it, but merely enough to temper the water, i.e., it must not be completely filled with cold water, for that hardens the metal. Ri maintains that if the hot water is first emptied, even a small quantity of cold water poured into it immediately afterwards will harden it. Hence he interprets it thus: Rab explains the Mishnah as Abaye, as meaning that the boiler was removed with its hot water. Nevertheless, it must not be filled up with cold water, for that hardens it, as before.

### Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 42a

it is permitted.<sup>1</sup>

Shall we say that Samuel agrees with R. Simeon?<sup>2</sup> But surely Samuel said: One may extinguish a lump of fiery metal in the street, that it should not harm the public,<sup>3</sup> but not a burning piece<sup>4</sup> of

wood.<sup>5</sup> A Now if you think that he agrees with R. Simeon, even that of wood too [should be permitted]?<sup>6</sup> -In respect to what is unintentional he holds with R. Simeon; but in the matter of work which is not needed per se, he agrees with R. Judah.<sup>7</sup> Rabina said: As a corollary, a thorn in public ground may be carried away in stages of less than four cubits;<sup>8</sup> whilst in a karmelith<sup>9</sup> even a great distance too [is permitted].

**BUT ONE MAY POUR**, etc. Our Rabbis taught: A man may pour hot water into cold, but not cold water into hot; this is the view of Beth Shammai;<sup>10</sup> while Beth Hillel maintain: Both hot into cold and cold into hot are permitted. This applies only to a cup,<sup>11</sup> but in the case of a bath, hot into cold [is permitted], but not cold into hot.<sup>12</sup> But R. Simeon b. Menassia forbids it.<sup>13</sup> R. Nahman said: The halachah is as R. Simeon b. Menassia.

R. Joseph thought to rule: A basin is as a bath. Said Abaye to him, R. Hiyya taught: A basin is not as a bath. Now, on the original supposition that it is as a bath, while R. Nahman ruled, The halachah is as R. Simeon, can there be no washing in hot water on the Sabbath?<sup>14</sup> -Do you think that R. Simeon refers to the second clause? He refers to the first clause: 'While Beth Hillel maintain: Both hot into cold and cold into hot are permitted';<sup>15</sup> but R. Simeon b. Menassia forbids even cold into hot. Shall we say that R. Simeon b. Menassia rules as Beth Shammai?<sup>16</sup> -He says thus: Beth Shammai and Beth Hillel did not differ in this matter.<sup>17</sup>

R. Huna son of R. Joshua said: I saw that Raba was not particular about vessels,<sup>18</sup> since R. Hiyya taught: A person may pour a jug of water into a basin of water, hot into cold or cold into hot.<sup>19</sup> Said R. Huna to R. Ashi: Perhaps it is different there, because the vessel intervenes?<sup>20</sup> -It is stated that he pours it, was his answer.<sup>21</sup> [Thus:] A person may pour a jug of water into a basin of water, both hot into cold and cold into hot.

**MISHNAH. IF A STEW POT OR A BOILING POT<sup>22</sup> IS REMOVED SEETHING; [FROM THE FIRE],<sup>23</sup> ONE MUST NOT PUT SPICES THEREIN,<sup>24</sup>**

---

(1) Since that is not his intention.

(2) That whatever is unintentional is permitted.

(3) Metal does not really burn, but throws off fiery sparks when red-hot. The prohibition of extinguishing does not apply in this case by Biblical law at all, save by Rabbinical law; hence where general damage may ensue the Rabbis waived their prohibition.

(4) Lit., 'coal'.

(5) For that is Biblically forbidden.

(6) For R. Simeon rules that if work is not needed per se (v. p. 510, n. 3) it imposes no liability, and every case of extinguishing, except the extinguishing of a wick to make it easier for subsequent relighting (v. supra 29b bottom), falls within this category. Hence it is only Rabbinically forbidden, and therefore the same as metal.

(7) That it is interdicted.

(8) The least distance which is Biblically forbidden is four cubits in a single passage, without an interval. A thorn too may cause harm to the public; hence the Rabbinical interdict is waived.

(9) V. Glos. and supra 6a.

(10) Rashi: they hold that the lower prevails against the upper. Hence in the former case the hot water is tempered by the cold, which is permitted; but in the latter the cold is heated by the hot, which is forbidden. R. Tam: 'hot water into cold' implies that the cold water exceeds the hot, and therefore cools it, hence it is permitted. 'Cold water into hot' implies that there is more hot water, which heats the cold; consequently, it is forbidden. According to this interpretation this is independent of the question whether the lower prevails against the upper or the reverse, which refers to equal quantities; cf. ערוך השלחן Yoreh De'ah XCI, 12.

(11) The water being required for drinking, one does not wish it to become very hot. Moreover, a cup is a 'second vessel' (v. supra p. 188, n. 6), i.e., the water is not actually heated therein, and the contents of a second vessel cannot cause anything that comes into contact therewith to boil.

(12) The water is needed for washing, and must be very hot. Therefore if the latter case is permitted, we fear that one will come intentionally to heat water in a forbidden manner. The reference is to a bath which is a 'second vessel', and yet it is forbidden for this reason.

(13) Even hot into cold.

(14) Rashi: even if heated on the eve of the Sabbath, cold water must be added to temper its heat, which according to R. Simeon b. Menassia is forbidden.

(15) The reference being to a cup, not a bath, as stated.

(16) Surely not, for it is axiomatic that the halachah is always as Beth Hillel.

(17) Both agreeing that it is forbidden.

(18) Pouring hot water into cold and vice versa. Asheri omits 'about vessels.'

(19) Tosaf. suggests that this may be the identical Baraita cited above, but that there it was quoted in brief.

(20) He assumed that the water is poured on to the inner side of the basin first, which somewhat cools it.

(21) I.e., directly into the water.

(22) The first means a tightly covered pot.

(23) At twilight on Friday.

(24) After nightfall. The pot is a 'first vessel' (v. p. 188, n. 6) and its contents, as long as they are seething, cause any other commodity put therein to boil likewise.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 42b

BUT ONE MAY PUT [SPICES] INTO A DISH OR A TUREEN.<sup>1</sup> R. JUDAH SAID: HE MAY PUT [SPICES] INTO ANYTHING EXCEPT WHAT CONTAINS VINEGAR OR BRINE.<sup>2</sup> GEMARA. The scholars propounded: Does R. Judah refer to the first clause, and [he rules] in the direction of leniency,<sup>3</sup> or perhaps he refers to the second clause, [inclining] to stringency?<sup>4</sup> — Come and hear: R. Judah said: One may put [spices] into all stew pots and into all boiling pots that are seething, except aught that contains vinegar or brine.<sup>5</sup>

R. Joseph thought to rule that salt is like spices, [viz.,] that it boils in a 'first vessel' but not in a second vessel'. Said Abaye to him, R. Hiyya taught: Salt is not like spices, for it boils even in a second vessel'. Now, he differs from R. Nahman, who said: Salt requires as much boiling as ox flesh. Others state, R. Joseph thought to rule: Salt is like spices, [viz.,] that it boils in a 'first vessel' but not in a 'second vessel'. Said Abaye to him, R. Hiyya taught: Salt is not like spices, for it does not boil even in a 'first vessel'. And this is identical with R. Nahmanis dictum: Salt requires as much boiling as ox flesh.<sup>6</sup>

MISHNAH. ONE MAY NOT PLACE A VESSEL UNDER A LAMP TO CATCH THE OIL.<sup>7</sup> BUT IF IT IS PLACED THERE BEFORE SUNSET,<sup>8</sup> IT IS PERMITTED. YET ONE MAY NOT BENEFIT FROM IT,<sup>9</sup> BECAUSE IT IS NOT OF MUKAN.<sup>10</sup>

GEMARA. R. Hisda said: Though they [the Sages] ruled, A vessel may not be placed under a fowl to receive its eggs,<sup>11</sup> yet a vessel may be overturned upon it [the egg] that it should not be broken. Said Rabbah, What is R. Hisda's reason? — He holds that it is usual for a fowl to lay her eggs in a dung heap, but not on sloping ground; now, they [the Sages] permitted<sup>12</sup> in a common [case of] saving,<sup>13</sup> but in an uncommon [case of] saving they did not permit.<sup>14</sup> Abaye raised an objection: Now, did they [the Sages] not permit in an uncommon [case of] saving? Surely it was taught: If a person's barrel of tebel<sup>15</sup> burst on the top of his roof, he may bring a vessel and place it beneath it.<sup>16</sup> -The reference is to new jars, which frequently burst.

He raised an objection: A vessel may be placed under a lamp to catch the sparks?-Sparks too are common.

---

(1) Containing a hot stew. The dish or tureen is a 'second vessel', which cannot make the spices boil.

- (2) Being sharp, they cause the spices to boil.
- (3) I.e., the first Tanna, having stated that spices may not be put into a 'first vessel', R. Judah permits it, save where it contains vinegar or brine.
- (4) The first Tanna permits spices to be put into a 'second vessel', no matter what its contents, whereas R. Judah makes an exception.
- (5) Thus he refers to a 'first vessel'.
- (6) Hence it does not boil unless actually on the fire.
- (7) On the Sabbath. Rashi offers two reasons: (i) The oil, having been set apart for fuel, is mukzeh, i.e., it must not be used in any other manner, nor may it be handled, and this Tanna holds that a utensil can be moved only for the sake of an object which may itself be handled. (ii) At present the vessel may be handled for a number of purposes. Once oil drops into it, it may not be moved, because the oil is mukzeh, and in the opinion of this Tanna one may not cause a vessel to become immovable, for it is as though he joins it to the lamp on the Sabbath.
- (8) Lit., 'while it is yet day.'
- (9) I.e., use the oil which drops therein.
- (10) V.Glos.
- (11) When she lays them on sloping ground; the vessel is to prevent them from rolling down the incline and breaking.
- (12) To move a vessel for the sake of an object that may not be handled, as the egg in question.
- (13) Viz., to save the eggs from being trampled upon while they lay on the dung heap. People walked over dung (manure) heaps; cf. B.K. 30a.
- (14) Viz., to save them from rolling down the slope.
- (15) V. Glos. The reference is to oil or wine.
- (16) Though *tebel* itself may not be handled, while such a case of saving is uncommon, as it is rare for a barrel to burst. The same assumption is made in the other attempted refutations, that the savings permitted are in an uncommon case.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 43a

He raised an objection: A dish may be overturned above a lamp, that the beams should not catch [fire]? This refers to houses with low ceilings, for it is a common thing for them to catch fire. [He raised a further objection:] And likewise, if a beam is broken, it may be supported by a bench or bed staves?<sup>1</sup> -This refers to new planks, for it is a common thing for them to split. [Another objection:] A utensil may be placed under a leak [in the roof] on the Sabbath?-This refers to new houses, where leaking is common.

R. Joseph said: This is R. Hisda's reason, [viz.,] because he deprives the vessel of its readiness [for use].<sup>2</sup> Abaye objected to him: if a barrel [of *tebel*] is broken, another vessel may be brought and placed under it?<sup>3</sup> -*Tebel* is ready [for use] in respect to the Sabbath, replied he, for if he transgresses and prepares it,<sup>4</sup> it is prepared. [Another objection:] A vessel may be placed under a lamp to catch the sparks?-Said R. Huna son of R. Joshua: Sparks are intangible.<sup>5</sup> [Another objection:] And likewise, if a beam is broken, it may be supported by a bench or bed-staves?<sup>6</sup> That means that it is loose,<sup>7</sup> So that, if he desires, he can remove it. [Another objection:] A vessel may be placed under drippings on the Sabbath?<sup>8</sup> -The reference is to drippings that are fit [for use]. [Another objection:] A basket may be overturned before fledglings, for them to ascend or descend?<sup>9</sup> -He holds that it [the basket] may [still] be moved. But it was taught, It may not be moved?-That is [only] while they [the fledglings] are yet upon it. But it was taught, Though they are not still upon it, it is forbidden?-Said R. Abbahu: That means that they were upon it throughout the period of twilight; since It was forbidden to handle<sup>10</sup> at twilight, it remains so forbidden for the whole day.<sup>11</sup>

R. Isaac said: just as a vessel may not be placed under a fowl to receive her eggs, so may a vessel not be overturned upon it [the egg] that it should not be broken. He holds that a vessel may be handled only for the sake of that which itself may be handled on the Sabbath.<sup>12</sup> All the foregoing objections were raised;<sup>13</sup> and he answered, It means that its place is required.<sup>14</sup> Come and hear: An egg laid on the Sabbath or an egg laid on a Festival may not be moved, neither for covering a

vessel<sup>15</sup> nor for supporting the legs of a bed therewith;<sup>16</sup> but a vessel may be turned over it, that it [the egg] should not be broken? — Here too it means that its place is required.

Come and hear: Mats may be spread over stones on the Sabbath?<sup>17</sup> -The reference is to smoothly rounded stones, which are fit [for use] in a privy.

Come and hear: Mats may be spread on the Sabbath upon bricks which were left over from a building?-That is because they are fit for reclining [thereon].

Come and hear: One may spread mats over bee-hives on the Sabbath: in the sun on account of the sun and in the rain on account of the rain, providing he has no intention of capturing [the bees]?<sup>18</sup> -The circumstances are that they contain honey. Said R. 'Ukba of Mesene<sup>19</sup> to R. Ashi: That is correct of summer,

---

(1) I.e., the long-sides of bedsteads.

(2) V. p. 196, n. 5.

(3) Tebel may not be made fit for food on the Sabbath by rendering its dues. Hence neither it nor the vessel which receives it may be handled. Thus that too loses its general fitness, and yet it is permitted.

(4) On the Sabbath, by separating the tithes.

(5) Consequently the vessel into which they fall may be handled.

(6) Though it is then impossible to remove them for general use.

(7) The bench, etc., is not planted there firmly.

(8) He assumed that the drippings consisted of dirty water, unfit for use, as a result of which one may not handle the vessel which receives them.

(9) Into or from the hen-coop.

(10) I.e., mukzeh q.v. Glos.

(11) This is a principle often met with. But if the basket is placed there after nightfall, so that it was fit for handling at twilight, it may be moved when the birds are not upon it.

(12) Which excludes an egg laid on the Sabbath.

(13) In every case there the article itself for which the utensil is taken may not be handled.

(14) A utensil may be moved when its place is required, and when so moved it may be utilized for the purposes enumerated above,

(15) E.g., the neck of a bottle.

(16) The egg did not actually support the bed, but was placed near it for magical purposes; v. A. Marmorstein, MGWJ. 72. 1928, pp. 391-395.

(17) Stones, being unfit for use, may not be handled.

(18) Though the hives themselves may not be handled.

(19) The region to the south of Babylon bounded by the Tigris, the Euphrates and the Royal Canal, and differentiated from Babylon proper in respect to marriage; v. Kid. 71b, Obermeyer, pp. 90 seqq.

## **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 43b**

when there is honey; but what can be said of winter, when it does not contain honey?<sup>1</sup> -It is in respect of two loaves.<sup>2</sup> -But they are mukzeh?<sup>3</sup> -It means that he designated them.<sup>4</sup> Then what if he did not designate them? It is forbidden! If so, instead of teaching, 'providing he has no intention of capturing [the bees],' let a distinction be drawn and taught in that itself: [thus:] when is that said? When he designated them; but if he did not designate them, it is forbidden?-He [the Tanna] teaches us this: even if he designated them, yet there is the proviso that he must not intend to capture [the bees]. With whom does this agree?<sup>5</sup> If R. Simeon, surely he rejects [the prohibition of] mukzeh! If R. Judah, then what matters if one does not intend [to capture the bees],-[surely he holds that] an unintentional act is forbidden?<sup>6</sup> -In truth this agrees with R. Judah; and what is meant by, 'providing he has no intention of capturing [the bees]?' That he must not arrange it like a net, namely, he must

leave an opening<sup>7</sup> so that they [the bees] should not be automatically caught.

R. Ashi said:<sup>8</sup> Is it then taught, 'in summer' and 'in winter'? Surely, it is stated, 'in the sun because of the sun and in the rain because of the rain.' [That means,] in the days of Nisan and Tishri,<sup>9</sup> when there is sun, rain, and honey.

R. Shesheth said to them [his disciples], 'Go forth and tell R. Isaac, R. Huna has already stated your ruling in Babylon. For R. Huna said: A screen may be made for the dead for the sake of the living, but not for the sake of the dead. What does this mean? As R. Samuel b. Judah said, and Shila Mari recited likewise: If a dead man is lying in the sun, two men come and sit down at his side. If they feel hot underneath,<sup>10</sup> each brings a couch and sits upon it.<sup>11</sup> If they feel hot above, they can bring a hanging and spread it above them: then each sets up his couch, slips away and departs, and thus the screen [for the dead] is found to have been made automatically.<sup>12</sup>

It was stated: If a corpse is lying in the sun, — Rab Judah maintained in Samuel's name: It may be changed over from bier to bier.<sup>13</sup> R. Hanina said on Rab's authority: A loaf or a child is placed upon it,<sup>14</sup> and it is moved away. Now, if a loaf or a child is available, all agree that that is permitted. When do they differ?—When they are not available: one Master holds, Sidelong moving is designated moving;<sup>15</sup> while the other Master holds, Sidelong moving is not designated moving.

Shall we say that this is dependent on Tannaim? A corpse may not be rescued from a conflagration.<sup>16</sup> R. Judah b. Lakish said: I have heard that a corpse may be rescued from a fire. What are the circumstances? if a loaf or a child is available, what is the reason of the first Tanna? If it is not,<sup>17</sup> what is the reason of R. Judah b. Lakish? Hence they surely differ in respect to sidelong moving, one Master holding that such is designated moving, while the other Master holds that it is not? — No. All agree that sidelong moving is designated moving, but this is the reason of R. Judah b. Lakish: since a man is agitated over his dead,

---

(1) The questioner assumes 'in the sun' and 'in the rain' to mean 'in the days of the sun' and 'in the days of rain' respectively, i.e., in summer and in winter.

(2) Of honey, left in the honeycomb for the bees themselves.

(3) V. Glos. Having been set apart for the bees, they may not be handled.

(4) For food, before the Sabbath.

(5) Assuming that the reference 'is to one who designated the two loaves, who is the author of this Baraitha?

(6) Since the covering blocks the bees' exit, he does in fact capture them, notwithstanding his lack of intention.

(7) Lit., 'space'

(8) In reply to the objection from the last cited Baraitha.

(9) The first and seventh months of the Jewish year, corresponding roughly to mid-March-April and mid-September-October.

(10) The sun having heated the pavement.

(11) The prohibitions of carrying from domain to domain (v. supra 2a, 6a) must of course not be violated.

(12) Thus the awning is not made for the dead, but for the sake of the living. This is a legal fiction.

(13) Until it reaches the shade.

(14) Cf. supra 30b; infra 142b.

(15) Moving indirectly, by changing over from bier to bier, is nevertheless moving, and forbidden.

(16) On the Sabbath, because it must not be handled.

(17) And consequently the point at issue is whether the dead may be rescued directly.

## **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 44a**

if you do not permit [it] to him, he will come to extinguish [the fire].<sup>1</sup> R. Judah b. Shila said in the name of R. Assi in R. Johanan's name: The halachah is as R. Judah b. Lakish in the matter of the

corpse.

YET ONE MAY NOT BENEFIT FROM IT, BECAUSE IT IS NOT OF MUKAN. Our Rabbis taught: The residue of oil in the lamp or in the dish is forbidden; but R. Simeon permits [it].

MISHNAH. A NEW LAMP<sup>2</sup> MAY BE HANDLED, BUT NOT AN OLD ONE.<sup>3</sup> R. SIMEON MAINTAINED: ALL LAMPS MAY BE HANDLED, EXCEPT A LAMP [ACTUALLY] BURNING ON THE SABBATH.

GEMARA. Our Rabbis taught: A new lamp<sup>4</sup> may be moved, but not an old one: this is R. Judah's opinion. R. Meir ruled: All lamps may be moved, except a lamp which was lit on the Sabbath;<sup>5</sup> R. Simeon said: Except a lamp burning on the Sabbath; if it is extinguished, it may be moved; but a cup, dish or glass lantern<sup>6</sup> may not be stirred from its place. R. Eliezer son of R. Simeon said: One may take supplies from an extinguished lamp or from dripping oil, even while the lamp is burning.

Abaye observed: R. Eliezer son of R. Simeon agrees with his father on one [point] and disagrees with him on another. He agrees with his father on one [point] in reflecting [the prohibition of] mukzeh. Yet he disagrees with him on another: for whereas his father holds, Only if it is extinguished [is it permitted], but not otherwise; he holds, Even if it is not extinguished. 'But a cup, dish, or glass lantern may not be stirred from its place'. Wherein do these differ? — Said 'Ulla: This last clause follows R. Judah. Mar Zutra demurred to this: If so, why 'but'? — Rather, said Mar Zutra: In truth, it follows R. Simeon; yet R. Simeon permits [handling] only in the case of a small lamp, because one's mind is set upon it;<sup>7</sup> but not [in the case of] these, which are large. But it was taught: The residue of oil in a lamp or in a dish is forbidden; while R. Simeon permits [it]?-There the dish is similar to the lamp;<sup>8</sup> here the dish is similar to the cup.<sup>9</sup>

R. Zera said: A shaft<sup>10</sup> in which [a lamp] was lit on [that] Sabbath,<sup>11</sup> in the view of him who permits [an earthen lamp],<sup>12</sup> this is prohibited;<sup>13</sup> in the view of him who forbids [an earthen lamp],<sup>14</sup> this is permitted.<sup>15</sup> Shall we say that R. Judah accepts [the prohibition of] mukzeh on account of repulsiveness, but rejects [that of] mukzeh on account of an interdict? But it was taught, R. Judah said: All metal lamps may be handled, except a lamp which was lit on the Sabbath?<sup>16</sup> But if stated, it was thus stated: R. Zera said: A shaft on which a lamp was lit<sup>17</sup> on the Sabbath, all agree that it is forbidden [to handle it]; if a lamp was not lit therein, all agree that it is permitted.

Rab Judah said in Rab's name: If a bed is designated for money, it may not be moved.<sup>18</sup> R. Nahman b. Isaac objected: A NEW LAMP MAY BE HANDLED, BUT NOT AN OLD ONE.

---

(1) Yet he may not permit it when the corpse is lying in the sun.

(2) I.e., one which has never been used.

(3) Once used it is mukzeh (q. v. Glos.) on account of its repulsiveness, which this Tanna holds is forbidden.

(4) The reference is to an earthenware lamp.

(5) Var. lec.: on that Sabbath.

(6) The three used as lamps. For the various types of lamps and their descriptions v. T.A. I, 68 seq.

(7) Thinking, the oil will not last long, and when it goes out I will use the lamp.

(8) I.e., small.

(9) Large.

(10) פִּירוֹט: 'a shaft with a receptacle for a lamp, a plain candlestick', Jast. Rashi: a metal candlestick.

(11) jast. reads: a shaft on which a lamp was lit etc. V. also) T.A. I, p. 70 and n. 234.

(12) R. Meir.

(13) Because it burnt on that Sabbath. This is known as mukzeh on account of an interdict, I.e., the lamp was employed on that Sabbath for burning, and one may not light a lamp on the Sabbath itself.

(14) R. Judah: the reference is to an old lamp, which is mukzeh on account of repulsiveness.

(15) Because R. Judah rejects the prohibition of mukzeh on account of an interdict.-Being of metal, the lamp is not regarded as repulsive, even when it has been used.

(16) Var. lec.: on that Sabbath.

(17) V. P. 202, n. 7. Here this is the reading of cur. edd.

(18) Mere designation renders it forbidden, even if money was not actually placed there.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 44b

Now if a lamp, though made for that purpose, may be handled if it was not lit, how much more so a bed, which was not made for that purpose! Rather if stated, it was thus stated: Rab Judah said in Rab's name: In the case of a bed which was designated for money, if money was placed upon it,<sup>1</sup> it may not be handled; if money was not placed upon it, it may be handled. But if it was not designated for money, then if money is lying upon it [now], it may not be handled; if money is not lying upon it, it may be handled, provided that there was none upon it at twilight.<sup>2</sup>

R. Eleazar objected: As for its wheel-work, if detachable, it has no connection therewith, is not measured with it, does not protect together with it in [the matter of] a covering above the dead, and it may not be rolled on the Sabbath if there is money upon it.<sup>3</sup> Hence if there is no money upon it [now] it is permitted, though it was there at twilight?-That is according to R. Simeon, who rejects [the law of] mukzeh,<sup>4</sup> whereas Rab agrees with R. Judah.

---

(1) Even on weekdays, and it was removed before the Sabbath. Yet it has thereby been set apart and employed for something (sc. money) that may not be handled on the Sabbath, and therefore may not be handled itself either.

(2) Before the commencement of the Sabbath. For if there was money upon it at twilight, it could not be handled then, and being interdicted then it remains so for the whole Sabbath.

(3) Kel. XVIII, 2. The reference is to the wheel-work of a carriage. It has no connection with the body of the carriage: if either the wheel-work or the carriage comes into contact with an unclean object, the other remains unaffected. Now, a utensil can become unclean only if its capacity is less than forty se'ahs, which Beth Hillel defines as referring to its displacement. Thus, not only is the hollow of the vessel reckoned, but also its sides, etc. Consequently, if the wheel-work were not detachable, its own volume too would be measured in conjunction with the body itself, but being detachable, it is not. Again, if any object or a human being is stationed directly above a corpse, e.g., it is suspended above a grave, even without touching it, it becomes unclean; but if an object of forty se'ahs capacity, e.g., a large box or the body of a carriage, intervenes, it is saved from uncleanness. Now, if the body of this carriage, which is of forty se'ahs capacity, is piled up with articles, some of which protrude and overflow its sides, while the detachable wheel-work too is higher than the body, and thus the wheel-work interposes between these articles and the grave, it does not save them from uncleanness. For the body itself does not intervene, while the wheel-work has not a capacity of forty se'ahs, and it is not counted as part of the whole. The object which becomes unclean is technically called a tent or covering (ohel) of the dead. With respect to the last clause Ri explains: if it is not detachable it may be rolled even if money is lying upon it, because the wheel-work is then only part of the carriage, whilst there is no money upon the body thereof, which is the chief portion.

(4) Nevertheless, since money may not be handled for any purpose whatsoever, he admits that the wheel may not be rolled when there is actually money upon it now.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 45a

Logic too avers that Rab agrees with R. Judah. For Rab said: A lamp may be placed on a palm tree for the Sabbath,<sup>1</sup> but not on a Festival.<sup>2</sup> Now, it is well if you admit that Rab holds as R. Judah: hence he draws a distinction between the Sabbath and Festivals.<sup>3</sup> But if you say that he holds as R. Simeon, what is the difference between the Sabbath and Festivals?<sup>4</sup>

But does Rab hold as R. Judah? Surely Rab was asked: Is it permitted to move the Hanukkah lamp<sup>5</sup> on account of the Guebres on the Sabbath?<sup>6</sup> and he answered them, It is well.<sup>7</sup> -A time of

emergency is different. For R. Kahana and R. Ashi asked Rab: Is that the law? whereat he answered them, R. Simeon is sufficient to be relied upon in an emergency.

Resh Lakish asked R. Johanan: What of wheat sown in the earth or eggs under a fowl?<sup>8</sup> When does R. Simeon reflect [the prohibition of] mukzeh? Where one has not rejected it [an object] with his [own] hands; but where one rejects it with his own hands,<sup>9</sup> he accepts [the interdict of] mukzeh: or perhaps there is no difference? — He answered him: R. Simeon accepts mukzeh only in respect of the oil in the [Sabbath] lamp while it is burning: since it was set apart for its precept,<sup>10</sup> and set apart on account of its prohibition.<sup>11</sup> But does he not [accept it where] it [only] was set apart for its precept?<sup>12</sup> Surely it was taught: If one roofs it [the booth] in accordance with its requirements, beautifies it with hangings and sheets, and suspends therein nuts, peaches, almonds, pomegranates, grape clusters, garlands of ears of corn, wines, oil, and flours, he may not use them until the conclusion of the last Festival day of the Feast; yet if he stipulates concerning them, it is all according to his stipulation.<sup>13</sup> And how do you know that this is R. Simeon's view? Because R. Hiyya b. Joseph recited before R. Johanan: Wood must not be taken from a hut on a Festival,<sup>14</sup> save from what is near it;<sup>15</sup> but R. Simeon permits it.<sup>16</sup> Yet both agree in respect to the sukkah of the Festival<sup>17</sup> that it is forbidden on the Festival;<sup>18</sup> yet if he [the owner] stipulated concerning it, it all depends on his stipulation!<sup>19</sup> — We mean, similar to the oil in the lamp: since it was set apart for its precept, it was set apart for its interdict.<sup>20</sup> It was stated likewise: R. Hiyya b. Abba said in R. Johanan's name: R. Simeon rejects mukzeh save in a case similar to the oil in the lamp while it is burning: since it was set apart for its precept, it was set apart for its interdict.

Rab Judah said in Samuel's name: In R. Simeon's view mukzeh applies only to drying figs and grapes.<sup>21</sup> But [does it apply] to nothing else? Surely it was taught: If one was eating figs, left [some] over, and took them up to the roof to make dried figs; or grapes, and left [some] over and took them up to the roof to make raisins: he may not eat [of them] unless he designates them.<sup>22</sup> And you must say the same of peaches, quinces, and other kinds of fruit.<sup>23</sup> Which Tanna is this? Shall we say, R. Judah: seeing that he maintains [the prohibition of] mukzeh even where one does not reject it with his own hands, how much more so where he does reject it with his own hands!<sup>24</sup> Hence it must surely be R. Simeon?<sup>25</sup> — After all, it is R. Judah, yet the case of eating is necessary: I might argue, since he was engaged in eating, no designation is required; hence we are informed that since he took them up to the roof, he withdrew his thoughts thence.

R. Simeon b. Rabbi asked Rabbi:

---

(1) I.e., before the Sabbath, that it should burn during the Sabbath. There is no fear that he will take and use it if it goes out, thereby technically making use of what is attached to the soil. For since it was mukzeh at twilight it may not be used for the whole of the Sabbath.

(2) For then one may remove it from the tree, replace it, and so on, thus making use of the tree itself, which is prohibited.

(3) He will not remove it from the tree on the Sabbath, because of the interdict of mukzeh, which in this respect does not operate on Festivals.

(4) None at all. Hence he must hold as R. Judah.

(5) After it has been extinguished.

(6) The Parsees, being fire worshippers, forbade the Jews to have fire in their houses during their (the Parsees') festivities. Consequently the Hanukkah lamp, which was lit near the street (supra 21b), would have to be hidden on the approach of a Parsee.

(7) This does not agree with R. Judah.

(8) May they be removed on the Sabbath for use, before the wheat has taken root or the egg become addled?

(9) As here. When one sows wheat in the soil or places an egg under a fowl, he rejects it for the time being.

(10) I.e., for the Sabbath lamp.

(11) Sc. the prohibition of extinguishing a light on the Sabbath renders this oil inaccessible while the lamp is burning. The text follows an old Tosaf. (v. Marginal gloss). Curr. edd.: since it was set apart for its precept, it was set apart (i.e.,

rendered mukzeh and forbidden) for its interdict. But the general context shows that the amended version is preferable.

(12) Viz., that that alone suffices to render it forbidden.

(13) V. supra 22a for notes. Thus we see that mere setting apart for the fulfilment of a precept casts an interdict.

(14) The reference is not to a sukkah (q.v. Glos.) but to an ordinary booth or hut. Even if it collapses during a Festival, one must not take the timber for use, because had it not collapsed it might not be pulled down on the Festival, and this renders it mukzeh.

(15) Or, supporting it. If a bundle of wood was laid against the wall of the hut, in a measure serving as a support, it may be used on the Festival, because that must have been the owner's intention before the Festival, and so it is not mukzeh. Again, its removal will not cause the hut to collapse.

(16) Because he rejects the prohibition of mukzeh,

(17) 'The Festival' without a determinant always means Tabernacles.

(18) if the sukkah collapses, its wood must not be used during the whole seven days of the Festival, as it had been set aside for the precept.

(19) Thus we see that the previous Baraitha does agree with R. Simeon!

(20) I.e., the former alone imposes the interdict.

(21) When they are spread out to dry they cease to be fit for food until fully dried. Hence they are certainly rejected as food, and so even R. Simeon admits the prohibition.

(22) He may not eat them on a Festival, because he has rendered them mukzeh, unless he designates them as food before the Festival, thereby annulling their character of mukzeh.

(23) Though they are fit during the process of drying.

(24) Hence it is unnecessary to state it where he puts fruit aside for drying. Even if he merely stores it is forbidden, according to R. Judah.

(25) Proving that he admits mukzeh in other cases too,

## **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 45b**

What of unripe dates<sup>1</sup> according to R. Simeon? Said he to him: R. Simeon holds that mukzeh applies only to drying figs and raisins.

But does not Rabbi accept mukzeh?<sup>2</sup> Surely we learnt: Pasture animals may not be watered and killed,<sup>3</sup> but home animals may be watered and killed. And it was taught: These are pasture animals: those that go out on Passover and re-enter [the town limits] at the rainfall;<sup>4</sup> home animals: those that go out and graze beyond the tehum and re-enter and spend the night within the tehum.<sup>5</sup> Rabbi said: Both of these are home animals; but the following are pasture animals: those that graze in the meadow<sup>6</sup> and do not enter the town limits<sup>7</sup> either in summer or in winter.<sup>8</sup> -If you wish I can answer: these too are like drying figs and raisins. Alternatively, he<sup>9</sup> answered according to R. Simeon's view, which he himself does not accept. Another alternative: he<sup>10</sup> speaks according to the view of the Rabbis. As for me, I do not accept mukzeh at all;<sup>11</sup> but even on your view, you must at least agree with me that if they go out on Passover and return at the rainfall they are home animals? But the Rabbis answered him: No! they are pasture animals.<sup>12</sup>

Rabbah b. Bar Hanah said in R. Johanan's name: They<sup>13</sup> ruled: The halachah is as R. Simeon. But did R. Johanan say thus? Surely a certain old man of Kirwaya-others say, of Sirvaya-asked R. Johanan: May a fowl-nest be handled on the Sabbath? He answered him: Is it made for aught but fowls?<sup>14</sup> — Here the circumstances are that it contains a dead bird.<sup>15</sup> That is well according to Mar b. Amemar in Raba's name, who said: R. Simeon admits that if living creatures die, they are forbidden;<sup>16</sup> but on the view of Mar son of R. Joseph in Raba's name, who maintained: R. Simeon differed even in respect of living creatures that died, [ruling] that they are permitted, what can be said? — The reference here is to one [sc. a hen coop] that contains an egg.<sup>17</sup> But R. Nahman said: He who accepts [the prohibition of] mukzeh accepts [that of] nolad; he who rejects mukzeh, rejects nolad?-That is when it contains the egg of a fledgling.<sup>18</sup>

When R. Isaac son of R. Joseph came,<sup>19</sup> he said in the name of R. Johanan The halachah is as R. Judah: while R. Joshua b. Levi said: The halachah is as R. Simeon. R. Joseph observed: Hence Rabbah b. Bar Hanah said in R. Johanan's name, They said, The halachah is as R. Simeon: they said, but he himself [R. Johanan] did not rule thus. Said Abaye to R. Joseph: And do you yourself not hold that R. Johanan [rules] as R. Judah?<sup>20</sup> Surely R. Abba and R. Assi visited R. Abba of Haifa,<sup>21</sup> when a candelabrum fell on R. Assi's robe, but he did not remove it. What is the reason? Surely because R. Assi was R. Johanan's disciple, and R. Johanan held as R. Judah, who maintained [the prohibition of] mukzeh?-You speak of a candelabrum? he replied. A candelabrum is different, for R. Aha b. Hanina said in R. Assi's name: Resh Lakish gave a practical ruling in Zidon: A candelabrum which can be lifted with one hand may be moved; that which requires two hands may not be moved. But R. Johanan said: In the matter of a lamp we accept no other view but R. Simeon's; but as for a candelabrum, whether it can be lifted by one hand or by two, it may not be moved.<sup>22</sup> And what is the reason?<sup>23</sup> -Rabbah and R. Joseph both say: Because one appoints a place for it. Said Abaye to R. Joseph, But what of a bridal couch<sup>24</sup> for which [too] one appoints a place, yet Samuel said on R. Hiyya's authority: A bridal couch

- 
- (1) Lit., 'burst dates', i.e., unripe dates that fell off from the tree and were placed in the sun to ripen (Jast.). Others: dates that are split and placed in the sun to ripen. Whilst they are ripening and drying they suffer discoloration and are unfit, yet not so unfit as drying figs and raisins.
- (2) It is now assumed that Rabbi was asked about R. Simeon's view because it is his own too.
- (3) On Festivals. The animals were first watered, to make it easier to flay them.
- (4) Which takes place in Marheshwan: thus they spend about eight months in the commons beyond the town limits.
- (5) V. Glos.
- (6) Outside the town limits.
- (7) Lit., 'inhabited territory'.
- (8) Pasture animals may not be slaughtered on Festivals because they are mukzeh, i.e., their owner has altogether put them out of mind.-Animals were frequently watered before slaughter, in order to facilitate the flaying of their skin.
- (9) Rabbi, in his reply to his son Simeon.
- (10) Rabbi, in the last cited Baraita.
- (11) So that pasture animals, however defined, are permitted.
- (12) On this passage see Bezah, Sonc. ed., p. 202f notes.
- (13) The scholars of the Academy.
- (14) I.e., it is mukzeh, and forbidden. Thus he does not rule as R. Simeon.
- (15) Hence it may not be handled, even according to R. Simeon.
- (16) They may not even be cut up for dogs. That is if they were in good health at twilight, so that one's thoughts were completely turned away from it. If the animal was dying at twilight and perished after nightfall, R. Simeon maintains that it can be cut up for dogs, because the owner must have thought of it.
- (17) Laid that day. It is then nolad (newly created), which R. Simeon admits is forbidden.
- (18) I.e., upon which the fowl is brooding. This is quite unfit and the nest may not be handled on all views.
- (19) From Palestine to Babylon. He was a Palestinian amora, the disciple of R. Abbahu and R. Johanan, and transmitted teachings in the latter's name; he travelled to Babylon (Hul. 101a) and acted as an intermediary between the two countries on religious questions.
- (20) Even before you heard it from R. Isaac.
- (21) A harbour of the Mediterranean sea on the coast of Palestine.
- (22) Hence, but for the dictum of R. Isaac, R. Joseph would not have known R. Johanan's view. But now he knows that in all cases R. Johanan ruled as R. Judah, that mukzeh is forbidden, save in the matter of an old lamp, which he holds may be handled, agreeing there with R. Simeon.
- (23) That a candelabrum which requires both hands for lifting may not be moved.
- (24) Without an overhead awning. V. also T.A. III, 42f, ¶ 122.

may be set up and dismantled on the Sabbath?<sup>1</sup> Rather, said Abaye: [it refers to a candelabrum] of [movable] joints.<sup>2</sup> If So, what is the reason of R. Simeon b. Lakish, who permits it? What is meant by joints'? Similar to joints, viz., it has grooves.<sup>3</sup> Hence, [if it is of real] joints, whether large or small it may not be handled; also, a large one which has grooves is forbidden on account of a large jointed one;<sup>4</sup> where do they differ? in respect to a small grooved one: one Master holds, We forbid it as a preventive measure;<sup>5</sup> while the other Master holds, We do not forbid it thus.<sup>6</sup>

But did R. Johanan rule thus?<sup>7</sup> Surely R. Johanan said: The halachah is [always] as an anonymous Mishnah,<sup>8</sup> and we learnt: As for its wheel-work, if detachable, it has no connection therewith, is not measured with it, and does not protect together with it in [the matter of] a covering over the dead, and it may not be rolled on the Sabbath if there is money upon it.<sup>9</sup> Hence if there is no money upon it, it is permitted, though it was upon it at twilight?<sup>10</sup> — Said. R. Zera: Interpret our Mishnah as meaning<sup>11</sup> that there was no money upon it during the whole of twilight, so as not to overthrow<sup>12</sup> R. Johanan's words.

R. Joshua b. Levi said: Rabbi once went to Diospera<sup>13</sup> and gave a practical ruling in respect to a candelabrum as R. Simeon's view in respect to a lamp.<sup>14</sup> — The scholars asked: Did he give a practical ruling in respect to a candelabrum as R. Simeon's view in respect to a lamp, i.e., permissively; or perhaps he gave a restrictive ruling in respect to a candelabrum, and as R. Simeon in respect to a lamp, i.e., permissively?<sup>15</sup> The question stands over.

R. Malkia visited R. Simlai's home and moved a lamp,<sup>16</sup> to which R. Simlai took exception. R. Jose of Galilee visited the town of R. Jose son of R. Hanina; he moved a lamp, to which R. Jose son of R. Hanina took exception. When R. Abbahu visited R. Joshua b. Levi's town he would move a lamp: when he visited R. Johanan's town he would not move a lamp. What will you: if he holds as R. Judah, let him act accordingly; while if he holds as R. Simeon, let him act accordingly?— In truth, he agreed with R. Simeon, but did not act [thus] out of respect to R. Johanan. R. Judah said: An oil lamp may be handled;<sup>17</sup> a naphtha lamp may not be handled.<sup>18</sup> Rabbah and R. Joseph both maintain: A naphtha [lamp] too may be handled.<sup>19</sup>

R. Awia visited Raba's home. Now, his boots were muddied with clay, [yet] he sat down on a bed before Raba. [Thereupon] Raba was annoyed and wished to vex him. Said he to him: What is the reason that Rabbah and R. Joseph both maintain that a naphtha lamp too may be handled? — Because it is fit for covering a utensil, replied he. If so, all chips of the yard may be handled, since they are fit to cover a utensil?—The one [a naphtha lamp] bears the character of a utensil; the others do not bear the character of a utensil. Was it not taught:

---

(1) The ordinary bed had an overhead awning. Hence when it was set up or dismantled, technically speaking it constituted the erecting or the taking down of a tent, which is forbidden. But that prohibition does not hold good here, since there is no overhead awning.

(2) it may not be handled lest it fall to pieces and be put together again, which is tantamount to making a utensil.

(3) It is all fastened in one piece, but by means of grooves it looks like being moveably jointed.

(4) Since a large one is generally jointed, even if it is only an imitation, it is still forbidden, lest they be confused with each other.

(5) Likewise lest it be confused with a jointed candelabrum.

(6) Since a small one is not generally jointed.

(7) That the halachah is as R. Judah.

(8) If a Mishnah bears no name it represents the final decision of Rabbi and his colleagues.

(9) V. p. 203, n. 6.

(10) Which renders it mukzeh.

(11) Lit., 'let our Mishnah be.' I.e., the Mishnah, Kel. XVIII, 2.

(12) Lit., 'break'.

- (13) Probably Diosopolis = Lydda (Jast.),  
 (14) Menorah is a branched candlestick; ner a single lamp.  
 (15) The exact version of R. Joshua's statement is in doubt.  
 (16) That had gone out.  
 (17) Because it is not repulsive.  
 (18) Even R. Simeon agrees, because of its unpleasant odour it cannot be used for anything save its purpose.  
 (19) Its unpleasant odour does not make it repulsive, whilst at the same time it is fit for covering a utensil.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 46b

Bracelets, ear-rings and [finger]rings are like all utensils which may be handled in a yard.<sup>1</sup> And 'Ulla said: What is the reason? Since they bear the character of a utensil. So here too, since it bears the character of a utensil [it may be handled]. R. Nahman b. Isaac observed: Praised be the All Merciful, that Raba did not put R. Awia to shame.

Abaye pointed out a contradiction to Rabbah: It was taught: The residue of the oil in the lamp or in the dish is forbidden; but R. Simeon permits [it]. Thus we see that R. Simeon rejects mukzeh. But the following opposes it: R. Simeon said: Wherever the blemish was not perceptible from the eve of the Festival, it is not mukan!<sup>2</sup> -How compare! There, a man sits and hopes, When will his lamp go out!<sup>3</sup> But here, does a man sit and hope, When will it receive a blemish?<sup>4</sup> [For] he argues: Who can say that it will receive a blemish? And even if you say that it will, who can say that it will be a permanent blemish?<sup>5</sup> And even if you say that it will be a permanent blemish, who can say that a scholar will oblige him?<sup>6</sup>

Rami b. Hama objected: Vows can be annulled on the Sabbath,<sup>7</sup> and one may apply<sup>8</sup> for absolution from vows where such is necessary for the Sabbath. Yet why: let us argue, who can say that her husband will oblige her?<sup>9</sup> -There it is as R. Phinehas in Raba's name. For R. Phinehas said in Raba's name: Whoever vows does so conditional upon her husband's consent.<sup>10</sup>

Come and hear: One may apply for absolution from vows on the Sabbath where it is necessary for the Sabbath. Yet why? let us argue, Who can say that a Sage will oblige him?-There, if a Sage will not oblige, three laymen suffice; but here,<sup>11</sup> who can say that a Sage will oblige him?<sup>12</sup>

Abaye raised a difficulty before R. Joseph: Did then R. Simeon rule, If it [the lamp] is extinguished, it may be handled: thus, only if it is extinguished, but not if it is not extinguished What is the reason? [Presumably] lest through his handling it, it goes out?<sup>13</sup> But we know R. Simeon to rule that whatever is unintentional is permitted. For it was taught, R. Simeon said: One may drag a bed, seat, or bench, providing that he does not intend to make a rut! — Wherever there is a Scriptural interdict if it is intentional,<sup>14</sup> R. Simeon forbids it by Rabbinical law even if unintentional; but wherever there is [only] a Rabbinical interdict even if it is intentional,<sup>15</sup> R. Simeon permits it at the outset if unintentional.

Raba objected: Clothes' merchants may sell in their normal fashion, providing that one does not intend [to gain protection] from the sun in hot weather or from the rain when it is raining; but the strictly religious sling them on a staff behind their back.<sup>16</sup> Now here, though it is Scripturally intentional, yet if unintentional R. Simeon permits it at the outset?-Rather said Raba,

(1) Though a woman may not wear them in the street; v. infra 59b and M.K. 12b.

(2) V. Bez. 27a. A firstling may not be slaughtered and consumed unless it has a blemish: R. Simeon said that it may not be slaughtered on a Festival unless its blemish was already known on the eve thereof. Otherwise the animal was not mukan, i.e., prepared for the Festival, Thus he accepts the interdict of mukzeh.

(3) To save the oil. Hence R. Simeon holds that it is not really mukzeh.

- (4) Surely not! In fact, he does hope, but without expecting it, whereas one does expect a lamp to go out.
- (5) For a temporary blemish does not permit the animal to be slaughtered.
- (6) A scholar had to examine the blemish and declare it permanent. Could he be sure that he would obtain a scholar for this on the Festival?
- (7) A husband can annul his wife's vows, or a father his daughter's.
- (8) To a scholar.
- (9) When a woman forswears benefit from anything, she thrusts it away from herself, and it becomes like mukzeh. Even if her husband annuls her vow, she could not have anticipated it, and so it should remain mukzeh.
- (10) Hence she relies that her husband will annul it as soon as he is cognizant of it and the object was never mukzeh.
- (11) In the case of the blemish of a firstling.
- (12) Absolution can be granted by a Sage or three laymen; but only a Sage can declare a blemish permanent, unless it is obvious, e.g., when a limb is missing.
- (13) By lifting it up he may create a draught.
- (14) Extinguishing a light is Scripturally forbidden.
- (15) E.g., indirectly making a rut by dragging a heavy article over the floor.
- (16) V. supra 29b.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 47a

leave the lamp, oil, and wicks alone,<sup>1</sup> because they become a base for a forbidden thing.<sup>2</sup>

R. Zera said in R. Assi's name in R. Johanan's name in R. Hanina's name in the name of R. Romanus: Rabbi permitted me to handle a pan with its ashes.<sup>3</sup> Said R. Zera to R. Assi: Did R. Johanan say thus? But we learnt: A man may take up his son while he is holding a stone, or a basket containing a stone. Whereon Rabbah b. Bar Hanah said in R. Johanan's name: The reference is to a basket filled with fruit. Thus, only because it contains fruit; but if it does not contain fruit, it is not so?<sup>4</sup> 'He was astonished for a while,'<sup>5</sup> then answered, Here too it means that it [the pan] contains [also] some grains [of spice]. Abaye objected: Did grains have any value in Rabbi's house?<sup>6</sup> And should you answer, They were fit for the poor, -surely it was taught: 'The garments of the poor for the poor, and the garments of the wealthy for the wealthy'.<sup>7</sup> But those of the poor are not [deemed fit] for the purpose of the wealthy?<sup>8</sup> But said Abaye, it is analogous to a chamber pot.<sup>9</sup> Raba observed: There are two refutations to this. Firstly, a chamber pot is repulsive, while this is not repulsive.<sup>10</sup> And secondly, a chamber pot is uncovered, whereas this is covered!<sup>11</sup> Rather, said Raba, when we were at R. Nahmanis we would handle a brazier on account of its ashes,<sup>12</sup> even if broken pieces of wood were lying upon it.<sup>13</sup>

An objection is raised: And both<sup>14</sup> agree that if it [a lamp] contains fragments of a wick, it may not be handled.<sup>15</sup> Said Abaye: They learnt this of Galilee.<sup>16</sup>

Levi b. Samuel met R. Abba and R. Huna b. Hiyya standing at the door of R. Huna's college. Said he to them: Is it permissible to re-assemble a weaver's frame on the Sabbath?<sup>17</sup> -It is well, answered they. Then he went before Rab Judah, who said: Surely Rab and Samuel both rule: If one re-assembles a weaver's frame on the Sabbath, he is liable to a sin-offering.<sup>18</sup>

An objection is raised: If one puts back the branch of a candelabrum on the Sabbath, he is liable to a sin-offering; as for the joint of a whitewasher's pole,<sup>19</sup> it must not be re-inserted, yet if one does re-insert it, he is exempt, but it is forbidden.<sup>20</sup> R. Simai said: For a circular horn, one is liable; for a straight horn, one is exempt.<sup>21</sup> -They<sup>22</sup> ruled as this Tanna. For it was taught: The sockets of a bed,<sup>23</sup> the legs of a bed, and the archer's tablets,<sup>24</sup> may not be re-inserted, yet if one does re-insert [them], he is not liable [to a sin-offering],

---

(1) They cannot be compared with others.

(2) Sc. the flame. Whilst the lamp is alight everything may be regarded as subsidiary to the flame: R. Simeon admits that such mukzeh is forbidden.

(3) Used for fumigating. This is the meaning as first supposed. Ashes are mukzeh, and it is assumed that he was permitted to move the ashes on account of the pan, which is a utensil.

(4) And the pan is analogous.

(5) Dan. IV, 16.

(6) Surely not! Hence the pan with the ashes may not be handled on their account.

(7) The reference is to the minimum size of material which is liable to defilement as a 'garment'. The smallest size which has any value to a wealthy person is three handbreadths square; if it is less, he throws it away. A poor man, however, endeavours to find a use for it even if it is only three fingerbreadths square, and that accordingly is his minimum (cf. supra 26b seq.). These are the minima for the wealthy and the poor respectively which are technically called garments.

(8) They do not rank as 'garments' when in a wealthy man's possession. The same principle applies here.

(9) Which may be carried away with the excrements, and similarly the pan and ashes.

(10) Hence the former must be removed.

(11) Their shovels or coal pans were covered with a lid or top.

(12) I.e., when the ashes were needed for covering anything. These ashes were counted upon for this from before the Sabbath, and hence the whole might be handled. So here too, R. Romanus states that Rabbi permitted him to handle a

fumigating pan on account of the ashes.

(13) The latter might not be handled, and therefore the utensil which contained it likewise, save that it also contained ashes.

(14) R. Judah and R. Simeon.

(15) The same applies to pieces of wood on a brazier. For the lamp also contains oil, just as the brazier contains ashes too.

(16) Owing to the abundance of oil in Galilee the residue of oil in the lamp would be of no value to its owner, and therefore the lamp with the fragments of wick may not be handled on account of its oil (Tosaf. and R. Nissim Gaon).

(17) The frame or loom consisted of jointed parts, which fitted into each other.

(18) If done in ignorance.

(19) The handle of the painter's brush was jointed, to allow of different lengths according to requirements.

(20) A candelabrum is not taken to pieces frequently, and therefore when one inserts its branches he finishes its manufacture; hence he is liable to a sin-offering, it being a general rule that this is incurred for the completion of any utensil. But a painter's brush is continually taken to pieces; therefore the insertion of one of its parts is only temporary and does not complete it.

(21) These are musical instruments into which reeds were inserted to give various notes; v. T.A. III, 96. The putting together of the former was skilled work; hence liability is incurred. But the latter was assembled amateurishly, being frequently taken to pieces; hence no liability is incurred.—The difficulty is presented by the branch of a candelabrum, whose principle is the same as a weaver's frame.

(22) R. Abba and R. Huna b. Hiyya.

(23) Into which the legs of a bed fitted. to prevent them from being rotted by the damp earth.

(24) Rashi: a small wooden plaque inserted in the bow upon which the arrow presses before it is released. Jast. translates: 'the boards on which the straw rests', but does not make it clear what fitting or joining is required there.

## **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 47b**

but it is forbidden; nor must they be [tightly] fixed in, and if one does so, he is liable to a sin offering. R. Simeon b. Gamaliel said: if it is loose, it is permitted.<sup>1</sup> At R. Hama's home there was a folding bed, which they used to put up on Festivals. Said one of the Rabbis to Raba: What is your view, that it is building from the side?<sup>2</sup> granted that there is no Scriptural prohibition, yet it is Rabbinically forbidden? Said he to him, I agree with R. Simeon b. Gamaliel, who ruled: If it is loose, it is permitted.

**MISHNAH. A VESSEL, MAY BE PLACED UNDER A LAMP TO CATCH THE SPARKS, BUT ONE MUST NOT POUR WATER THEREIN, BECAUSE HE EXTINGUISHES [THEM].**

**GEMARA.** But he deprives the vessel of its readiness?<sup>3</sup> — Said R. Huna the son of R. Joshua: Sparks are intangible.<sup>4</sup>

**BUT ONE MUST NOT POUR WATER THEREIN, BECAUSE HE EXTINGUISHES [THEM].** Shall we say that we learnt anonymously as R. Jose, who maintained: That which is a cause of extinguishing is forbidden?<sup>5</sup> Now, is that logical: granted that R. Jose ruled thus for the Sabbath: did he rule thus for the eve of the Sabbath? And should you say, Here also it refers to the eve of the Sabbath, — surely it was taught: A vessel may be placed under a lamp on the Sabbath to catch the sparks, and on the eve of the Sabbath goes without saying; but one must not pour water therein on the eve of the Sabbath, because he extinguishes [them], and the Sabbath goes without saying?—Rather, said R. Ashi, you may say that it agrees even with the Rabbis: here it is different, because one brings the extinguisher near.<sup>6</sup>

## **CHAPTER IV**

**MISHNAH. WHEREIN MAY WE STORE [FOOD], AND WHEREIN MAY WE NOT STORE**

[IT]?<sup>7</sup> WE MAY NOT STORE [IT] IN PEAT,<sup>8</sup> FOLIAGE,<sup>9</sup> SALT, LIME, OR SAND, WHETHER MOIST OR DRY; NOR IN STRAW, GRAPE-SKINS, SOFT FLOCKING<sup>10</sup> OR HERBAGE, WHEN THEY ARE MOIST; BUT WE MAY STORE [FOOD] IN THEM WHEN THEY ARE DRY.

GEMARA. The scholars propounded: Did we learn, peat of olives, whereas peat of poppy seed is well; or perhaps we learnt peat of poppy seed, and how much more so of olives?-Come and hear: For R. Zera said on the authority of one of the disciples of the School of R. Jannai: A basket in which one put away [food]<sup>11</sup> may not be placed on peat of olives. This proves that we learnt peat of olives!-[No.] After all I may tell you that in respect of storing [peat] of poppy seed too is forbidden; [but] as for

---

(1) I.e., if it is so constructed that it need be only loosely joined, it is permitted even at the very outset. R. Abba and R. Huna b. Hiyya likewise refer to branches that sit lightly in their sockets.

(2) The technical term for work not done in a professional and usual way.-I.e., do you think that because it is loosely fitted it does not constitute building?

(3) V. p. 196, n. 5.

(4) V. p. 198, n. 2.

(5) Even if one does not directly extinguish; v. infra 120a.

(6) By pouring water into the vessel, And therefore as a preventive measure it is forbidden, also on the eve of sabbath. But in the case below, q.v., it is indirect extinguishing, because the heat must first cause the jars to burst before the water is released.

(7) When a pot is removed from the fire on the eve of the Sabbath, it may be stored in anything that preserves heat, but not in something that adds heat (supra 34b).

(8) I.e., a pressed, hard mass. The Gemara discusses which mass is meant.

(9) Zebel is foliage piled up for forming manure.

(10) E.g., rags, wool, etc.

(11) For the Sabbath, to preserve its heat.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 48a

causing heat to ascend,<sup>1</sup> [peat] of olives causes heat to ascend, but not [peat] of poppy seed.

Rabbah and R. Zera visited the Resh Galutha,<sup>2</sup> and saw a slave place a pitcher of water on the mouth of a kettle.<sup>3</sup> Thereupon Rabbah rebuked him. Said R. Zera to him: Wherein does it differ from a boiler [placed] upon a boiler?<sup>4</sup> -There he [merely] preserves [the heat]<sup>5</sup>, he replied, whereas here he creates it.<sup>6</sup> Then he saw him spread a turban over the mouth of a cask and place a cup<sup>7</sup> upon it. Thereupon Rabbah rebuked him. Said R. Zera to him: Why? You will soon see,<sup>8</sup> said he. Subsequently he saw him [the servant] wringing it out.<sup>9</sup> Wherein does this differ from [covering a cask with] a rag?<sup>10</sup> he asked him. There one is not particular about it;<sup>11</sup> here he is particular about it.<sup>12</sup>

[NOR WITH] STRAW. R. Adda b. Mattenah asked Abaye: Is it permissible to handle flocking in which one stored [food]?<sup>13</sup> Said he to him: Because he lacks a bundle of straw, does he arise and renounce a bundle of soft flocking?<sup>14</sup> - Shall we say that the following supports him: We may store [food] in wool clip, hatchelled wool, strips of purple [wool],<sup>15</sup> and flocking, but they may not be handled?-As for that, it is no proof: this may be its meaning: if one did not store [food] in them, they may not be handled. If so, why state it?<sup>16</sup> -You might say, They are fit for reclining:<sup>17</sup> hence we are told [otherwise].

R. Hisda permitted stuffing to be replaced in a pillow on the Sabbath. R. Hanan b. Hisda objected to R. Hisda: The neck [of a shirt] may be undone on the Sabbath,<sup>18</sup> but may not be opened;<sup>19</sup> nor

may flocking be put into a pillow or a bolster on a Festival, and on the Sabbath it goes without saying?—There is no difficulty: one refers to new ones, the other to old ones.<sup>20</sup> It was taught likewise: Flocking may not be put into a pillow or a bolster on the Festival, and on the Sabbath it need not be stated; if it falls out, it may be replaced [even] on the Sabbath, while on Festivals it goes without saying.

Rab Judah said in Rab's name: One who opens the neck [of a shirt] on the Sabbath incurs a sin-offering.<sup>21</sup> R. Kahana objected:

- (1) As here, the food is stored in a substance which does not add heat, but heat may mount up from the peat and penetrate the basket.
- (2) Head of the Exile, Exilarch, official title of the head of Babylonian and Persian Jewry, whose authority was recognized and sustained by the State. V. J.E. V, p. 228, s.v. Exilarch.
- (3) The pitcher contained cold water, and the kettle was hot.
- (4) Which is permissible; 51b.
- (5) For the upper boiler too is filled with hot water.
- (6) The kettle below heats the cold water in the pitcher.
- (7) Natla is a ladle or a small vessel for taking liquid out of a large vessel.
- (8) Lit., 'you see now'.
- (9) This is forbidden on the Sabbath.
- (10) Which is permitted, and we do not fear that the owner will wring it dry. And though the servant did so here, yet on what grounds did Rabbah rebuke him at the outset?
- (11) He does not mind if the rag remains wet.
- (12) Hence he is likely to wring it.
- (13) Normally they may not be handled; the question is whether this use converts it into a 'utensil' which may be handled on the Sabbath.
- (14) Where possible straw is used, because it is cheaper. When one must use rags, he does not on that account renounce them, i.e., declare that they have no value in his eyes save for that purpose, but they remain independent, as it were, just as before they were so used: hence they may not be handled.
- (15) **אָרְגָמָן** is translated purple in E.V. (Ex. XXV, 4). But this was an extremely costly dye, and its proposed use here for storing food shows that such is not meant. It is rather a scarlet red dye, more brilliant than purple but not so enduring; v. T.A. I, 146f.
- (16) In their present state they cannot be used, hence they certainly do not rank as 'utensils'.
- (17) So that they are utensils.
- (18) When it is returned by the launderer, who generally tied the neck up.
- (19) The first time after it is sewn. This opening makes it fit for wear and thus finishes its work.
- (20) A pillow etc., must not be stuffed for the first time, as that is part of its manufacture; but if the stuffing falls out, it may be replaced.
- (21) V. n. 1.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 48b

What is the difference between this and the bung of a barrel?<sup>1</sup> —Said Raba to him: The one is an integral part thereof, whereas the other is not.

R. Jeremiah pointed out a contradiction to R. Zera. We learnt: The fuller's loosely stitched bundle,<sup>2</sup> or a bunch of keys, or a garment stitched together with kil'ayim thread<sup>3</sup> are counted as connected in respect of uncleanness,<sup>4</sup> until one begins to undo them. This proves that they are [regarded as] joined even not at the time of work.<sup>5</sup> But the following is opposed thereto: If a stick is improvised to serve as a handle for an axe, it is counted as connected in respect of uncleanness at the time of work. [Thus,] only at the time of work, but not otherwise? — There, he replied, a man is wont to throw it [the handle] among the timber when it is not being used. Here, a man prefers [that

pieces remain together]<sup>6</sup> even not at the time of work, so that if they are soiled he can rewash them.<sup>7</sup>

In Sura the following discussion was recited in R. Hisda's name. in Pumbeditha it was recited in R. Kahana's name-others state, in Raba's name. Who is the Tanna responsible for the statement of the Rabbis: Whatever is joined to an article is counted as the article itself?-Said Rab Judah in Rab's name, It is R. Meir. For we learnt: The receptacles on a stove for the oil-flask, spicepot, and the lamp are defiled through contact, but not through air space: this is R. Meir's opinion. But R. Simeon declares them clean.<sup>8</sup> Now, as for R. Simeon, it is well: he holds that they are not as the stove. But according to R. Meir, — if they are as the stove, let them be defiled even through air space; if they are not as the stove, let them not be defiled even through contact?In truth, they are not as the stove, but the Rabbis decreed [uncleanness] in their case. If they decreed it, let them be defiled even through air space too?-The Rabbis made a distinction, so that people might not come to burn terumah and holy food on account of them.<sup>9</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: A shears of separate blades<sup>10</sup> and the cutter of a [carpenter's] plane are [counted as] connected in respect of uncleanness,<sup>11</sup> but not in respect of sprinkling.<sup>12</sup> What will you: if they are both [counted as] connected, [they are so] even in respect of sprinkling too; if [they do] not [count as] connected, [they are not so] even in respect of defilement?-Said Raba: By Scriptural law, when in use they are [counted as] connected in respect of both defilement and sprinkling, when not in use, they are [counted as] connected in respect of neither defilement nor sprinkling,

---

(1) Which according to the Rabbis infra 146a, may be pierced on the Sabbath.

(2) Of linen; they used to sew articles of washing loosely together, to prevent loss.

(3) V. Glos.

(4) If one part becomes unclean, the others are likewise, though they are sure to be untied at a later stage.

(5) E.g., the fuller's bundle need be sewn together only at the actual washing, yet the single pieces are regarded as one even afterwards, so long as one has not commenced to untie them.

(6) That the pieces remain together until required.

(7) Without having to search for the pieces.

(8) Separate receptacles for a flask of oil, spices, and a lamp were attached to earthen stoves. These stoves are defiled in two ways: (i) when an unclean object actually touches them on the inside; (ii) if an unclean object is suspended within their cavity, i.e., their air space. R. Meir holds that in the first case the attached receptacles too are defiled, as part of the stove, but not in the second; while R. Simeon maintains that they remain clean in both cases.

(9) If these receptacles, having been defiled through the stove, came into contact with terumah and holy food, they are unclean in their turn, but only by Rabbinical law, whereas they must be unclean by Scriptural law before they may be burnt. Hence the Rabbis limited their defilement, that it might be fully understood that it is merely Rabbinical.

(10) Lit., 'joints'

(11) If one part becomes unclean the other is too.

(12) If a utensil is defiled through a corpse, it needs sprinkling of water mixed with the ashes of the red heifer to render it clean (v. Num. XIX). If the mixture is sprinkled on one part but not on the other the latter is not cleansed.

## **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 49a**

But the Rabbis imposed a preventive measure in respect of defilement, when they are not in use,<sup>1</sup> on account of defilement when they are in use;<sup>2</sup> and in respect of sprinkling, when they are in use,<sup>3</sup> on account of when they are not in use.

WHEN THEY ARE MOIST. The Scholars propounded: Naturally moist, or artificially moist?<sup>4</sup> — Come and hear: [WE MAY NOT STORE . . .] IN STRAW, (GRAPE-SKINS, FLOCKING OR HERBAGE WHEN THEY ARE MOIST. Now, if you say [that it means] artificially moistened, it is well; but if you say, naturally moist, how can flocking be naturally moist?-[It is possible] in the case of wool plucked from between the flanks.<sup>5</sup> And as to what R. Oshaia taught: We may store [food] in

a dry cloth<sup>6</sup> and in dry produce, but not in a damp cloth or moist produce,-how is naturally damp cloth possible?-In the case of- wool plucked from between the flanks.

MISHNAH. WE MAY STORE [FOOD] IN, GARMENTS, PRODUCE,<sup>7</sup> DOVES' WINGS, CARPENTERS' SAWDUST<sup>8</sup> AND THOROUGHLY BEATEN HATCHELLED FLAX. R. JUDAH FORBIDS [STORING] IN FINE, BUT PERMITS [IT] IN COARSE [BEATEN FLAX].

GEMARA. R. Jannai said: Tefillin<sup>9</sup> demand a pure body, like Elisha, the man of wings. What does this mean?-Abaye said: That one must not pass wind while wearing them; Raba said: That one must not sleep in them.<sup>10</sup> And why is he called the man of wings'? Because the wicked Roman government once proclaimed a decree against Israel that whoever donned tefillin should have his brains pierced through;<sup>11</sup> yet Elisha put them on and went out into the streets. [When] a quaestor saw him, he fled before him, whereupon he gave pursuit. As he overtook him he [Elisha] removed them from his head and held them in his hand. 'What is that in your hand?' he demanded. 'The wings of a dove,' was his reply. He stretched out his hand and lo! they were the wings of a dove. Therefore he is called 'Elisha the man of the wings'. And why the wings of a dove rather than that of other birds? Because the Congregation of Israel is likened to a dove, as it is said, as the wings of a dove covered with silver:<sup>12</sup> just as a dove is protected by its wings, so is Israel protected by the precepts.<sup>13</sup>

IN CARPENTERS' SAWDUST, etc. The scholars propounded: Does R. Judah refer to carpenters' sawdust or to hatchelled flax? Come and hear: R. Judah said: Fine hatchelled flax is like foliage.<sup>14</sup> This proves that he refers to hatchelled flax. This proves it.

MISHNAH. WE MAY STORE [FOOD] IN FRESH HIDES, AND THEY MAY BE HANDLED;<sup>15</sup> IN WOOL SHEARINGS, BUT THEY MAY NOT BE HANDLED.<sup>16</sup> WHAT THEN IS DONE? THE LID [OF THE POT] IS LIFTED, AND THEY [THE SHEARINGS] FALL OFF OF THEIR OWN ACCORD. R. ELEAZAR B. AZARIAH SAID: THE BASKET<sup>17</sup> IS LIFTED ON ONE SIDE AND [THE FOOD] IS REMOVED, LEST ONE LIFT [THE LID OF THE POT] AND BE UNABLE TO REPLACE IT.<sup>18</sup> BUT THE SAGES SAY: ONE MAY TAKE AND REPLACE [IT].<sup>19</sup> GEMARA. R. Jonathan b. Akinai and R. Jonathan b. Eleazar were sitting, and R. Hanina b. Hama sat with them and it was asked: Did we learn, FRESH HIDES belonging to a private individual, but those of an artisan, since he is particular about them<sup>20</sup> may not be handled; or perhaps, we learnt about those of an artisan, and all the more so those of a private individual?-Said R. Jonathan b. Eleazar to them: It stands to reason that we learnt about those belonging to a private individual, but as for those of an artisan, he is particular about them. Thereupon R. Hanina b. Hama observed to them: Thus did R. Ishmael b. R. Jose say:

---

(1) That both limbs should count as one.

(2) To prevent laxity in the latter case,

(3) That they should not count as one.

(4) Lit., 'through themselves or through something else'. The former throws out more heat.

(5) Of a living animal: this contains its own moisture.

(6) Lit., 'raiment'.

(7) E.g., corn or pulse.

(8) Or, shavings.

(9) V. Glos.

(10) Phylacteries used to be worn all day.

(11) V. infra 130a.

(12) Ps. LXVIII, 14.

(13) In Gen. R. XXXIX, 8 the point of comparison is stated thus: all birds fly with both wings, and when exhausted they rest on a crag or rock; but the dove, when tired, rests on one wing and flies with the other. So Israel, when driven from one country, finds refuge and rest in another; v. also note a.l. in Sonc. ed.

(14) Which may not be used; supra 47b.

(15) Whether food was put away in them or not. They are fit for reclining upon, and therefore rank as utensils, which may be handled.

(16) Because they are mukzeh, being set aside to be woven and spun.

(17) Containing the pot and the shearings,

(18) If the pot is bodily lifted out, the shearings may all collapse, and since they must not be handled, they cannot be parted in order to replace the pot.

(19) This is discussed in the Gemara.

(20) He has to sell, and is therefore particular not to spoil them. This may render them mukzeh.

## **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 49b**

My father was a hide worker, and he would say: Fetch hides and that we may sit on them.<sup>1</sup>

An objection is raised: Boards belonging to a householder may be handled; those of an artisan may not be handled;<sup>2</sup> but if one intended to place bread upon them for guests, in both cases they may be handled? — Boards are different, for one is [certainly] particular about them.

Come and hear: Hides, whether tanned or not, may be handled on the Sabbath, 'tanned' being specified only in respect to uncleanness.<sup>3</sup> Now surely, no distinction is drawn whether they belong to a householder or an artisan? — No: [It means those] of a householder. But what of those of an artisan? They may not be handled? If so, when it is taught, "'tanned" being specified only in respect to uncleanness,' let a distinction be drawn and taught in that itself: [viz.,] when is that said? [Only] of those belonging to a householder, but not concerning those of an artisan?—The whole deals with those of a householder.<sup>4</sup>

This is dependent on Tannaim: Hides of a private individual may be handled, but those of an artisan may not: R. Jose maintained: Either the one or the other may be handled.

Again they<sup>5</sup> sat and pondered: Regarding what we learnt, The principal categories of labour<sup>6</sup> are forty less one,—to what do they correspond?<sup>7</sup> —Said R. Hanina b. Hama to them: To the forms of labour in the Tabernacle.<sup>8</sup> R. Jonathan son of R. Eleazar said to them, Thus did R. Simeon b. R. Jose b. Lakonia say: They correspond to [the words] 'work' [melakah], 'his work' [melakto], and 'the work of' [meleketh], which are [written] thirty-nine times in the Torah.<sup>9</sup> R. Joseph asked: Is 'and he went into the house to do his work'<sup>10</sup> included in this number, or not?—Said Abaye to him, Then let a Scroll of the Torah be brought and we will count! Did not Rabbah b. Bar Hanah say in R. Johanan's name: They did not stir thence until they brought a Scroll of the Torah and counted them?<sup>11</sup> The reason that I am doubtful, replied he, is because it is written, for the work<sup>12</sup> they had was sufficient:<sup>13</sup> is that of the number, while this<sup>14</sup> is [to be interpreted] in accordance with the view that he entered to perform his business;<sup>15</sup> or perhaps and he went into the house to do his work' is of the number, while this 'for the work they had was sufficient' is meant thus: their business was completed?<sup>16</sup> The question stands over.

It was taught as the opinion that it corresponds to the forms of labour in the Tabernacle. For it was taught: Liability is incurred only for work of which the same was performed in the Tabernacle. They sowed, hence ye must not sow; they reaped, hence ye must not reap;<sup>17</sup> they lifted up the boards from the ground to the waggon,<sup>18</sup> hence ye must not carry in from a public to a private domain; they lowered the boards from the waggon to the ground, hence ye must not carry out from a private to a public domain; they transported [boards, etc.,] from waggon to waggon, hence ye must not carry from one private to another private domain. 'From one private to another private domain'— what [wrong] is done? Abaye and Raba both explained — others say, R. Adda b. Ahabah: It means from one private to another private domain via public ground.

IN WOOL. SHEARINGS, BUT THEY MAY NOT BE HANDLED. Raba said: They learnt this only where one had not stored [food] in them; but if one had stored food in them [on that Sabbath], they may be handled. A certain student of one day's standing<sup>19</sup> refuted Raba: WE MAY STORE [FOOD] ... IN WOOL. SHEARINGS, BUT THEY MAY NOT BE HANDLED. WHAT THEN IS DONE?

- 
- (1) This shows that he was not particular.
  - (2) This shows that an artisan is particular.
  - (3) Tanned hides are subject to the laws of defilement; untanned hides are not.
  - (4) In whose case no distinction can be drawn between tanned and untanned skins save in respect of defilement.
  - (5) The Rabbis maintained above.
  - (6) Forbidden on the Sabbath; for aboth, lit., 'fathers', v. supra 2b.
  - (7) On what basis are they selected?
  - (8) Every form of labour necessary in the Tabernacle was regarded as a principal category of work forbidden on the Sabbath. This is learnt from the juxtaposition of the commands concerning the Sabbath and the erection of the Tabernacle, Ex. XXXV, 1-3;4 seq.
  - (9) Lit., 'forty times minus one'.
  - (10) Gen. XXXIX, 11
  - (11) Rashi conjectures that the reference may be to the waw (ו) of gahown (גחון); v. Kid, 30a.
  - (12) E.V. 'stuff'.
  - (13) Ex. XXXVI, 7.
  - (14) 'And he went into the house to do his work',
  - (15) A euphemism for adultery; v. Sot. 36b. In that case melakto (his work) does not connote actual work, and is not included.
  - (16) They had brought all the materials required. On this supposition the verse is translated as in the E.V.
  - (17) Certain vegetables had to be sown and reaped to provide dyes for the hangings.
  - (18) The ground was a public domain, while the waggon was a private domain.
  - (19) I.e., who had come to the college for the first time that day. V. Hag. 5b.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 50a

THE LID [OF THE POT] IS LIFTED, AND THEY [THE SHEARINGS] FALL. OFF OF THEIR OWN ACCORD.<sup>1</sup> Rather if stated, it was thus stated: Raba said: They learnt this only when one had not designated them for storing, but if he had, they may be handled. It was stated likewise: When Rabin came,<sup>2</sup> he said in the name of R. Jacob in the name of R. Assi b. Saul in Rab's name: They learnt this only where one had not designated them for [constant]<sup>3</sup> storing; but if he had designated them for [constant) storing, they may be handled. Rabina said: They [the Sages of the Mishnah] learnt in reference to the [merchant's] shelves.<sup>4</sup> it was taught likewise: Wool shearings of the shelves may not be handled; but if a private individual prepared them for use, they may be handled.

Rabbah b. Bar Hanah recited before Rab: If one cuts down dried branches of a palm tree for fuel and then changes his mind, [intending them] for a seat, he must tie [them] together;<sup>5</sup> R. Simeon b. Gamaliel said: He need not tie them together. He recited it and he stated it: The halachah is as R. Simeon b. Gamaliel.

It was stated: Rab said: He must tie [them] together; Samuel maintained: He must intend [to sit upon them]: while R. Assi ruled: If he sits upon them,<sup>6</sup> though he had neither tied nor intended them [for sitting, it is well].<sup>7</sup> As for Rab, it is well: he rules as the first Tanna: and Samuel too [is not refuted, for he] rules as R. Simeon b. Gamaliel. But according to whom does R. Assi rule?-He rules as the following Tanna. For it was taught: One may go out [into the street] with a wool tuft or a flake of Wool,<sup>8</sup> if he had dipped them [in oil]<sup>9</sup> and tied them with a cord. If he did not dip them [in oil]

and tie them with a cord, he may not go out with them; yet if he had gone out with them for one moment<sup>10</sup> before nightfall,<sup>11</sup> even if he had not dipped or tied them with a cord, he may go out with them [on the Sabbath].<sup>12</sup>

R. Ashi said, We too have learnt [so]: One must not move straw [lying] upon a bed with his hand, yet he may move it with his body;<sup>13</sup> but if it is fodder for animals, or a pillow or a sheet was upon it before nightfall,<sup>14</sup> he may move it with his hand.<sup>15</sup>

And which Tanna disagrees with R. Simeon b. Gamaliel? R. Hanina b. Akiba. For when R. Dimi came,<sup>16</sup> he said in the name of Ze'iri in R. Hanina's name: R. Hanina b. Akiba once went to a certain place and found dried branches of a palm tree cut down, and he said to his disciples, 'Go out and declare your intention,<sup>17</sup> so that we may be able to sit upon them tomorrow'. And I do not know whether it was a house of feasting or a house of mourning.<sup>18</sup> Since he says, '[I do not know] whether it was a house of feasting or a house of mourning', [it implies] only there, because they are occupied;<sup>19</sup> but elsewhere it must be tied together; but if not, it is not [permitted].

Rab Judah said: A man may bring a sack full of earth [into the house] and use it for his general needs.<sup>20</sup> Mar Zutra lectured in the name of Mar Zutra Rabbah: Providing that he allotted a certain corner to it.<sup>21</sup> Said the students before R. Papa: With whom [does this agree]: R. Simeon b. Gamaliel? For if with the Rabbis, — an act is required!<sup>22</sup> -R. Papa answered: You may even say, with the Rabbis. The Rabbis ruled that an act is required only where an act is possible,<sup>23</sup> but not where it is impossible.<sup>24</sup>

Shall we say that this is disputed by Tannaim? Utensils may be cleaned<sup>25</sup> with anything,<sup>26</sup> save silver vessels with white earth.<sup>27</sup> This [implies] that natron<sup>28</sup> and sand are permitted. But surely it was taught, Natron and sand are forbidden? Surely they differ in this: one Master holds that an act is required,<sup>29</sup> while the other Master holds that no act is required? No. All agree that no act is required, yet there is no difficulty: one is according to R. Judah, who maintains, What is unintentional is forbidden; the other is according to R. Simeon, who rules, What is unintentional is permitted.<sup>30</sup>

How have you explained the view that it is permitted? As agreeing with R. Simeon! Then consider the last clause: But one must not cleanse his hair with them.<sup>31</sup> Rather if R. Simeon, surely he permits it? For we learnt:

---

(1) This proves that even when food was stored in the shearings on that day, they may not be handled.

(2) V. p. 12, n. 9.

(3) So Rashi.

(4) Wool shearings stored in the merchant's shelves are certainly not designated for storing, and even if thus employed they will eventually be replaced in the shelves. Hence they may not be handled even if used for storing. But Raba referred to ordinary shorn wool: when one employs them for such a purpose, it is as though he designated them for storing, and therefore they may be handled. Thus Rabina justifies the first version of Raba's statement.

(5) Before the Sabbath, thus indicating their purpose, Otherwise they are regarded as fuel and may not be handled on the Sabbath, a change of mind without corresponding action being of no account. — 'Intended' means that this was verbally stated, and not mental.

(6) Before the Sabbath.

(7) He may handle and use them as a seat on the Sabbath.

(8) Both used as a dressing for a wound. Tosaf. translates a wig.

(9) So Rashi. He thereby shows that his purpose is to prevent his garments from chafing the wound. Rashal deletes 'in oil', and translates: if he had dyed them, thus rendering them an adornment. Otherwise, on both translations, they are a burden and may not be taken out into the street.

(10) Lit., 'one hour'.

(11) Lit., 'while yet daytime' -i.e., before the Sabbath.

- (12) The principle is the same as in R. Assi's ruling.
- (13) Generally speaking, straw is meant for fuel or brickmaking, and is therefore mukzeh. Therefore if straw is lying on a bed, not having been designated for a mattress, one must not move it with his hand to straighten it and make the bed more comfortable, but he may do so with his body, because that is an unusual manner (v. p. 201, n. 1 and p. 115, n. 7).
- (14) Lit., 'by day' -i.e., if one had lain upon it before the Sabbath, though he had neither put aside the straw nor declared his intention to use it as a mattress.
- (15) Here too the principle is the same as in R. Assi's ruling.
- (16) V. P. 12, n. 9,
- (17) To sit upon them on the Sabbath.
- (18) This is Ze'iri's comment.
- (19) Lit., 'troubled'. For that reason mere intention was sufficient.
- (20) On the Sabbath or Festivals. This must be done before the Sabbath or Festivals.
- (21) Which renders it prepared (mukan) for these purposes.
- (22) The equivalent of tying the branches.
- (23) Lit., 'for something that can be the subject of an act'.
- (24) Nothing can be done to the earth to show that it is meant for a particular purpose.
- (25) Lit., 'rubbed'.
- (26) On the Sabbath.
- (27) A kind of chalk. Rashi: **סלסול** i.e., the tartar deposited in wine vessels; Aruch: pulverized resin, These do more than cleanse, but actually smooth the silver, which is forbidden work.
- (28) V. Sanh., Sonc. ed., p. 330, n. 5.
- (29) To show its purpose, and since such is impossible, they are forbidden, but not because there is anything objectionable in them per se.
- (30) Supra, 22a, 29b. Natron and sand sometimes smooth the silver too, in addition to cleansing it, but that smoothing is unintentional. But white chalk always smooths: hence all rule it out.
- (31) Because it pulls hair out.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 50b

A nazirite may cleanse [his hair]<sup>1</sup> and part it,<sup>2</sup> but he must not comb it.<sup>3</sup> Rather both are according to R. Judah, yet two Tannaim differ as to R. Judah's view: one Tanna holds that in R. Judah's view they [natron and sand] smooth,<sup>4</sup> while the other Tanna holds that in R. Judah's view they do not smooth. How have you explained them? As agreeing with R. Judah! Then consider the second clause: 'But the face, hands, and feet are permitted';<sup>5</sup> but surely it removes the hair?-If you wish, I can answer that it refers to a child; alternatively, to a woman, another alternative, to a eunuch [by nature].<sup>6</sup>

Rab Judah said: Powdered brick is permitted.<sup>7</sup> R. Joseph said: Poppy pomace [scented] with jasmine is permitted.<sup>8</sup> Raba said: Crushed pepper is permitted. R. Shesheth said: Barda is permitted. What is barda?-Said R. Joseph: [A compound consisting of] a third aloes, a third myrtle, and a third violets. R. Nehemiah b. Joseph said: Providing that there is not a greater quantity of aloes, it is well.<sup>9</sup>

R. Shesheth was asked: Is it permissible to bruise olives on the Sabbath?<sup>10</sup> He answered them: Who permitted it then on weekdays? (He holds [that it is forbidden] on account of the destruction of food).<sup>11</sup> Shall we say that he disagrees with Samuel; for Samuel said: One may do whatever he desires with bread?-I will tell you: A loaf [crumbled] is not repulsive, but these are.

Amemar, Mar Zutra, and R. Ashi were sitting, when barda was brought before them.<sup>12</sup> Amemar and R. Ashi washed [their hands therewith]; Mar Zutra did not. Said they to him, Do you not accept R. Shesheth's ruling that barda is permitted? R. Mordecai answered them: Exclude the Master [Mar Zutra], who does not hold it [permitted] even on weekdays. His view is as what was taught: One may scrape off the dirt scabs and wound scabs that are on his flesh because of the pain;<sup>13</sup> [but] if in order to beautify himself, it is forbidden.<sup>14</sup> And whose view do they adopt? — As what was taught: One

must wash his face, hands, and feet daily in his Maker's honour, for it is said, The Lord hath made every thing for his own purpose.<sup>15</sup>

R. ELEAZAR B. AZARIAH SAID: THE BASKET IS TILTED ON ONE SIDE AND [THE FOOD] IS REMOVED, LEST ONE LIFT [THE LID OF THE POT], etc. R. Abba said in R. Hiyya b. Ashi's name: All agree that if the cavity becomes disordered,<sup>16</sup> we may not replace [the pot].<sup>17</sup> We learnt: BUT THE SAGES SAY: ONE MAY TAKE AND REPLACE [IT]. What are the circumstances? If the cavity is not disordered, the Rabbis [surely] say well?<sup>18</sup> Hence it must mean even if the cavity becomes disordered!-No. In truth, it means that the cavity was not disordered, but here they differ as to whether we fear. One Master holds: We fear lest the cavity become disordered;<sup>19</sup> while the other Master holds: We do not fear.

R. Hana said: With respect to selikustha,<sup>20</sup> if one put it in, drew it out, and put it in again,<sup>21</sup> it is permitted;<sup>22</sup> if not, it is forbidden.

Samuel said: As regards the knife between the rows of bricks,<sup>23</sup> — if one inserted it, withdrew it, and reinserted it,<sup>24</sup> it is permitted; if not, it is forbidden. Mar Zutra-others state R. Ashi-said: Yet it is well [to insert a knife] between the branches of a reed hedge.<sup>25</sup> R. Mordecai said to Raba, R. Kattina raised an objection: if one stores turnips or radishes under a vine, provided some of their leaves are uncovered, he need have no fear

---

(1) By rubbing it (hafaf denotes to rub) with sand or natron.

(2) With his fingers (Jast.). Rashi: he may beat out his hair.

(3) With a comb. A nazirite may not cut his hair (v. Num, VI, 5); a comb is certain to pull some hair out (v. T.A. II, 197 and note a.l.), and therefore it is forbidden as cutting. Now the first clause permits sand or natron: it can only agree with R. Simeon, who holds that what is unintentional is permitted, and it must be assumed therefore that sand or natron is not bound to pull out the hair. But that being so, R. Simeon will permit it on the Sabbath too.

(4) Lit., 'scrape'.

(5) This follows the prohibition of cleansing the hair with natron or sand.

(6) None of these three have hair on the face or body.

(7) For cleaning the face, even to one who has a beard.

(8) To be used as lotion.

(9) He permits even more than a third of aloes, but there must not be more of aloes than of the other ingredients combined, because aloes act as a depilatory.

(10) May olives be bruised on a stone, which improves their taste? (Rashi) Ri: May one rub his face with olives, using them as a detergent?

(11) He regarded it as wanton waste.

(12) On Sabbath.

(13) Which their presence causes him.

(14) Rashi: on account of, neither shall a man put on a woman's garment (Deut. XXII, 5), which he interprets as a general injunction against aping femininity. Self adornment for its own sake is a woman's prerogative!

(15) Prov. XVI, 4.

(16) Its walls collapsing.

(17) Because we thereby move the shearings.

(18) There can be no reason for prohibiting its return.

(19) If one is permitted to remove the pot without tilting the basket on one side, we fear that he might replace it even if the walls of the cavity happened to collapse.

(20) A fragrant plant used after meals in place of burnt spices (Jast.). it was removed from its pot earth, its fragrance inhaled, and then put back.

(21) Before the Sabbath, thus loosening the earth around it.

(22) To remove it from the pot and replace it on the Sabbath.

(23) Where it was inserted for safety (Rashi).

(24) Cf. n. 3.

(25) The branches spreading from a common stem (Jast.). We do not fear that in removing it he may scrape off the peel of the reeds, which is forbidden.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 51a

on account of kil'ayim,<sup>1</sup> or the seventh year,<sup>2</sup> or tithes,<sup>3</sup> and they may be removed on the Sabbath.<sup>4</sup> This is indeed a refutation.<sup>5</sup>

MISHNAH. IF IT [A POT] WAS NOT COVERED' WHILE IT WAS YET DAY, IT MAY NOT BE COVERED AFTER NIGHTFALL.<sup>6</sup> IF IT WAS COVERED BUT BECAME UNCOVERED, IT MAY BE RECOVERED. A CRUSE MAY BE FILLED WITH [COLD] WATER AND PLACED UNDER A PILLOW OR BOLSTER.<sup>7</sup>

GEMARA. Rab Judah said in Samuel's name: Cold [water, food, etc.]<sup>8</sup> may be hidden.; Said R. Joseph, What does he inform us? We learnt: A CRUSE MAY BE FILLED WITH [COLD] WATER AND PLACED UNDER A PILLOW OR A BOLSTER. Abaye answered him: He tells us much. For if [we learnt] from the Mishnah [alone], I might argue: That applies only to an object which it is not customary to store away,<sup>9</sup> but not to an object which it is customary to store away.<sup>10</sup> Therefore he informs us [that it is not so]. R. Huna said on Rabbi's authority: Cold [water, food, etc.] may not be hidden.<sup>11</sup> But it was taught: Rabbi permitted cold [water, etc.] to be hidden?-There is no difficulty: the one [ruling was given] before he heard it from R. Ishmael son of R. Jose; the other after he heard it [from him]. For Rabbi sat and declared: Cold [water, etc.] may not be hidden. Said R. ishmael son of R. Jose to him, My father permitted cold [water] to be hidden. Then the Elder<sup>12</sup> has already given a ruling, answered he.<sup>13</sup> R. Papa observed: Come and see how much they loved each other! For were R. Jose alive, he would have sat submissively before Rabbi, since R. Ishmael son of R. Jose, who occupied his father's place,<sup>14</sup> sat submissively before Rabbi,<sup>15</sup> yet he [Rabbi] said, Then the Elder has already given a ruling.<sup>16</sup>

R. Nahman said to his slave Daru: Put away cold water for me,<sup>17</sup> and bring me water heated by a Gentile<sup>18</sup> cook<sup>19</sup> When R. Ammi heard thereof, he objected. Said R. Joseph: Why should he have objected? He acted in accordance with his teachers, one [act] being according to Rab, and the other according to Samuel. According to Samuel, for Rab Judah said in Samuel's name: Cold [water, etc.] may be hidden. According to Rab, for R. Samuel son of R. Isaac said in Rab's name: Whatever can be eaten in its natural state,<sup>20</sup> raw, is not subject to [the interdict against] the cooking of Gentiles. But he [R. Ammi] held that an important man is different.<sup>21</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: Though it was said, One may not store [food] after nightfall even in a substance which does not add heat, yet if one comes to add,<sup>22</sup> he may add. How does he do it?<sup>23</sup> R. Simeon b. Gamaliel said: He may remove the sheets and replace them with blankets, or remove the blankets and replace them with sheets.<sup>24</sup> And thus did R. Simeon b. Gamaliel say: Only the self-same boiler was forbidden;<sup>25</sup> but if it [the food] was emptied from that boiler into another, it is permitted: seeing that he cools it,<sup>26</sup> will he indeed heat it up!<sup>27</sup> If one stored [food] in and covered [it] with a substance that may be handled on the Sabbath, or if he stored [it] in something that may not be handled on the Sabbath, but covered [it] with something that may be handled on the Sabbath, he may remove [the covering] and replace it.<sup>28</sup> If one stored [food] in and covered [it] with a substance that may not be handled on the Sabbath, or if he stored (it) in something that may be handled on the Sabbath, but covered it with something that may not be handled on the Sabbath, provided it was partly uncovered, he may take it [out] and replace [it];<sup>29</sup> but if not,

---

(1) V. Glos. This does not constitute the planting of diverse seeds.

(2) If these are from the sixth year and are placed in the earth in the seventh, they are not subject to the laws of seventh

year produce.

(3) Having been tithed before they were placed in the earth they are not to be retithed on removal, as though this were a new harvest.

(4) On this account the proviso is made that some of the leaves must be uncovered, for otherwise it would be necessary to remove the earth, which may not be done. But the other statements hold good even if they are entirely covered (Rashi and Tosaf.).

(5) For it is not stated that the earth must be loosened before the Sabbath. (14) I.e., put away in something to retain its heat.

(6) V. supra 34a.

(7) To prevent the sun from reaching and warming it.

(8) V. preceding note.

(9) To heat it, as for instance cold water; therefore it may be hidden in order to keep it cold.

(10) For if permission is given to hide it in order to keep it cold, the reverse too may be regarded as permitted.

(11) To keep it cool.

(12) The Sage, referring to R. Jose.

(13) And I retract.

(14) I.e., he was as great as his father (Rashi).

(15) As a disciple before his master.

(16) Thus showing deference to his views.

(17) On the Sabbath.

(18) Lit., 'Syrian'.

(19) On weekdays. Food cooked by Gentiles is forbidden. R. Nahman showed that this interdict does not apply to boiled water.

(20) Lit., 'as it is raw'.

(21) He should be more stringent for himself.

(22) Another covering.

(23) In which the pot is wrapped.

(24) According as he desires more or less heat.

(25) I.e., food may not be stored after nightfall in the same pot in which it was cooked.

(26) By emptying it from one pot into another.

(27) Surely there is no fear of this, which is the reason for the usual prohibition (supra 34a); hence it is permitted.

(28) Since the cover can be removed, one can take hold of the pot.

(29) Since there is something by which he can grasp it.

## **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 51b**

it may not be removed and replaced. R. Judah said: Thoroughly beaten flax is the same as foliage.<sup>1</sup> A boiler may be placed upon a boiler, and a pot upon a pot,<sup>2</sup> but not a pot upon a boiler,<sup>3</sup> or a boiler upon a pot;<sup>4</sup> and the mouth [thereof]<sup>5</sup> may [also] be daubed over with dough:<sup>6</sup> not in order to make them<sup>7</sup> hotter, but that [their heat] may be retained. And just as hot [food] may not be hidden, so may cold [food] not be hidden. Rabbi permitted cold [food] to be hidden. And neither snow nor hail may be broken up on the Sabbath in order that the water should flow, but they may be placed in a goblet or dish, without fear.<sup>8</sup>

## **CHAPTER V**

**MISHNAH. WHEREWITH MAY AN ANIMAL GO OUT [ON THE SABBATH], AND WHEREWITH MAY IT NOT GO OUT? A CAMEL MAY GO FORTH WITH A BIT, A DROMEDARY [NE' AKAH] WITH ITS NOSE-RING [HOTEM], A LYBIAN ASS WITH A HALTER, A HORSE WITH ITS CHAIN, AND ALL CHAINWEARING ANIMALS MAY GO OUT WITH THEIR CHAINS AND BE LED BY THEIR CHAINS, AND [WATER OF LUSTRATION] MAY BE SPRINKLED UPON THEM, AND THEY MAY BE IMMersed IN**

## THEIR PLACE.<sup>9</sup>

GEMARA. What is meant by a NE'AKAH WITH A HOTEH? — Said Rabbah b. Bar Hanah: A white [female] camel with its iron nose-ring.

A LYBIAN ASS WITH A HALTER. R. Huna said: That means a Lybian ass with an iron halter.<sup>10</sup> Levi sent money to Be Hozae<sup>11</sup> for a Lybian ass to be bought for him. [But] they parcelled up some barley and sent it to him, to intimate to him that an ass's steps depend on barley.<sup>12</sup>

Rab Judah said in Samuel's name: They [the scholars] transposed them [in their questions] before Rabbi: What about one animal going forth with [the accouterment] of the other? As for a dromedary [ne'akah] with a bit, there is no question; since it is not guarded thereby, it is a burden.<sup>13</sup> The problem is in respect of a camel with a nose-ring. How is it: Since a bit is sufficient, this [the nose-ring] is a burden; or Perhaps an additional guard is not called a burden? Said R. Ishmael son of R. Jose before him, Thus did my father rule: Four animals may go out with a bit: a horse, mule, camel and ass. What does this exclude? Surely it excludes a camel [from being led out] with a nose-ring? — No: it excludes a dromedary [ne'akah] with a bit. In a Baraita it was taught: A Lybian ass and a camel may go out with a bit.

This is dependent on Tannaim: A beast may not go forth with a muzzle;<sup>14</sup> Hananiah said: It may go forth with a muzzle and with anything whereby it is guarded. To what is the reference? Shall we say, to a large beast? is a muzzle sufficient! But if a small beast is meant, is a muzzle insufficient?<sup>15</sup> Hence they must surely differ in respect to a cat: the first Tanna holds: since a mere cord is sufficient, it [a muzzle] is a burden;<sup>16</sup> while Hananiah holds, Whatever is an additional guard is not called a burden. R. Huna b. Hiyya said in Samuel's name: The halachah, is as Hananiah.

Levi son of R. Huna b. Hiyya and Rabbah b. R. Huna were travelling on a road, when Levi's ass went ahead of Rabbah b. R. Huna's, whereupon Rabbah b. R. Huna felt aggrieved.<sup>17</sup> Said he [Levi], I will say something to him, so that

---

(1) It adds heat, and therefore food may not be put away in it even before the Sabbath.

(2) A boiler is of copper, and a pot is of earthenware.

(3) That is the corrected text.

(4) Var. lec.: and a pot upon a boiler, but not a boiler upon a pot. [The reason for the distinction is not clear and Rashi explains because a pot being of earthenware retains more effective heat which it communicates to the boiler of copper. Tosef. Shab. VI, however reads: and a pot upon a boiler and a boiler upon a pot. V. Asheri and Alfasi].

(5) [I.e., of the lower vessel, v. R. Hananel].

(6) Kneaded before the Sabbath.

(7) [I.e., the contents of the upper vessel].

(8) Of desecrating the Sabbath, though they may melt there.

(9) To whom the law of Sabbath rest applies. V. Ex. XX, 10; Deut. V, 14. If the chain becomes ritually unclean, the ceremony of sprinkling (v. Num. XIX, 14 seq.) and immersion (tebillah) may be performed while they are on the animal.

(10) The words used in the Mishnah had become unfamiliar to the Babylonian amoraim and needed explaining.

(11) A district on the caravan route along the Tigris and its canals. The modern Khuzistan, a province of S.W. Persia, Obermeyer, Landschaft, pp. 204ff.

(12) I.e., barley is the proper food for asses. — Rashi: they returned the money, not wishing to send an ass so far. (5) [I.e., the appurtenances mentioned in the Mishnah.

(13) And must certainly not be led out with it.

(14) Or, collar.

(15) It is a complete guard in itself, and there can be no reason for prohibiting it.

(16) Therefore it is forbidden.

(17) He thought that Levi had acted intentionally, which was disrespectful, for Rabbah b. R. Huna was a greater scholar.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 52a

his mind may be appeased. Said he: An ass of evil habits, such as this one, may it go forth wearing a halter on the Sabbath? — Thus did your father say in Samuel's name, he answered him, The halachah is as Hananiah.<sup>1</sup>

The School of Manasseh taught: If grooves are made between a goat's horns, it may be led out with a bit on the Sabbath.<sup>2</sup> R. Joseph asked: What if one fastened it through its beard:<sup>3</sup> since It is painful [to the goat] to tug at it,<sup>4</sup> it will not come to do so;<sup>5</sup> or perhaps it may chance to loosen and fall, and he will come to carry it four cubits in the street? The question stands over.

We learnt elsewhere: Nor with the strap between its horns.<sup>6</sup> R. Jeremiah b. Abba said: Rab and Samuel differ therein: One maintains: Whether as an ornament or as a guard, it is forbidden; while the other rules: As an ornament it is forbidden; as a guard it is permitted. R. Joseph observed: It may be proved that it was Samuel who maintained: As an ornament it is forbidden; as a guard it is permitted. For R. Huna b. Hiyya said in Samuel's name: The halachah is as Hananiah.<sup>7</sup> Said Abaye to him, On the contrary, It may be proved that it was Samuel who maintained: Whether as an ornament or as a guard it is forbidden. For Rab Judah said in Samuel's name: They transposed them [in their questions] before Rabbi: What about one animal going forth with [the accoutrement] of the other? Said R. Ishmael b. R. Jose before him, Thus did my father rule: Four animals may go out with a bit: A horse, mule, camel and ass. What does it exclude?<sup>8</sup> Surely it excludes a camel [from being led out] with a nose-ring?<sup>9</sup> Delete the latter on account of the former.<sup>10</sup> And what [reason] do you see to delete the latter on account of the former? Delete the former on account of the latter! — Because we find that it was Samuel who ruled: As an ornament it is forbidden; as a guard it is permitted. [For it was stated:]<sup>11</sup> R. Hiyya b. Ashi said in Rab's name: Whether as an ornament or as a guard it is forbidden; while R. Hiyya b. Abin said in Samuel's name: As an ornament it is forbidden; as a guard it is permitted.

An objection is raised: If it [the red heifer] was tied up in a loft by a cord,<sup>12</sup> it is fit.<sup>13</sup> Now if you say that it is a burden, surely Scripture saith, Upon which never came yoke?<sup>14</sup> — Abaye answered: This is when it is led from one town to another.<sup>15</sup> Raba said: The red heifer is different, because its value is high. Rabina said: This refers to an intractable [animal].<sup>16</sup>

A HORSE WITH ITS CHAIN, etc. What is GO OUT and what is LED? — R. Huna said: [It means,] They may either go out [with the chain] wound round them,<sup>17</sup> or led [by the chain]; while Samuel maintained: [It means,] They may go out led [by the chain], but they may not go out [with the chain] wound round them. In a Baraitha it was taught: They may go out [with the chain] wound round then, [ready] to be led.<sup>18</sup>

R. Joseph said: I saw the calves of R. Huna's house go forth with their cords<sup>19</sup> wound about them, on the Sabbath. When R. Dimi came,<sup>20</sup> he related in R. Hanina's name: The mules of Rabbi's house went forth with their reins on the Sabbath. The scholars propounded: 'Wound about them', or 'led'?- Come and hear: When R. Samuel b. Judah came, he related in R. Hanina's name: The mules of Rabbi's house went forth on the Sabbath with their reins wound about them. Said the Rabbis before R. Assi, This [dictum] of R. Samuel b. Judah is unnecessary, [because] it may be deduced from R. Dimi's [statement]. For should you think that R. Dimi meant 'led', it would follow from Rab Judah's [statement] in Samuel's name. For Rab Judah said in Samuel's name: They [the scholars] transposed them [in their questions] before Rabbi: What about one animal going forth with [the accoutrement] of the other? Said R. Ishmael son of R. Jose before him, Thus did my father rule: Four animals may go out with a bit: a horse, mule, camel, and ass!<sup>21</sup> — Said R. Assi to them, This [R. Samuel b. Judah's statement] is necessary. For if it were derived from Rab Judah's [dictum], I could argue: He

[R. Ishmael Son of R. Jose] stated it before him, but he did not accept it. Hence R. Dimi's statement informs us [that he did]. And if there were R. Dimi's [alone], I could argue: It means 'led', but not merely 'wound round'; hence R. Samuel b. Judah's [statement] informs us [otherwise].

AND, [WATER OF LUSTRATION] MAY BE SPRINKLED UPON THEM, AND THEY MAY BE IMMERSSED IN THEIR PLACE. Are we to say that they can contract uncleanness? But we learnt: A man's ring is unclean,<sup>22</sup> but the rings of animals and utensils and all other rings

---

(1) Hence even if it is an extra guard it is permitted.

(2) Which is fastened to the grooves. But otherwise it is forbidden, because It can easily slip off the head, which is very narrow, and its owner may carry it in the street.

(3) Making a circle of the beard and inserting the bit through it.

(4) On account of the beard.

(5) Hence we may assume that it is safe there, and is permitted.

(6) V. infra 54b.

(7) Hence he holds that an extra guard is permitted, and this includes the strap between a cow's horns.

(8) v. supra 51b.

(9) That being forbidden because it is an extra guard. Since Samuel quotes it with evident approval, it is his view too.

(10) Because these two statements of Samuel are contradictory.

(11) Other edd. omit the bracketed passage, and substitute: What is our decision on the matter? — It was stated:

(12) Or, the reins.

(13) For its purpose; v. Num. XIX, 2 Seq.

(14) Num. XIX, 2. A burden is a yoke.

(15) The cord or reins are then required as an ordinary, not an additional, guard.

(16) According to both answers, what would be an extra guard elsewhere is only an ordinary one here.

(17) Even that is permitted.

(18) I.e., either that it must be wound round it loosely, so that one can insert his hand between the animal's neck and the chain and grasp it; or that a portion of the cord must be left free, whereby the animal may be led.

(19) Lit., 'bit'.

(20) V. p. 12, n. 9.

(21) V. supra 51b.

(22) I.e., it is liable to uncleanness.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 52b

are clean!<sup>1</sup> — Said R. Isaac: It [our Mishnah] refers to such as pass from [being] men's ornaments to [become] animals' ornaments;<sup>2</sup> while R. Joseph said: [They<sup>3</sup> become unclean] because a man leads the animal by them. [For] was it not taught: An animal's staff<sup>4</sup> of metal<sup>5</sup> is susceptible to uncleanness.' What is the reason? Since a man beats [the animal] with it. So here too; [they are unclean,] because a man leads [the animals] by them.

AND THEY MAY BE IMMERSSED IN THEIR PLACE. But there is an intervention?<sup>6</sup> — Said R. Ammi: It means that he beat them out.<sup>7</sup> Shall we say that R. Ammi holds as R. Joseph? For if as R. Isaac, who maintained that it refers to such as pass from [being] men's ornaments to [become] animals' ornaments; since he beat them out, he has performed an act, and their uncleanness vanishes. For we learnt: All utensils enter upon their uncleanness by intention, but are relieved from their uncleanness only by a change-effecting act!<sup>8</sup> — He holds as R. Judah, who maintained, An act to adapt [an object] is not [considered] an act.<sup>9</sup> For it was taught: R. Judah said: A change-effecting act was not mentioned<sup>10</sup> where it adapts [the object], save where it spoils it. In a Baraita it was taught: It [our Mishnah] refers to [chains] with movable links.<sup>11</sup>

A certain disciple from Upper Galilee asked R. Eleazar: I have heard that a distinction is drawn

between one ring and another?<sup>12</sup> Perhaps you heard it only in reference to the Sabbath;<sup>13</sup> for if in connection with uncleanness, they are all alike.<sup>14</sup> Now, in connection with uncleanness, are they all alike? Surely we learnt: A man's ring is unclean, but the rings of animals and utensils and all other rings are clean.<sup>15</sup> — He<sup>16</sup> too was referring to men's [rings]. And are all men's [rings] alike? Surely it was taught: A ring made to gird one's loins therewith or to fasten [the clothes about] the shoulders is clean, and only a finger [ring] was declared to be unclean! — He too was referring to finger rings. And are all finger rings alike? Surely we learnt: If the ring is of metal and its signet is of coral,<sup>17</sup> It is unclean; if it is of coral while the signet is of metal, it is clean.<sup>18</sup> — He too referred to [rings] wholly of metal.

He asked him further: I have heard that we distinguish between one needle and another? Perhaps you heard it only in respect to the Sabbath,<sup>19</sup> for if in the matter of uncleanness, they are all alike. Now, in the matter of uncleanness, are they all alike? Surely we learnt: If the eyehole or the point of a needle is removed, it is clean! — He referred to a whole [needle]. And are all whole [needles] alike? Surely we learnt: If a needle gathers rust and it hinders the sewing, it is clean; if not, it is unclean. And the School of R. Jannai said: Providing that its mark is perceptible.<sup>20</sup> He referred to a bright [needle]. But are all bright [needles] alike? Surely it was taught; A needle, whether containing an eyehole or not, may be handled on the Sabbath;<sup>21</sup> while a needle with an eyehole was specified only in respect to uncleanness.<sup>22</sup> Surely Abaye interpreted it according to Raba as referring to unfinished utensils!<sup>23</sup>

**MISHNAH. AN ASS MAY GO OUT WITH ITS CUSHION IF IT IS TIED TO IT;<sup>24</sup> RAMS MAY GO OUT COUPLED [LEBUBIN]. EWES MAY GO OUT [WITH THEIR POSTERIORS] EXPOSED [SHEHUZOTH], TIED [KEBULOTH], AND COVERED [KEBUNOTH]; GOATS MAY GO OUT [WITH THEIR UDDERS] TIED UP. R. JOSE FORBIDS IN ALL THESE CASES, SAVE EWES THAT ARE COVERED. R. JUDAH SAID: GOATS MAY GO OUT [WITH THEIR UDDERS] TIED IN ORDER TO DRY UP,<sup>25</sup> BUT NOT TO SAVE THEIR MILK.<sup>26</sup> gemara.**

---

(1) Because they do not rank either as utensils or ornaments, v. Kel. XIII.

(2) And they had become unclean as human ornaments. But when they are animals' ornaments they cannot become unclean, though they retain the defilement contracted before.

(3) The appurtenance mentioned in our Mishnah.

(4) With which it is beaten.

(5) Flat wooden implements are not susceptible to defilement.

(6) Nothing must come between the object that is immersed and the water; but here the neck of the animal intervenes.

(7) Sc. the rings, halters, etc., were beaten thin, so that they fit loosely about the animal and leave room for the water to touch it on all sides.

(8) Utensils become unclean only from when they are quite finished for use; if they still require smoothing, scraping, etc., they are not liable to uncleanness, unless their owner declares his intention to use them as they are. On the other hand, having done so, it is not enough that he subsequently declares that he will not use them, in order to relieve them from their susceptibility to defilement, unless he actually begins smoothing them. Or, if the utensils are unclean, it is insufficient for their owner to state that he will not use them any more, so that they should lose the status of utensils and become clean, but must render them unfit for use by an act, e.g., break or make a hole in them.

(9) To annul the status of a utensil. Hence he can agree with R. Isaac in the explanation of the Mishnah.

(10) In this connection.

(11) Loosely joined and fitting roomily round the animal's neck, so that the water can enter.

(12) In respect to what is that drawn?

(13) Where a distinction is made between a signet ring and an ordinary one; v. infra 59a.

(14) Lit., 'this and this are one'.

(15) V. supra 52b.

(16) R. Eleazar.

(17) Probably a species of cedar-tree.

(18) Only a metal ring becomes unclean, the matter being determined by the ring itself, not the signet. This shows that a distinction is drawn also in connection with uncleanness between finger ring and finger ring.

(19) For carrying a needle with an eye in it from public or private ground or vice versa one is liable to a sin-offering but not if it has no eye.

(20) I.e., providing it is recognizable as a needle — only then is it unclean. Others: providing that the mark of the rust is perceptible when one sews with it — that is regarded as hindering the sewing and makes it clean.

(21) Like any other utensil.

(22) This shows that there is a distinction in connection with defilement between needle and needle also.

(23) I.e., if it is unfinished and a hole is still to be punched therein, it is not liable to defilement. But if it is thus finished off without an eye, e.g., as a kind of bodkin, it is a utensil and liable to uncleanness, no distinction being drawn in connection with defilement between needle and needle. In connection with Sabbath, however, even the former may be handled, for one may decide to use it in its unfinished state, e.g., as a toothpick or for removing splinters from the flesh, and so it ranks as a utensil.

(24) The cushion is to protect it from the cold.

(25) To cease giving milk.

(26) A pouch is sometimes loosely tied round the udder to prevent the milk from dripping; hence it may fall off and therefore R. Judah forbids it (v. 53a). But in the second case it is tied very tightly.

### **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 53a**

Samuel said: Providing it was tied thereto since the eve of the Sabbath. R. Nahman observed, Our Mishnah too proves it, as it states: An ass may not go out with its cushion if it is not tied thereto.<sup>1</sup> How is this meant? Shall we say that it is not tied thereto at all, — then it is obvious, lest it fall off and he come to carry it? Hence It must mean that it was not tied to it since the eve of the Sabbath, whence it follows that the first clause<sup>2</sup> means that it was tied thereto since the eve of the Sabbath. This proves it.

It was taught likewise: An ass may go out with its cushion when it was tied thereto on the eve of the Sabbath, but not with its saddle, even if tied thereto on the eve of the Sabbath. R. Simeon b. Gamaliel said: With its saddle too, if it was tied to it since the eve of the Sabbath,<sup>3</sup> providing, however, that he does not tie its band thereto,<sup>4</sup> and providing that he does not pass the strap under its tail.<sup>5</sup>

R. Assi b. Nathan asked R. Hiyya b. R. Ashi: May the cushion be placed on an ass on the Sabbath?<sup>6</sup> It is permitted, replied he. Said he to him, Yet wherein does this differ from a saddle? He remained silent. Thereupon he refuted him:<sup>7</sup> One must not move by hand the saddle upon an ass, but must lead it [the ass] up and down in the courtyard until it [the saddle] falls off of its own accord. Seeing that you say that it must not [even] be moved, can there be a question about placing it [on the ass]?<sup>8</sup> — Said R. Zera to him, Leave him alone: he agrees with his teacher. For R. Hiyya b. Ashi said in Rab's name: A fodder-bag may be hung around [the neck of] an animal on the Sabbath, and how much more so [may] a cushion [be placed on its back]: for if it is permitted there for [the animal's] pleasures how much more so here, that it is [to save the animal] suffering!<sup>9</sup> Samuel said: A cushion is permitted, a fodder-bag is forbidden.<sup>10</sup> R. Hiyya b. Joseph went and related Rab's ruling before Samuel. Said he: If Abba<sup>11</sup> said thus, he knows nothing at all in matters pertaining to the Sabbath.

When R. Zera went up [to Palestine], he found R. Benjamin b. Jepheth sitting and saying in R. Johanan's name: A cushion may be placed on an ass on the Sabbath. Said he to him, 'Well spoken! and thus did Ariocho teach it in Babylon too.' Now, who is Ariocho? Samuel!<sup>12</sup> But Rab too ruled thus? — Rather he had heard him conclude: Yet a fodder-bag may not be hung [around the animal's neck] on the Sabbath. Thereupon he exclaimed, 'Well spoken! And thus did Ariocho teach it in Babylon.'<sup>13</sup>

At all events, it is generally agreed that a cushion is permitted: wherein does it differ from a saddle? — There it is different, as it may possibly fall off of its own accord.<sup>14</sup> R. Papa said: The former<sup>15</sup> is to warm it [the ass]; the latter<sup>16</sup> is in order to cool it.<sup>17</sup> Where it needs warming it suffers; but where it needs cooling it does not. And thus people say: An ass feels cold even in the summer solstice.<sup>18</sup>

An objection is raised: A horse must not be led out with a fox's tail,<sup>19</sup> nor with a crimson strap between its eyes.<sup>20</sup> A zab must not go out with his pouch,<sup>21</sup> nor goats with the pouch attached to their udders,<sup>22</sup> nor a cow with a muzzle on its mouth,<sup>23</sup> nor may foals [be led out] into the streets with fodder-bags around their mouths; nor an animal with shoes on its feet, nor with an amulet, though it is proven;<sup>24</sup> and this is a greater stringency in the case of an animal than in that of a human being.<sup>25</sup> But he may go out with a bandage on a wound or with splints on a fracture; and [an animal may be led out] with the after-birth hanging down;<sup>26</sup> and the bell at the neck must be stopped up,<sup>27</sup> and it may then amble about with it in the courtyard.<sup>28</sup> At all events it is stated, nor may foals [be led out] into the street with fodder-bags around their mouths': thus only into the street is it forbidden, but in a courtyard it is well [permitted]. Now, does this not refer to large [foals], its purpose being [the animals' greater] pleasure?<sup>29</sup> — No: it refers to small ones, the purpose being [to obviate] suffering.<sup>30</sup> This may be proved too, because it is taught

---

(1) V. infra 54b.

(2) Sc. the present Mishnah.

(3) The saddle too affords some warmth.

(4) The band with which the saddle is fastened around the ass's belly. Rashi: lest it appear that he intends placing a burden upon it.

(5) Which is generally placed there to prevent the saddle and burden from slipping forward or backward

(6) Not to be led out with it, but to warm it.

(7) Thinking that his silence meant that no answer was necessary, the difference being too obvious.

(8) Surely not!

(9) Suffering from cold.

(10) The animal of course must be fed, but the fodder can be placed on the ground, and it is a mere luxury to hang the nose-bag around its neck.

(11) An affectionate and reverential name for Rab — 'father'. Others maintain that his name was Abba Arika, while Rab was a title — the teacher par excellence — , the equivalent of Rabbi as the title of R. Judah ha-nasi.

(12) V. Kid., Sonc. ed., p. 189 n. 11.

(13) Whereas Rab forbade it.

(14) And the owner may carry it in the street; supra.

(15) Sc. the cushion.

(16) Sc. the removing of the saddle.

(17) When it becomes overheated through its burden. But in any case an ass cools very rapidly.

(18) Tammuz is the fourth month of the Jewish year, generally corresponding to mid June-July.

(19) Rashi: it was suspended between its eyes to ward off the evil eye; cf. Sanh., Sonc. ed., \_ p. 623, n. 2. Animals too were regarded as subject thereto.

(20) Suspended as an ornament.

(21) V. Supra 11b.

(22) Either to catch the milk that may ooze out, or to protect the udders from thorns, etc.

(23) It was muzzled until it came to its own fields, so that it should not browse in other peoples' land.

(24) I.e., three animals had been healed thereby. Generally speaking, Judaism is opposed to superstitious practices (v. Sanh. 65b, 66a; M. Joseph, Judaism as Creed and Life, pp. 79-81; 384); nevertheless, the Rabbis were children of their time and recognized the efficacy of such practices and took steps to regulate them.

(25) This is now assumed to refer to an amulet; a human being may wear a proven amulet; infra 61a.

(26) Not having been removed yet.

(27) With cotton, wool, etc., to prevent it from ringing, which is forbidden on the Sabbath.

(28) But not in the street, v. infra 54b.

(29) Though they can stretch their necks and eat from the ground. This contradicts Samuel.

(30) It is difficult for very young foals to eat from the ground.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 53b

analogous to an amulet.<sup>1</sup> This proves it.

The Master said: 'Nor with an amulet, though it is proven'. But we learnt: 'Nor with an amulet that is not proven'; hence if it is proven, it is permitted? — That means proven in respect of human beings but not in respect of animals. But can they be proven in respect of human beings yet not in respect of animals? — Yes: for it may help man, who is under planetary influence, but not animals, who are not under planetary influence.<sup>2</sup> If so, how is this 'a greater stringency in the case of an animal than in the case of a human being'?<sup>3</sup> — Do you think that that refers to amulets? It refers to the shoe.<sup>4</sup>

Come and hear: One may anoint [a sore] and scrape [a scab] off for a human being, but not for an animal. Surely that means that there is [still] a sore, the purpose being [to obviate] pain? — No. It means that the sore has healed,<sup>5</sup> the purpose being pleasure.<sup>6</sup>

Come and hear: If an animal has an attack of congestion. It may not be made to stand in water to be cooled; if a human being has an attack of congestion, he may be made to stand in water to be cooled?<sup>7</sup> — 'Ulla answered: It is a preventive measure, on account of the crushing of [medical] ingredients.<sup>8</sup> If so, the same should also apply to man? — A man may appear to be cooling himself.<sup>9</sup> If so, an animal too may appear to be cooling itself? — There is no [mere] cooling for an animal,<sup>10</sup> Now, do we enact a preventive measure in the case of animal? But it was taught: 'If it [an animal] is standing without the tehum,<sup>11</sup> one calls it and it comes',<sup>12</sup> and we do not forbid this lest he [thereby] come to fetch it? — Said Rabina: It means, e.g., that its tehum fell<sup>13</sup> within his tehum.<sup>14</sup> R. Nahman b. Isaac said: The crushing of ingredients itself<sup>15</sup> is dependent on Tannaim. For it was taught: If an animal ate [an abundance of] vetch,<sup>16</sup> one must not cause it to run about in the courtyard to be cured; but R. Josiah<sup>17</sup> permits it.<sup>18</sup> Raba lectured: The halachah is as R. Josiah.

The Master said: 'A zab may not go out with his pouch, nor goats with the pouch attached to their udders.' But it was taught: Goats may go out with the pouch attached to their udders? Said Rab Judah, There is no difficulty: Here it means that it is tightly fastened;<sup>19</sup> there it is not tightly fastened. R. Joseph answered: You quote Tannaim at random!<sup>20</sup> This is a controversy of Tannaim. For we learnt: GOATS MAY BE LED OUT [WITH THEIR UDDERS] TIED UP. R. JOSE FORBIDS IN ALL THESE CASES, SAVE EWES THAT ARE COVERED. R. JUDAH SAID: GOATS MAY BE LED OUT [WITH THEIR UDDERS] TIED UP IN ORDER TO GO DRY, BUT NOT IN ORDER TO SAVE THEIR MILK.<sup>21</sup> Alternatively, both are according to R. Judah: in the one case it is in order that they may go dry; in the other it is for milking.<sup>22</sup> It was taught: R. Judah said: It once happened that goats in a household of Antioch<sup>23</sup> had large udders, and pouches were made for them, that their udders should not be lacerated.

Our Rabbis taught: It once happened that a man's wife died and left a child to be suckled, and he could not afford to pay a wet-nurse, whereupon a miracle was performed for him and his teats opened like the two teats of a woman and he suckled his son. R. Joseph observed, Come and see how great was this man, that such a miracle was performed on his account! Said Abaye to him, On the contrary: how lowly was this man, that the order of the Creation<sup>24</sup> was changed on his account!<sup>25</sup> Rab Judah observed, Come and see how difficult are men's wants [of being satisfied]. that the order of the Creation had to be altered for him! R. Nahman said: The proof is that miracles do [frequently] occur, whereas food is [rarely] created<sup>26</sup> miraculously.

Our Rabbis taught: It once happened that a man married a woman with a stumped hand, yet he did not perceive it in her until the day of her death. Rabbi observed: How modest this woman must have been, that her husband did not know her! Said R. Hiyya to him, For her it was natural;<sup>27</sup> but how modest was this man, that he did not scrutinize his wife!

RAMS MAY GO OUT COUPLED [LEBUBIN]. What is leubin? R. Huna said: coupled. How is it indicated that LEBUBIN implies nearness? For it is written, Thou hast drawn me near,<sup>28</sup> my sister, my bride.<sup>29</sup> Ulla said: It refers to the hide which is tied over their hearts<sup>30</sup> that wolves should not attack them.<sup>31</sup> Do then wolves attack rams only but not ewes? — [Yes.] because they [the rams] travel at the head of the flock. And do wolves attack the head of the flock and not the rear? — Rather [they attack rams] because they are fat. But are there no fat ones among ewes? Moreover, can they distinguish between them? — Rather it is because their noses are elevated and they march along as though looking out [for the wolf].<sup>32</sup> R. Nahman b. Isaac said, It means the skin which is tied under their genitals, to restrain them from copulating with the females. Whence [is this interpretation derived]? Because the following clause states: AND EWES MAY GO OUT SHEHUZOTH. What is SHEHUZOTH? With their tails tied back<sup>33</sup> upwards, for the males to copulate with them: thus in the first clause it is that they should not copulate with the females, whilst in the second it is for the males to copulate with them. Where is it implied that SHEHUZOTH denotes exposed? In the verse, And behold, there met him a woman

- 
- (1) The purpose of which is not pleasure but the avoidance of sickness.
  - (2) The planetary influence was regarded as in the nature of a protecting angel; v. Sanh., Sonc. ed., p. 629, n. 10.
  - (3) For a man too may go out only with an amulet proven for humans.
  - (4) With which an animal may not be led out, though that is permitted for men.
  - (5) Lit., 'is finished'.
  - (6) To mollify the slight rawness which remains; that rawness, however, does not really cause suffering.
  - (7) On the Sabbath. This proves that in the case of an animal, even to obviate its sufferings, it is forbidden.
  - (8) This is forbidden on the Sabbath, save where life is in danger. If cooling in water is permitted, it will be thought that crushing ingredients is likewise permitted.
  - (9) Not for medical purposes.
  - (10) It is not customary to take an animal for cooling save for medical purposes.
  - (11) V. Glos.
  - (12) V. infra 151a.
  - (13) Lit., 'was swallowed up'.
  - (14) When an animal is entrusted to a cowherd, its *tehum* is that of the cowherd, i.e., it may go only where the cowherd may go. Here the owner's *tehum* stretched beyond that of the cowherd; hence he may call the animal that strayed beyond its own *tehum*, for even if he forgets himself and goes for it, he is still within his own boundaries. Nevertheless he may not actually go for it, because when one (a man or a beast) goes beyond his *tehum*, he becomes tied to that spot and may only move within a radius of four cubits from it; hence the owner must not actually lead the animal away, but may only call it. (One can extend his *tehum* by placing some food at any spot within the two thousand cubits, whereupon he may then walk a further two thousand cubits from that spot. Here the owner had extended his *tehum*, but not the cowherd).
  - (15) I.e., whether any other form of healing is forbidden as a preventive measure, lest one come to crush ingredients too.
  - (16) Which made it constipated.
  - (17) v. marginal gloss cur. edd. R. Oshaia.
  - (18) The first Tanna forbids it as a preventive against the crushing of ingredients, while R. Josiah declares this preventive measure unnecessary.
  - (19) And there is no fear of its falling off, so that the owner may carry it.
  - (20) Aliter: have you removed Tannaim from the world, v. Rashi.
  - (21) Thus this is disputed in our Mishnah, and so possibly in the Baraitas too.
  - (22) Rashi: to preserve the milk in its pouch. Ri: both are to protect the udders from being scratched by thorns, but in the one case it is desired that the goats shall go dry; then it is permitted, since it is tied very tightly; but in the other it is

desired that the goats shall remain milkers; then it is forbidden, because it is lightly tied.

(23) The capital of Syria.

(24) Lit., 'the beginning'; i.e., nature.

(25) In Ber. 20a Abaye himself regards miracles wrought for people as testifying to their greatness and merit. Rashi observes that his lowliness lay in the fact that a means of earning money was not opened to him.

(26) So Rashi.

(27) It is natural for a woman to cover herself, particularly when it is in her own interest.

(28) Heb. libabtini (E.V. Thou hast ravished my heart).

(29) Cant. IV, 9.

(30) Heb. leb, which 'Ulla takes to be the root of lebubin.

(31) Thus he translates: RAMS MAY GO OUT with their hides over their hearts. Wolves usually seize beasts at the heart (Rashi).

(32) Which rouses its ire, Var. lec.: ke-budin, like bears, i.e., proudly and fiercely. V. D.S.

(33) Heb. she'ohazin, lit., 'we catch up'

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 54a

exposed<sup>1</sup> and wily of heart.<sup>2</sup>

EWES MAY GO OUT TIED [KEBULOTH]. What is KEBULOTH? — With their tails tied downwards, to restrain the males from copulating with them. How is it implied that kabul<sup>3</sup> denotes non-productively? — Because it is written, What cities are these which thou hast given me, my brother? And he called them the land of Cabul, unto this day.<sup>4</sup> What is 'the land of Cabul'? — Said R. Huna: It contained inhabitants who were smothered [mekubolin] with silver and gold. Said Raba to him, If so, is that why it is written, and they pleased him not?<sup>5</sup> because they were smothered with silver and gold they pleased him not! — Even so, he replied; being wealthy and soft-living, they would do no work. R. Nahman b. Isaac said, It was a sandy region.<sup>6</sup> and why was it called Cabul? Because the leg sinks into it up to the ankle, and people designate it an ankle-bound land which produces no fruit.

[AND COVERED] KEBUNOTH. What is KEBUNOTH? — It means that they [the sheep] are covered for the sake of the fine wool.<sup>7</sup> As we learnt: [The hue of] a rising is like white wool.<sup>8</sup> What is white wool? — Said R. Bibi b. Abaye: Like pure wool [from a sheep] which is covered from birth<sup>9</sup> in order to produce fine wool.

AND GOATS MAY BE LED OUT [WITH THEIR UDDERS] TIED UP. It was stated: Rab said: The halachah is as R. Judah; while Samuel said: The halachah is as R. Jose. Others learn this controversy independently. Rab said: If it is in order to go dry, it is permitted. but if it is for milking it is forbidden; while Samuel said: Both are forbidden. Others learn it in reference to the following: Goats may go out [with their udders] tied up in order to go dry, but not for milking. On the authority of R. Judah b. Bathyra it was said: That is the halachah; but who can vouch<sup>10</sup> which is for going dry and which is for milking? And since we cannot distinguish [between them], both are forbidden. Said Samuel, — others say. Rab Judah said in Samuel's name: The halachah is as R. Judah b. Bathyra. When Rabin came,<sup>11</sup> he said in the name of R. Johanan: The halachah is as the first Tanna.<sup>12</sup>

MISHNAH. AND WHEREWITH MAY IT NOT GO OUT? A CAMEL MAY NOT GO OUT WITH A PAD [TIED TO ITS TAIL] OR 'AKUD OR RAGUL,<sup>13</sup> AND SIMILARLY OTHER ANIMALS. ONE MUST NOT TIE CAMELS TOGETHER AND PULL [ONE OF THEM]. BUT HE MAY TAKE<sup>14</sup> THE CORDS IN HIS HAND AND PULL [THEM]. PROVIDING HE DOES NOT TWINE THEM TOGETHER.

GEMARA. It was taught: A camel must not go out with a pad tied to its tail, but it may go out

with a pad tied to its tail and its hump.<sup>15</sup> Rabbah son of R. Huna said: A camel may be led out with a pad tied to its after-birth.<sup>16</sup>

OR 'AKUD OR RAGUL. Rab Judah said: 'AKUD means the tying of hand and foot<sup>17</sup> together, like Isaac the son of Abraham; RAGUL means that the forefoot must not be bent back on to the shoulder and tied. An objection is raised: 'Akud refers to the two forefeet or the two hindfeet [tied together]; ragul means that the forefoot must not be bent back on to the shoulder and tied? — He interprets as the following Tanna. For it was taught: 'Akud means the tying together of the forefoot and the hindfoot, or of the two forefeet or the two hindfeet; ragul means that the forefoot must not be bent back on to the shoulder and tied. Yet it is still not the same: as for the first and the last clauses, it is well; but the middle one is difficult?<sup>18</sup> — Rather [he maintains] as the following Tanna. For it was taught: 'Akud means the tying of hand and foot, like Isaac the son of Abraham; ragul means that the forefoot must not be bent back on to the shoulder and tied.

ONE MUST NOT TIE CAMELS TOGETHER. What is the reason? — Said R. Ashi: Because it looks as if he is going to the fair.

BUT HE MAY TAKE [etc.]. R. Ashi said: This was taught only in respect to Kil'ayim.<sup>19</sup> Kil'ayim of what? Shall we say, kil'ayim of man?<sup>20</sup> Surely we learnt: A man is permitted to plough and pull with all of them.<sup>21</sup> But if it means kil'ayim of the cords,<sup>22</sup> — surely we learnt: If one fastens [two pieces together] with one fastening,<sup>23</sup> it is not a connection?<sup>24</sup> — After all, it means kil'ayim of the cords, but this is its teaching: providing that he does not twine and knot [them together].<sup>25</sup>

Samuel said: Providing that a handbreadth of a cord does not hang out of his hand.<sup>26</sup> But the School of R. Ishmael taught, Two handbreadths? — Said Abaye, Now that Samuel said one handbreadth, while the School of R. Ishmael taught two handbreadths, Samuel comes to inform us the halachah in actual practice.<sup>27</sup>

---

(1) Heb. Shith zonah, which is regarded as connected with SHEHUZOTH. E.V.: With the attire of a harlot.

(2) Prov. VII, 10.

(3) Sing. masc. of kebuloth.

(4) I Kings IX, 13.

(5) Ibid. 12.

(6) Jast.: the land of Humton, a district of northern Palestine.

(7) That the wool should be of a fine, silky texture.

(8) The reference is to Lev. XIII, 2.

(9) Lit., 'its first day'.

(10) Lit., 'cast lots'.

(11) V. p. 12, n. 9

(12) In our Mishnah that both are permitted.

(13) This is explained in the Gemara.

(14) Lit., 'insert'.

(15) In the first case it can slide off (v. supra 53a top). but not in the second.

(16) The camel refrains from pulling at it, because it is painful; hence it will not fall off.

(17) In the case of an animal, the forefoot and the hindfoot.

(18) For this Tanna includes the tying together of the two forefeet or the two hindfeet in the term 'akud, whereas according to Rab Judah, who gives the analogy of Isaac, only the tying of the forefoot to the hindfoot is thus designated.

(19) V. Glos. The prohibition of twining them together cannot refer to the Sabbath.

(20) When he winds the cords round his hand, he may pull at something simultaneously with the camels; thus they act in unison, and this may be regarded as two different species working together, which is forbidden, v. Deut. XXII, 10. On this supposition the Mishnah must be translated: providing he does not wind them (round his hand).

(21) Sc. various animals, and this does not constitute kil'ayim.

(22) In case some are of wool, while others are of flax; when twined together they become kil'ayim, and as he holds them, they warm his hands, which is the equivalent of 'wearing' (v. Deut. XII, 11).

(23) I.e., if he joins two pieces of cloth, one of wool and the other of linen, with a single stitch or knot.

(24) Hence when he twines the cords together they are not kil'ayim.

(25) This is a double fastening, which renders the combination kil'ayim.

(26) For then it looks like a separate cord which he is carrying.

(27) I.e., to be on the safe side we rule one handbreadth, yet no prohibition is violated for less than two.

## **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 54b**

But it was taught: Providing that he lifts it a handbreadth from the ground?<sup>1</sup> — That was taught of the cord between.<sup>2</sup>

MISHNAH. AN ASS MAY NOT GO OUT WITH A CUSHION, WHEN IT IS NOT TIED TO IT, OR WITH A BELL, EVEN IF IT IS PLUGGED, OR WITH A LADDER[-SHAPED YOKE] AROUND ITS NECK, OR WITH A THONG AROUND ITS FOOT. FOWLS MAY NOT GO OUT WITH RIBBONS, OR WITH A STRAP ON THEIR LEGS; RAMS MAY NOT GO OUT WITH A WAGGONETTE UNDER THEIR TAILS,<sup>3</sup> EWES MAY NOT GO OUT PROTECTED [HANUNOTH].<sup>4</sup> OR A CALF WITH A GIMON,<sup>5</sup> OR A COW WITH THE SKIN OF A HEDGEHOG,<sup>6</sup> OR WITH THE STRAP BETWEEN ITS HORNS. R. ELEAZAR B. 'AZARIAH'S COW USED TO GO OUT WITH A THONG BETWEEN ITS HORNS, [BUT] NOT WITH THE CONSENT OF THE RABBIS.

GEMARA. What is the reason?<sup>7</sup> — As we have said.<sup>8</sup>

OR WITH A BELL., EVEN IF IT IS PLUGGED UP. Because it looks like going to the fair.

OR WITH A LADDER [-SHAPED YOKE] AROUND ITS NECK. R. Huna said: That is a jaw bar.<sup>9</sup> For what purpose is it made? For where it has a bruise, lest it chafe it afresh.<sup>10</sup>

OR WITH A STRAP ON THEIR LEGS. It is put on him [the ass] as a guard.<sup>11</sup> FOWLS MAY NOT GO OUT WITH RIBBONS. Which are put on them, for a sign, that they should not be exchanged.

OR WITH A STRAP. Which is fastened on them to restrain them from breaking utensils.<sup>12</sup>

RAMS MAY NOT GO OUT WITH A WAGGONETTE. [Its purpose is] that their tails may not knock [against rocks, etc.].

EWES MAY NOT GO OUT PROTECTED [HANUNOTH]. R. Aha b. 'Ulla sat before R. Hisda, and he sat and said: When it is sheared, a compress is saturated<sup>13</sup> in oil and placed on its forehead that it should not catch cold. Said R. Hisda to him: If so, you treat it like Mar 'Ukba!<sup>14</sup> But R. Papa b. Samuel sat before R. Hisda,<sup>15</sup> and he sat and said: When she kneels for lambing two oily compresses are made for her, and one is placed on her forehead and the other on her womb, that she may be warmed. Said R. Nahman to him, If so, you would treat her like Yaltha!<sup>16</sup> But said R. Huna, there is a certain wood in the sea towns called hanun, whereof a chip is brought and placed in her nostril to make her sneeze, so that the worms in her head should fall out. If so, the same [is required] for males? — Since the males butt each other, they fall out in any case. Simeon the Nazirite said: A chip of the juniper tree [is placed in its nostril]. As for R. Huna, it is well: hence HANUNOTH is mentioned. But according to the Rabbis, what is the meaning of HANUNOTH? — That an act of kindness is done for it.<sup>17</sup>

NOR MAY A CALF GO OUT WITH A GIMON. What is the meaning of A CALF WITH A GIMON? — Said R. Huna: A little yoke.<sup>18</sup> Where is it implied that ‘GIMON’ connotes bending?<sup>19</sup> In the verse, Is it to bow down his head as a rush [ke-agmon]?<sup>20</sup>

NOR A COW WITH THE SKIN OF A HEDGEHOG. It is placed upon it to prevent hedgehogs<sup>21</sup> from sucking it. NOR WITH THE STRAP BETWEEN ITS HORNS. On Rab's view, whether as an ornament or as a protection, it is forbidden; on Samuel's view, as an ornament it is forbidden, as a protection it is permitted.<sup>22</sup>

R. ELEAZAR B. ‘AZARIAH'S COW. Did he have [but] one cow? Surely Rab-others state, Rab Judah in Rab's name — said: The tithes of R. Eleazar b. ‘Azariah's flocks amounted to thirteen thousand calves annually? — It was taught: This was not his,<sup>23</sup> but a female neighbour of his; yet since he did not protest thereat, it was designated his.<sup>24</sup>

Rab and R. Hanina, R. Johanan and R. Habiba taught [the following] (In the whole of the Order Mo'ed<sup>25</sup> whenever this pair<sup>26</sup> occur some substitute R. Jonathan for R. Johanan)<sup>27</sup> Whoever can forbid his household [to commit a sin] but does not, is seized<sup>28</sup> for [the sins of] his household; [if he can forbid] his fellow citizens, he is seized for [the sins of] his fellow citizens; if the whole world, he is seized for [the sins of] the whole world. R. Papa observed, And the members of the Resh Galutha's [household]<sup>29</sup> are seized for the whole world. Even as R. Hanina said, Why is it written, The Lord will enter into judgement with the elders of his people, and the princes thereof:<sup>30</sup> if the Princes sinned,

- 
- (1) Implying that there is no limit to the length that may hang out of his hand.
  - (2) Between the man and the camel. If it trails nearer to the ground, it looks as though he is carrying a cord.
  - (3) This refers to a species of ram whose tail was very fat, to preserve which it was yoked to a waggonette.
  - (4) v. Gemara.
  - (5) Discussed in the Gemara.
  - (6) Tied round its udder.
  - (7) For the prohibition relating to the cushion.
  - (8) Supra 53a.
  - (9) Jast.: a bandage or bar under the jaw.
  - (10) I.e., it should let it heal.
  - (11) To prevent the legs from knocking each other.
  - (12) The two legs were tied together; hence it could not run about and cause damage.
  - (13) Lit., ‘hid’
  - (14) The head of the Beth din. — A sheep will not be treated with such care.
  - (15) Rashal reads: R. Nahman.
  - (16) His wife.
  - (17) Deriving HANUNOTH from hanan, to be gracious, kind.
  - (18) To accustom it to bend its head under the yoke when it grows up.
  - (19) V. preceding note.
  - (20) Isa. LVIII,5.
  - (21) ‘Believed to suck and injure the udders of cattle’ (Jast).
  - (22) V. supra 52a.
  - (23) Sc. the cow referred to in the Mishnah.
  - (24) Lit., ‘it was called by his name’.
  - (25) V. Introduction to this Order, in this volume.
  - (26) I.e., these four names.
  - (27) This is a parenthetic observation by the Talmud (Tosaf.).
  - (28) Just as a pledge is seized for non-payment of debt. I.e., he is punished.

(29) V. p. 217. n. 7.

(30) Is'. III, 14.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 55a

how did the elders sin? But say, [He will bring punishment] upon the elders because they do not forbid the princes.

Rab Judah was sitting before Samuel. [when] a woman came and cried before him,<sup>1</sup> but he ignored her. Said he to him, Does not the Master agree [that] 'whoso stoppeth his ears at the cry of the poor, he also shall cry, but shall not be heard'?<sup>2</sup> 'O keen scholar!'<sup>3</sup> he replied. 'Your superior [will be punished] with cold [water]. but your superior's superior [will be punished] with hot.'<sup>4</sup> Surely Mar 'Ukba, the Ab-Beth din<sup>5</sup> is sitting!' For it is written, O house of David, thus saith the Lord. Execute judgement in the morning, and deliver the spoiled out of the hand of the oppressor, lest my fury go forth like fire, and burn that none can quench it, because of the evil of your doing, etc.<sup>6</sup>

R. Zera said to R. Simeon, Let the Master rebuke the members of the Resh Galutha's suite. They will not accept it from me, was his reply. Though they will not accept its returned he, yet you should rebuke them. For R. Aha b. R. Hanina said: Never did a favourable word<sup>7</sup> go forth from the mouth of the Holy One, blessed be He, of which He retracted for evil, save the following, where it is written, And the Lord said unto him, Go through the midst of the city, through the midst of Jerusalem, and set a mark [taw] upon the foreheads of the men that sigh and that cry for all the abominations that be done in the midst thereof, etc.<sup>8</sup> The Holy One, blessed be He, said to Gabriel,<sup>9</sup> Go and set a taw<sup>10</sup> of ink upon the foreheads of the righteous, that the destroying angels may have no power over them; and a taw of blood upon the foreheads of the wicked, that the destroying angels may have power over them. Said the Attribute of Justice<sup>11</sup> before the Holy One, blessed be He, 'Sovereign of the Universe! Wherein are these different from those?' 'Those are completely righteous men, while these are completely wicked,' replied He. 'Sovereign of the Universe!' it continued, 'they had the power to protest but did not.' 'It was fully known<sup>12</sup> to them that had they protested they would not have heeded them.'<sup>13</sup> 'Sovereign of the Universe!' said he, 'If it was revealed to Thee, was it revealed to them?' Hence it is written, [Slay utterly] the old man, the young and the maiden, and little children and women; but come not near any man upon whom is the mark; and begin at my Sanctuary [mikdash]. Then they began at the elders which were before the house.<sup>14</sup> R. Joseph recited: Read not mikdash but mekuddashay [my sanctified ones]: this refers to the people who fulfilled the Torah from alef to taw.<sup>15</sup> And straightway, And behold, six men came from the way of the upper gate, which lieth toward the north, every man with his slaughter weapon in his hand; and one man in the midst of them clothed in linen, with a writer's inkhorn by his side. And they went in, and stood beside the brazen altar.<sup>16</sup> Was then the brazen altar [still] in existence?<sup>17</sup> — The Holy One, blessed be He, spake thus to them; Commence [destruction] from the place where song is uttered before Me.<sup>18</sup> And who were the six men? — Said R. Hisda: Indignation [Kezef], Anger [Af], Wrath [Hemah], Destroyer [Mashhith] Breaker [Meshabber] and Annihilator [Mekaleh]. And why taw? — Said Rab: Taw [stands for] tihyeh [thou shalt live], taw [stands for] tamuth [thou shalt die]. Samuel said: The taw denotes, the merit of the Patriarchs is exhausted [tamah].<sup>19</sup> R. Johanan said: The merit of the Patriarchs will confer grace [tahon].<sup>20</sup> While Resh Lakish said: Taw is the end of the seal of the Holy One, blessed be He. For R. Hanina said: The seal of the Holy One, blessed be He, is emeth [truth]. R. Samuel b. Nahmani said: It denotes the people who fulfilled the Torah from alef to taw.<sup>21</sup>

And since when has the merit of the Patriarchs been exhausted? — Rab said, Since the days of Hosea the son of Beeri, for it is written, [And now] will I discover her lewdness in the sight of her lovers, and none shall deliver her out of mine hand.<sup>22</sup> Samuel said. Since the days of Hazael, for it is said, And Hazael king of Syria oppressed Israel all the days of Jehoahaz;<sup>23</sup> and it is written, But the

Lord was gracious unto them, and had compassion upon them, and had respect unto them, because of the covenant with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and would not destroy them, neither cast he them from his presence until now.<sup>24</sup> R. Joshua b. Levi said: Since the days of Elijah, for it is said, And it came to pass at the time of the offering of the evening oblation, that Elijah the prophet came near, and said, O Lord, the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Israel, let it be known this day that thou art God in Israel, and that I am thy servant, and that I have done all these things at thy word.<sup>25</sup> R. Johanan said: Since the days of Hezekiah, for it is said, Of the increase of his government and of peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to establish it, and to uphold it with judgement and with righteousness for henceforth even for ever. The zeal of the Lord of hosts shall perform this.<sup>26</sup>

R. Ammi said: There is no death without sin,<sup>27</sup> and there is no suffering without iniquity. There is no death without sin, for it is written, The soul that sinneth, it shall die: the son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son, the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him, etc.,<sup>28</sup> There is no suffering without iniquity, for it is written, Then will I visit their transgression with the rod, and their iniquity with stripes.<sup>29</sup>

---

(1) About a wrong done to her.

(2) Prov. XXI, 13.

(3) Or, man of long teeth.

(4) I.e., I, your superior, will go unscathed, because there is a higher court than mine, viz., Mar 'Ukba's. which should really take the matter up.

(5) The father, i.e., the head of the Beth din.

(6) Jer. XXI, 12. From this Samuel deduced that only the head, with whom lay the real power, would be punished.

(7) Lit., 'a good attribute'.

(8) Ezek. IX, 4.

(9) Gabriel, 'man of God', is mentioned in the Book of Daniel VIII, 16-26; IX, 21-27. He was regarded as God's messenger, who executes His will on earth.

(10) The last letter of the Hebrew alphabet.

(11) Justice was often hypostasized as an independent being.

(12) Lit., 'it was revealed and known'.

(13) Lit., 'accepted (it) from them'.

(14) Ezek. IX, 6.

(15) The first and the last letters of the alphabet — as we say from Alpha to Omega'. Nevertheless they were included, because they had failed to protest. Thus the Almighty retracted from His original intention, the change being for evil.

(16) Ibid. 2.

(17) According to tradition Solomon hid it and substituted an earthen altar for it; v. I Kings VIII, 64 and Zeb. 59b.

(18) I.e., start with the Levites, who utter song to the accompaniment of musical instruments of brass.

(19) The merit of the Patriarchs, which acted as a shield for the wicked, is at an end.

(20) Samuel explains the law on the wicked; R. Johanan that on the righteous.

(21) V. n. 2.

(22) Hos. II, 12; 'and none', i.e., their merit

(23) II Kings XIII, 22.

(24) Ibid. 23. 'Until now' implies, but no longer.

(25) I Kings XVIII, 36. Here too this day implies a limitation.

(26) Isa. IX, 6. 'The zeal, etc.' implies, but not the merit of the Patriarchs, this being exhausted by now.

(27) One's sins cause his death.

(28) Ezek. XVIII, 20.

(29) Ps. LXXXIX, 33.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 55b

An objection is raised: The ministering angels asked the Holy One, blessed be He: 'Sovereign of the Universe! Why didst Thou impose the penalty of death upon Adam?' Said He to them, I gave him an easy command, yet he violated it.' 'But Moses and Aaron fulfilled the whole Torah,' they pursued — 'yet they died'. 'There is one event to the righteous and to the wicked; to the good, etc.,<sup>1</sup> He replied .<sup>2</sup> — He maintains as the following Tanna. For it was taught: R. Simeon b. Eleazar said: Moses and Aaron too died through their sin, for it is said, Because ye believed not in me[...therefore ye shall not bring this assembly into the land which I have given them]:<sup>3</sup> hence, had ye believed in Me, your time had not yet come to depart from the world.<sup>4</sup>

An objection is raised: Four died through the serpent's machinations,<sup>5</sup> viz., Benjamin the son of Jacob, Amram the father of Moses, Jesse the father of David, and Caleb the son of David. Now, all are known by tradition, save Jesse the father of David, in whose case the Writ gives an explicit intimation. For it is written, And Absalom set Amasa over the host instead of Joab. Now Amasa was the son of a man whose name was Ithra the Israelite, that went in to Abigail the daughter of Nahash, sister to Zeruah Joab's mother.<sup>6</sup> Now, was she the daughter of Nahash? Surely she was the daughter of Jesse, for it is written, and their sisters were Zeruah and Abigail?<sup>7</sup> Hence it must mean, the daughter of one who died through the machinations of the nahash [serpent].<sup>8</sup> Who is [the author of this]? Shall we say, the Tanna [who taught] about the ministering angels? — Surely there were Moses and Aaron too! Hence it must surely be R. Simeon b. Eleazar, which proves that there is death without sin and suffering without iniquity. Thus the refutation of R. Ammi is [indeed] a refutation.

R. Samuel b. Nahman said in R. Jonathan's name: Whoever maintains that Reuben sinned is merely making an error, for it is said, Now the sons of Jacob were twelve,<sup>9</sup> teaching that they were all equal.<sup>10</sup> Then how do I interpret, and he lay with Bilhah his father's concubine?<sup>11</sup> This teaches that he transposed his father's couch,<sup>12</sup> and the Writ imputes [blame] to him as though he had lain with her. It was taught, R. Simeon b. Eleazar said: That righteous man was saved from that sin and that deed did not come to his hand.<sup>13</sup> Is it possible that his seed was destined to stand on Mount Ebal and proclaim, Cursed be he that lieth with his father's wife,<sup>14</sup> yet this sin should come to his hand? But how do I interpret, and he lay with Bilhah his father's concubine'? He resented his mother's humiliation. Said he, If my mother's sister was a rival to my mother, shall the bondmaid of my mother's sister be a rival to my mother? [Thereupon] he arose and transposed her couch. Others say, He transposed two couches, one of the Shechinah and the other of his father.<sup>15</sup> Thus it is written, Then thou defiledst, my couch on which [the Shechinah] went up.<sup>16</sup>

This is dependent on Tannaim. Unstable [Pahaz] as water, thou shalt not excel.<sup>17</sup> R. Eliezer interpreted: Thou wast hasty [Paztah], thou wast guilty [Habtah] thou didst disgrace [Zaltah]. R. Joshua interpreted: Thou didst overstep [Pasatah] the law, thou didst sin [Hatatha], thou didst fornicate [Zanitha]. R. Gamaliel interpreted: Thou didst meditate [Pillaltah],<sup>18</sup> thou didst supplicate [Haltah], thy prayer shone forth [Zarhah]. Said R. Gamaliel, We still need [the interpretation of] the Modiite. R. Eleazar the Modiite<sup>19</sup> said, Reverse the word and interpret it: Thou didst tremble [Zi'az'atha], thou didst recoil [Halitha], thy sin fled [Parhah] from thee.<sup>20</sup> Raba — others state, R. Jeremiah b. Abba interpreted: Thou didst remember [Zakarta] the penalty of the crime, thou wast [grievously] sick [Halitha],<sup>21</sup> thou heldest aloof [Pirashta] from sinning.

(Mnemonic: Reuben, the sons of Eli, the sons of Samuel, David, Solomon, and Josiah.)<sup>22</sup> R. Samuel b. Nahmani said in R. Jonathan's name: Whoever maintains that the sons of Eli sinned is merely making an error, for it is said, And the two sons of Eli, Hophni and Phinehas, priests unto the Lord, were there.<sup>23</sup> Now he agrees with Rab, who said, Phinehas did not sin. [Hence] Hophni is likened to Phinehas: just as Phinehas did not sin, so did Hophni not sin. Then how do I interpret, and how that they [sc. Eli's sons] lay with the women?<sup>24</sup> Because they delayed their bird-offerings<sup>25</sup> so that they did not go to their husbands,<sup>26</sup> the Writ stigmatizes them as though they had lain with them.

It was stated above, ‘Rab said, Phinehas did not sin,’ for it is said, and Ahijah, the son of Ahitub, Ichabod’s brother, the son of Phinehas, the son of Eli, the priest of the Lord, etc.<sup>27</sup> Now, is it possible that sin had come to his hand, yet the Writ states his descent? Surely It is said, The Lord will cut off to the man that doeth this, him that waketh [‘er] and him that answereth, out of the tents of Jacob, and him that offereth an offering unto the Lord of hosts:<sup>28</sup> [this means:] if an Israelite,<sup>29</sup> he shall have none awakening [i.e., teaching] among the Sages and none responding among the disciples; if a priest, he shall have no son to offer an offering? Hence it follows that Phinehas did not sin. But it is written, ‘how that they lay [etc.]’? — ‘He lay’ is written.<sup>30</sup> But it is written, Nay, my sons; for it is no good report that I hear?<sup>31</sup> — Said R. Nahman b. Isaac: My son is written.<sup>32</sup> But it is written, ye make [the Lord’s people] to transgress?<sup>33</sup> — Said R. Huna son of R. Joshua, It is written, he causes them to transgress.<sup>34</sup> But it is written, sons of Belial?<sup>35</sup> — Because Phinehas should have protested to Hophni but did not, the Writ regards him as though he [too] sinned.

R. Samuel b. Nahmani said in R. Jonathan’s name: Whoever maintains

- 
- (1) Eccl. IX, 2.
  - (2) Showing that death may come without sin.
  - (3) Num. XX, 12.
  - (4) On the view that they died sinless, this deduction is made: but had ye believed, you would have led the assembly into the land, etc. The punishment therefore was that they would not lead, not that they should die, which would have been disproportionate to their fault (Maharsha).
  - (5) I.e., because the serpent caused Adam and Eve to sin, but not on account of their own sin. — This is not to be confused with the doctrine of Original sin, which is rejected by Judaism, v. B.B., Sonc. ed., p. 86, n. 11.
  - (6) II Sam. XVII, 25.
  - (7) I Chron. II, 16. ‘Their sisters’ refers to the sons of Jesse; v. preceding verse.
  - (8) It may be observed that the Talmud calls this an explicit intimation.
  - (9) Gen. XXXV, 22.
  - (10) Lit., ‘balanced as one’ — they were all equal in righteousness.
  - (11) Ibid.
  - (12) Placing it in Leah’s tent; v. infra.
  - (13) He did not even have the opportunity.
  - (14) Deut. XXVII; 20; v. 13.
  - (15) Rashi: Jacob set a couch for the Shechinah in the tents of each of his wives, and where the Shechinah came to rest, there he spent the night.
  - (16) Gen. XLIX, 4. This translation is based on the change of person from second (defiledst) to third (went), which implies a different subject for ‘went’.
  - (17) Ibid.
  - (18) To be saved from sin.
  - (19) Of Modim, some fifteen miles north of Jerusalem.
  - (20) All treat the word Pahaz (E.V. unstable) as a mnemonic, each letter indicating a word. Thus R. Eliezer and R. Joshua maintain that he sinned, while the others hold that his nobler feelings triumphed.
  - (21) Through defying his lust.
  - (22) V. p. 149, n. 6.
  - (23) I Sam. I, 3.
  - (24) Ibid. II, 22.
  - (25) After childbirth; v. Lev. XII, 6-8.
  - (26) They had to wait in Shiloh until their birds were sacrificed.
  - (27) Ibid. XIV, 3.
  - (28) Mal. II, 12.
  - (29) I.e., not a priest.
  - (30) **יִשְׁכַּבְנִי**, defectively, and to be treated as 3rd. person singular; cf. Arabic ending in an].

(31) I Sam. II, 24.

(32) The sing. and the plural are the same in Heb. He must mean that the earlier traditional reading was my son.

(33) Ibid.

(34) [מעבירים]: M.T. has מעבירים, but in a number of places the Talmud version differs from ours. V. Tosaf and Marginal Gloss].

(35) Ibid. 12.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 56a

that Samuel's sons sinned is merely erring. For it is said, And it came to pass when Samuel was old... that his sons walked not in his ways:<sup>1</sup> thus, they [merely] walked not in his ways, yet they did not sin either. Then how do I fulfil, 'they turned aside for lucre'?<sup>2</sup> That means that they did not act like their father. For Samuel the righteous used to travel to all the places of Israel and judge them in their towns, as it is said, And he went from year to year in circuit to Beth-el, and Gilgal, and Mizpah; and he judged Israel.<sup>3</sup> But they did not act thus, but sat in their own towns, in order to increase the fees of their beadles<sup>4</sup> and scribes.<sup>5</sup>

This is a controversy of Tannaim: 'They turned aside for lucre': R. Meir said, [That means,] They openly demanded their portions.<sup>6</sup> R. Judah said: They forced<sup>7</sup> goods on private people. R. Akiba said: They took an extra basket of tithes by force. R. Jose said: They took the gifts by force.<sup>8</sup>

R. Samuel b. Nahmani said in R. Jonathan's name: Whoever says that David sinned is merely erring, for it is said, And David behaved himself wisely in all his ways: and the Lord was with him.<sup>9</sup> Is it possible that sin came to his hand, yet the Divine Presence was with him? Then how do I interpret, Wherefore hast thou despised the word of the Lord, to do that which is evil in his sight?<sup>10</sup> He wished to do [evil], but did not. Rab observed: Rabbi, who is descended from David, seeks to defend him, and expounds [the verse] in David's favour. [Thus:] The 'evil' [mentioned] here is unlike every other 'evil' [mentioned] elsewhere in the Torah. For of every other evil [mentioned] in the Torah it is written, 'and he did,' whereas here it is written, 'to do': [this means] that he desired to do, but did not. Thou hast smitten Uriah the Hittite with the sword:<sup>11</sup> thou shouldst have had him tried by the Sanhedrin,<sup>12</sup> but didst not. And hast taken his wife to be thy wife: thou hast marriage rights in her.<sup>13</sup> For R. Samuel b. Nahmani said in R. Jonathan's name: Every one who went out in the wars of the house of David wrote a bill of divorcement for his wife, for it is said, and bring these ten cheeses unto the captain of their thousand, and look how thy brethren fare, and take their pledge ['arubatham].<sup>14</sup> What is meant by 'arubatham? R. Joseph learned: The things which pledge man and woman [to one another].<sup>15</sup> And thou hast slain him with the sword of the children of Ammon:<sup>11</sup> just as thou art not [to be] punished for the sword of the Ammonites, so art thou not [to be] punished for [the death of] Uriah the Hittite. What is the reason? He was rebellious against royal authority, saying to him, and my lord Joab, and the servants of my lord, are encamped in the open field [etc].<sup>16</sup>

Rab said: When you examine [the life of] David, you find nought but 'save only in the matter of Uriah the Hittite.'<sup>17</sup> Abaye the Elder pointed out a contradiction in Rab['s dicta]: Did Rab say thus? Surely Rab said, David paid heed to slander? The difficulty remains.

[To revert to] the main text: 'Rab said, David paid heed to slander,' for it is written, And the king said unto him, where is he? And Ziba said unto the king, Behold, he is in the house of Machir the son of Ammiel, belo da bar [in Lo-debar].<sup>18</sup> And it is written, Then David sent, and fetched him out of the house of Machir the son of Ammiel, millo dabar [from Lo-debar].<sup>19</sup> Now consider: he [David] saw that he [Ziba] was a liar; then when he slandered him a second time, why did he pay heed thereto? For it is written, And the king said, And where is thy master's son? And Ziba said unto the king, Behold, he abideth at Jerusalem [: for he said, To-day shall the house of Israel restore me the kingdom of my father].<sup>20</sup> And how do we know that he accepted it [the slander] from, him? Because

it is written, Then said the king to Ziba, Behold, thine is all that pertaineth unto Mephibosheth. And Ziba said, I do obeisance; let me find favour in thy sight, my lord, O king.<sup>21</sup>

But Samuel maintained: David did not pay heed to slander, [for] he saw self-evident things in him,<sup>22</sup> For it is written, And Mephibosheth the son of Saul came down to meet the king; and he had neither dressed his feet, nor trimmed his beard, nor washed his clothes, etc.<sup>23</sup> While it is written, And it came to pass, when he was come to Jerusalem to meet the king, that the king said unto him, Wherefore wentest thou not with me, Mephibosheth? And he answered, My Lord, O king, my servant deceived me: for thy servant said, I will saddle me an ass, that I may ride thereon, and go with the king, because thy servant is lame,

---

(1) I Sam. VIII, 1, 3.

(2) Ibid.

(3) Ibid. VII, 16.

(4) Who are sent to summon the litigants. On *hazzan v.* p. 41, n. 7.

(5) Who record the pleas, arguments, verdicts, etc.

(6) They were Levites, and personally demanded the tithes. Owing to their exalted position their demands were acceded to, while the humbler Levites might starve. But they did not actually pervert judgment. — R. Meir's interpretation may have been called forth by the troublous times before the overthrow of the Jewish state, when many High Priests abused their positions by such extortion; *v. Halevi, Doroth I, 5, pp. 4 seq.*

(7) They compelled people to be their business agents.

(8) Either the priestly dues, viz., the shoulder, cheeks, and maw of animals, though they were not priests; or the Levitical dues, sc. the first tithes, their sin being that they used force.

(9) Ibid. XVIII, 14.

(10) II Sam. XII, 9.

(11) II Sam. Xli, 9.

(12) The great court; *v. Sanh. 2a.*

(13) *Lakah*, the verb employed here, denotes marriage; cf. Deut. XXIV, 1.

(14) I Sam. XVII, 18.

(15) Lit., 'him and her', sc. the marriage. I.e., take away their marriage — cancel it by means of a divorce. — The divorce was conditional, in the sense that it became retrospectively valid if the husband died. Thus, since Uriah died, she was a free woman from the time he went out, and was not married when David took her.

(16) II Sam. XI, 11. Thus he disobeyed David's order to go home.

(17) I Kings XV, 5. Rashi: his only sin lay in encompassing Uriah's death, but not in taking Bathsheba (as explained above). From the context, however, it appears that Rab does not exculpate him from adultery with Bathsheba, but means that David was guilty of no other sin save that in connection with Uriah, which naturally includes his behaviour with Bathsheba. On that view Rab rejects Rabbi's exegesis (That too appears from Rab's prefacing remark: 'Rabbi who is descended, etc.').

(18) II Sam. IX, 4.

(19) Ibid. 5. Maharsha: *belo dabar* is translated: He (Mephibosheth son of Jonathan and grandson of Saul) has words, i.e., makes unloyal accusations against you. But David found that he was *millo dabar*, i.e., he had not made such accusations. Thus Ziba's charges were unfounded. This explains the Gemara that follows.

(20) Ibid. XVI, 3.

(21) Ibid. 4.

(22) Which substantiated Ziba's charges. Thus it was not a mere acceptance of slander.

(23) Ibid. XIX, 24.

## **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 56b**

And he hath slandered thy servant unto my lord the king; but my lord the king is as an angel of God: do therefore what is good in thine eyes. For all my father's house were but dead men before my lord the king: yet didst thou set thy servant among them that did eat at thine own table. What right

therefore have I yet that I should cry and more unto the king? And the king said unto him, Why speakest thou any more of thy matters? I say, Thou and Ziba divide the land. And Mephibosheth said unto the king, Yea, let him take all, forasmuch as my lord the king is come in peace unto his own house.<sup>1</sup> He said [thus] to him: I prayed,<sup>2</sup> when wilt thou return in peace? Yet thou treatest me so. Not against thee have I resentment, but against Him who restored thee in peace!<sup>3</sup> Hence it is written, And the son of Jonathan was Meribbaal:<sup>4</sup> was then his name Merib-baal? Surely it was Mephibosheth? But because he raised a quarrel [meribah] with his Master,<sup>5</sup> a Heavenly Echo went forth and rebuked him, Thou man of strife, [and] the son of a man of strife! Man of strife, as we have stated. Son of a man of strife, for it is written, And Saul came to the city of Amalek, and strove in the valley.<sup>6</sup> R. Manni said: [That means,] concerning the matter of the valley.<sup>7</sup>

Rab Judah said in Rab's name: When David said to Mephibosheth, 'Thou and Ziba divide the land,' a Heavenly Echo came forth and declared to him, Rehoboam and Jeroboam shall divide the kingdom.<sup>8</sup> Rab Judah said in Rab's name: Had not David paid heed to slander, the kingdom of the House of David would not have been divided, Israel had not engaged in idolatry,<sup>9</sup> and we would not have been exiled from our country.<sup>10</sup>

R. Samuel b. Nahmani said in R. Jonathan's name: Whoever maintains that Solomon sinned is merely making an error, for it is said, and his heart was not perfect with the Lord his God, as was the heart of David his father:<sup>11</sup> it was [merely] not as the heart of David his father, but neither did he sin. Then how do I interpret, For it came to pass, when Solomon was old, that his wives turned away his heart?<sup>12</sup> That is [to be explained] as R. Nathan. For R. Nathan opposed [two verses]: It is written, For it came to pass, when Solomon was old, that his wives turned away his heart,' whereas it is [also] written, and his heart was not perfect with the Lord his God, as was the heart of David his father, [implying that] it was [merely] not as the heart of David his father, but neither did he sin? This is its meaning: his wives turned away his heart to go after other gods, but he did not go.<sup>13</sup> But it is written, Then would<sup>14</sup> Solomon build a high place for Chemosh the abomination of Moab?<sup>15</sup> — That means, he desired to build, but did not.<sup>16</sup> If so, Then Joshua built [yibneh] an altar unto the Lord,<sup>17</sup> [does this too mean,] he desired to build but did not! Hence it [surely means] that he [actually] built; so here too it means that he built? — Rather it<sup>18</sup> is as was taught: R. Jose said, and the high places that were before Jerusalem, which were on the right hand of the mount of corruption, which Solomon the king of Israel had builded for Ashtoreth the abomination of Moab.<sup>19</sup> Now, is it possible that Assa came and did not destroy them, then Jehoshaphat, and he did not destroy them, until Josiah came and destroyed them! But surely Assa and Jehoshaphat destroyed all the idolatrous cults in Palestine? Hence [the explanation is that] the earlier are assimilated to the later: just as the later did not do, yet it was ascribed to them, to their glory, so the earlier ones too did not do, yet it was ascribed to them, to their shame.<sup>20</sup> But it is written, And Solomon did that which was evil in the sight of the Lord?<sup>21</sup> — But because he should have restrained his wives, but did not, the Writ regards him as though he sinned.

Rab Judah said in Samuel's name: Better had it been for that righteous man to be an acolyte to the unmentionable,<sup>22</sup> only that it should not be written of him, 'and he did that which was evil in the sight of the Lord'.

Rab Judah said in Samuel's name: When Solomon married Pharaoh's daughter, she brought him a thousand musical instruments and said to him, Thus we play<sup>23</sup> in honour of that idol, thus in honour of that idol, yet he did not forbid her.

Rab Judah said in Samuel's name: When Solomon married Pharaoh's daughter, Gabriel descended and planted a reed in the sea, and it gathered a bank around it, on which the great city of Rome was built.<sup>24</sup> In a Baraitha it was taught: On the day that Jeroboam brought the two golden calves, one into Bethel and the other into Dan, a hut was built,<sup>25</sup> and this developed into Greek Italy.<sup>26</sup>

R. Samuel b. Nahmani said in R. Jonathan's name: Whoever maintains that Josiah sinned is merely making an error, for it is said, And he did that which was right in the eyes of the Lord, and walked in all the ways of David his father.<sup>27</sup> Then how do I interpret, and like unto him there was no king before him, that returned [shab] to the Lord with all his heart etc.?<sup>28</sup> [This teaches] that he revised every judgment which he had pronounced between the ages of eight and eighteen.<sup>29</sup> You might say that he took from one and gave to another:<sup>30</sup> therefore it is taught, 'with all me'odo [his might]', [teaching] that he gave of his own.<sup>31</sup> Now, he disagrees with Rab. For Rab said: There was no greater penitent than Josiah in his generation and a certain person in ours; and who is that? Abba the father of R. Jeremiah b. Abba, and some say Aha the brother of Abba the father of Jeremiah b. Abba. (For a Master said: R. Abba and Aha were brothers). R. Joseph said: And there is yet another in our generation. And who is he? 'Ukban b. Nehemiah the Resh Galutha.<sup>32</sup> And he is 'Nathan with the ray of light.'<sup>33</sup> R. Joseph said: I was sitting at the session and dozing, and saw in a dream how one [an angel] stretched out his hand and received him. [

---

(1) II Sam. XIX, 25-30.

(2) Lit., 'said'.

(3) Thus he confirmed Ziba's accusation. For David regarded Mephibosheth's unkempt appearance too as a sign that he grieved over his return.

(4) I Chron. VIII, 34; IX, 40.

(5) Be'alaw fr. ba'al.

(6) I Sam. XV, 5.

(7) Saul argued: If the Torah decreed that a heifer should have its neck broken in the valley on account of a single murdered man (Deut. XXI, 1-9), how much greater is the sin of slaying all these Amalekites! (v. Yoma 22b). Thus he strove against God's command.

(8) This agrees with Rab's view (supra a) that David paid heed to slander and acted unjustly. Hence this punishment.

(9) The first step to idolatry was Jeroboam's setting up of the golden calves in order to maintain the independence of his kingdom (v. I Kings XII, 26 seq.).

(10) As a punishment for idolatry.

(11) I Kings XI, 4.

(12) Ibid.

(13) His wives attempted to seduce him, but failed.

(14) E.V. 'did'.

(15) I Kings XI, 7.

(16) Yibneh is imperfect, denoting uncompleted action; v. Driver's Hebrew Tenses, ch. III, 21 seq.

(17) Josh. VIII, 30.

(18) The statement that Solomon did not sin.

(19) II Kings XXIII, 13. This refers to the religious reformations of Josiah.

(20) Josiah merely removed the idols that were reintroduced after the deaths of the former two kings, but not all idols, since they had already been destroyed, yet it is all attributed to him. So Solomon too was not responsible for the building of the idolatrous high places; nevertheless, since he did not veto them, they are ascribed to him.

(21) I Kings XI, 6.

(22) Lit., 'something else' — i.e., to an idol, receiving pay for drawing water and hewing wood in its service, etc., though not believing in it.

(23) Lit., 'do'.

(24) This, of course, is an allegory. Solomon's unfaithfulness laid the seeds for the dissolution of the Jewish State.

(25) On the site of Rome.

(26) This term was particularly applied to the southern portion of Italy, called Magna Graecia, Cf. Meg. 6b in the ed. Ven. (omitted in later ed.): Greek Italy, that means the great city of Rome, v. Meg., Sonc. ed., p. 31, nn. 5-6.

(27) II Kings XXII, 2.

(28) Ibid. XXIII, 25. Shab really means that he repented, and thus implies that he first sinned.

(29) I.e., from his accession until the finding of the Book of the Law, i.e., the Torah (v. XXII, 1-8). He revised his

judgments in the light of the Torah, and shab is translated accordingly.

(30) In the course of this revision.

(31) Me'odo <me'od is translated money, wealth, in the Talmud. Cf. Sanh. 74a on Deut. VI, 5 (Sonc. ed., p. 502).

(32) V. p. 217, n. 7.

(33) Jast.: a repentant sinner with a halo; others: whom an angel seized by his forelock (accepting his repentance and bringing him to God).

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 57a

### CHAPTER VI

MISHNAH. WHEREWITH MAY A WOMAN GO OUT, AND WHEREWITH MAY SHE NOT GO OUT?<sup>1</sup> A WOMAN MAY NOT GO OUT WITH RIBBONS OF WOOL, LINEN RIBBONS, OR FILLETS ROUND HER HEAD;<sup>2</sup> NOR MAY SHE PERFORM RITUAL IMMERSION WHILST WEARING THEM, UNLESS SHE LOOSENS THEM. [SHE MAY NOT GO OUT] WITH FRONTLETS,<sup>3</sup> GARLANDS [SARBITIN], IF THEY ARE NOT SEWN,<sup>4</sup> OR WITH A HAIR-NET [KABUL]<sup>5</sup> INTO THE STREET,<sup>6</sup> OR WITH A GOLDEN CITY,<sup>7</sup> OR WITH A NECKLACE [KATLA]. OR WITH EAR-RINGS, OR WITH A FINGER — RING WHICH HAS NO SIGNET, OR WITH A NEEDLE WHICH IS UNPIERCED. YET IF SHE GOES OUT WITH THESE], SHE IS NOT LIABLE TO A SIN-OFFERING.<sup>8</sup>

GEMARA. Who mentioned anything about ritual immersion?<sup>9</sup> — Said R. Nahman b. Isaac in Rabbah b. Abbuha's name: He [the Tanna] states what is the reason. [Thus:] what is the reason that A WOMAN MAY NOT GO OUT WITH WOOL RIBBONS OR LINEN RIBBONS? Because the Sages ruled, SHE MAY NOT PERFORM RITUAL IMMERSION WHILST WEARING THEM, UNLESS SHE LOOSENS THEM. And since she may not perform ritual immersion on weekdays while wearing them, she may not go out [with them] on the Sabbath, lest she happen to need immersion by ritual law<sup>10</sup> and she untie them, and so come to carry them four cubits in the street.

R. Kahana asked Rab: What of openwork bands?<sup>11</sup> — Said he to him, You speak of something woven:<sup>12</sup> whatever is woven, no prohibition was enacted [in respect thereof].<sup>13</sup> It was stated likewise: R. Huna son of R. Joshua said: Whatever is woven, no prohibition was enacted [in respect thereof]. Others state, R. Huna son of R. Joshua said: I saw that my sisters are not particular about them,<sup>14</sup> What is the difference between the latter version and the former? — There is a difference where they are soiled. On the version that no prohibition was enacted for anything that is woven, these too are woven. But according to the version which bases it on [not] being particular; since they are soiled, one does indeed object to them.<sup>15</sup>

We learnt elsewhere: And the following constitute interpositions in the case of human beings: Wool ribbons, linen ribbons, and the fillet round maidens' heads.<sup>16</sup> R. Judah said: [Ribbons] of wool or of hair do not interpose. because the water enters through them.<sup>17</sup> R. Huna observed: And we learnt all with reference to maidens' heads.<sup>18</sup> R. Joseph demurred: What does this exclude? Shall we say it excludes [ribbons] of the neck, — and of what [material]? Shall we say, it excludes wool: [The question can be raised] if soft [material] on hard<sup>19</sup> forms an interposition, is there a question of soft upon soft?<sup>20</sup> Again. if it excludes linen ribbons, [one might ask] if hard upon hard constitutes an interposition, is there a question of hard upon soft?<sup>21</sup> Rather, said R. Joseph. this is R. Huna's reason, because a woman does not strangle herself.<sup>22</sup>

Abaye refuted him: Maidens may go out with the threads through their ears,<sup>23</sup> but not with fillets round their necks. Now if you say that a woman will not strangle herself, why not with fillets round their necks?<sup>24</sup> — Said Rabina:

- (1) On the Sabbath. The general rule is that a woman may wear superfluous garments which are ornamental, save some which the Rabbis prohibited for fear that she might remove them for a friend's inspection and admiration, carrying them meanwhile in the street. Those which are not considered ornamental constitute a burden, and are always forbidden.
- (2) 'Her head' applies to all three. These are for tying the hair.
- (3) Ornaments worn on the forehead.
- (4) To the wig which was generally worn.
- (5) The Gemara discusses these. V. also T.A. I, 188 and note a.l.
- (6) But she may wear it in a courtyard, whereas all the others are forbidden even in a courtyard, lest she forget herself and go out into the street; v. infra 64b.
- (7) An ornament which contained a picture of Jerusalem.
- (8) Because all these are ornaments, hence only Rabbinically prohibited; v. n. I .
- (9) The reference to immersion is apparently irrelevant.
- (10) I.e., if the first evening, when she is permitted to take a ritual bath after menstruation to enable her to cohabit with her husband, falls on the Sabbath.
- (11) Chains or cords formed in network fashion. These cannot be tied very tightly; hence the question is whether they need be loosened before a ritual bath and by corollary, must not be worn on the Sabbath, or not.
- (12) I.e., a network.
- (13) In connection with Sabbath, since they need not be removed for immersion.
- (14) To remove them before bathing. This shows that they know that the water enters through the network. Consequently it is unnecessary to remove them before a ritual bath, and they may be worn on the Sabbath.
- (15) And is particular to remove them.
- (16) When one takes a ritual bath, nothing must interpose between the water and his body. If one of these is worn it does interpose, rendering the bath invalid.
- (17) And reaches the skin.
- (18) I.e., the wool and linen ribbons also mean those that are used for tying the hair.
- (19) Sc. the hair, which is hard in comparison with the skin of the neck.
- (20) Surely not, for it is more clinging, making it more difficult for the water to enter.
- (21) Linen ribbon is regarded as hard in comparison with wool.
- (22) Though ribbons cling more closely to flesh than to hair when tied with equal strength, they are always worn more loosely around the neck, for the reason stated.
- (23) They are inserted there after the ear is pierced for ear-rings to prevent the hole from closing up.
- (24) For they need not be removed before a ritual bath, being loose; v. p. 267. n. 5.

## **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 57b**

The reference here is to a broad band<sup>1</sup> which a woman ties very tightly,<sup>2</sup> as she is pleased to have a fleshy appearance.<sup>3</sup>

'R. Judah said: [Ribbons] of wool or of hair do not interpose, because the water enters through them.' R. Joseph said in the name of Rab Judah in Samuel's name: The halachah is as R. Judah in respect of ribbons of hair. Said Abaye to him: 'The halachah [is thus]' implies that they differ thereon?<sup>4</sup> And should you say, Had he not known the first Tanna to treat of ribbons of hair [too], he would not have treated thereof either: but perhaps he argued with them from analogy:<sup>5</sup> just as you agree with me in the matter of ribbons of hair, so should you agree with me in respect of wool ribbons? It was stated: R. Nahman said in Samuel's name: The Sages agree with R. Judah in respect to ribbons of hair. It was taught likewise: Ribbons of wool interpose; ribbons of hair do not interpose. R. Judah maintained: [Ribbons] of wool or of hair do not interpose. R. Nahman b. Isaac said: Our Mishnah too proves this. For it teaches: A woman may go out with ribbons of hair, whether of her own [hair] or of her companion's.<sup>6</sup> Who is the authority [for this]? Shall we say. R. Judah — even ribbons of wool too [are permitted]? Hence it must surely be the Rabbis, which proves that they do not disagree in respect of ribbons of hair. This proves it.

[SHE MAY] NOT [GO OUT] WITH FRONTLETS [TOTEFETH]. What is TOTEFETH? — Said R. Joseph: A charm containing balsam.<sup>7</sup> Said Abaye to him: Let it be [regarded] as an approved amulet, and hence permitted? Rather said Rab Judah on Abaye's authority: It is an ornament of beads.<sup>8</sup> It was taught likewise: A woman may go out with a gilded hair-net,<sup>9</sup> a totfeth, and with sarbitin that are fastened to her. What is totfeth and what is sarbitin? — Said R. Abbahu: A totfeth encompasses her [head] from ear to ear; sarbitin reach to her cheeks. R. Huna said: poor women make them of various dyed materials; wealthy women make them of gold and silver.

NOR WITH A HAIR-NET [KABUL]. R. Jannai said: I do not know what is this [kabul]: whether we learnt of a slave's chain, but a wool hair-net<sup>10</sup> is permitted; or perhaps we learnt of a wool hair-net and how much more so a slave's neckchain?<sup>11</sup> Said R. Abbahu: Reason supports the view that we learnt of a wool hair-net. And it was taught likewise: A woman may go out into a courtyard with a kabul and a clasp [istema].<sup>12</sup> R. Simeon b. Eleazar said: [She may go out] with a kabul into the street too. R. Simeon b. Eleazar stated a general rule: Whatever is [worn] beneath the net, one may go out therewith: whatever is [worn] above the net, one may not go out with it.<sup>13</sup>

What is istema? — Said R. Abbahu: Bizyune. What is bizyune? Said Abaye in Rab's name: That which imprisons the flying [locks].<sup>14</sup> Our Rabbis taught: Three things were said of an istema: It is not subject to [the interdict of] kil'ayim.<sup>15</sup> it is not defiled by leprosy,<sup>16</sup> and one may not go out with it into the street. On the authority of R. Simeon it was said: It is also not subject to [the interdict against]

---

(1) Rashi.

(2) Lit., 'chokes or strangles herself'.

(3) In eastern countries that constitutes beauty. Being broad, the band does not injure her.

(4) But the first Tanna says nothing about this!

(5) Lit., 'he said to them, "just as".'

(6) V. infra 64b.

(7) Rashi: to ward off the evil eye.

(8) Jast.: obsidian beads.

(9) For if she removes it, her hair is uncovered; hence she is unlikely to remove it.

(10) Or wig.

(11) The term Kabul bears both meanings.

(12) To keep the hair in order under the net or wig.

(13) Thus he refers to the kabul as something above the hair band. Hence it can only mean the hair-net.

(14) I.e., a clasp or buckle.

(15) V. Glos. This may contain diverse materials. Rashi: because it is not spun; Riba: because it is hard, in which case the Rabbis did not impose a prohibition.

(16) I.e., if leprosy breaks out in the istema. The reason is that it is not technically a garment.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 58a

bridal crowns.<sup>1</sup>

But Samuel maintained: We learnt of a slave's neck-chain. Now, did Samuel say thus? Surely Samuel said: A slave may go out with a seal round his neck,<sup>2</sup> but not with a seal on his garments? There is no difficulty: in the one case [the reference is] where his master set it upon him; in the other where he set it upon himself.<sup>3</sup> How have you explained this latter [dictum] of Samuel? that his master set it upon him! Then why [may he] not [go out] with the seal on his garment? — Lest it break off, and he be afraid and fold it [the garment] and put it over his shoulder.<sup>4</sup> This is as R. Isaac b. Joseph, who said in R. Johanan's name: If one goes out on the Sabbath with a folded garment slung over his shoulder, he incurs a sin-offering. And [this is] as Samuel said to R. Hinena b. Shila:

No scholar of the house of the Resh Galutha<sup>5</sup> may go out with a cloak bearing a seal, except you, because the house of the Resh Galutha is not particular about you.<sup>6</sup>

It was stated above: ‘Samuel said: A slave may go out with a seal around his neck, but not with the seal on his garments.’ It was taught likewise: A slave may go out with a seal around his neck, but not with the seal on his garments. But the following contradicts this: A slave may not go out with the seal around his neck, nor with the seal on his garments; and neither are susceptible to defilement.<sup>7</sup> [He may] not [go out] with the bell around his neck, but he may go out with the bell on his garments, and both are susceptible to defilement.<sup>8</sup> An animal may not go out with a seal around its neck nor with a seal on its covering, nor with the bell on its covering nor with the bell around its neck,<sup>9</sup> and none of these are susceptible to defilement.<sup>10</sup> Shall we say that in the one case his master had set it upon him, while in the other he had set it upon himself?<sup>11</sup> — No. In both cases his master had set it upon him, but one refers to a metal [seal] while the other refers to a clay [seal].<sup>12</sup> And [this is] as R. Nahman said in Rabbah b. Abbuha's name: That about which the master is particular,<sup>13</sup> one [a slave] may not go out with it; that about which the master is not particular, one may go out with it. Reason too supports this, since it is stated: ‘none of these are susceptible to defilement’. Now, if you say [that the reference is to] metal [seals], it is well; [hence] only these are not susceptible to defilement, but their utensils<sup>14</sup> are. But if you say that we learnt of clay [seals], [it might be asked] are only these not susceptible to defilement, whereas their utensils<sup>15</sup> are? Surely it was taught: Utensils of stone, dung, or earth do not contract uncleanness either by Biblical or by Rabbinical law.<sup>16</sup> Hence it follows that the reference is to metal [seals]. This proves it.

The Master said: ‘[He may] not [go out] with the bell around his neck, but he may go out with the bell on his garment.’ Why not with the bell around his neck; [presumably] ‘lest it snap off and he come to carry it: then also in the case of the bell on his garment let us fear that it may snap off and he come to carry it? — The reference here is to one that was woven [sewn] into it. And [this is] in agreement with R. Huna the son of R. Joshua, who said: Concerning whatever is woven they enacted no prohibition.<sup>17</sup>

The Master said: ‘An animal may not go out with a seal around its neck, with a seal on its covering, nor with a bell around its neck nor with a bell on its coat, and none of these are susceptible to defilement.’ Now, does not an animal's bell contract uncleanness? But the following contradicts it: An animal's bell is unclean,<sup>18</sup>

---

(1) The wearing of bridal crowns was forbidden as a sign of mourning for the destruction of the Temple; v. Sot. 49a.

(2) This is the slave's neck-chain.

(3) In the former case he fears to remove it; hence he may wear it. But he is not afraid to remove it in the latter case, and possibly will.

(4) He may fold the garment to hide the absence of the signet, fearing that his master may accuse him of having purposely removed it in order to pass as a free man.

(5) V. p. 217. n. 7.

(6) From this it appears that some scholars wore a badge to indicate that they belonged to the retinue of the exilarch, and were possibly in the position of his clients. He was also evidently very particular about this, so that if the seal fell off one might fold up the garment to hide its absence.

(7) Because they are neither ornaments nor useful utensils, but merely badges of shame.

(8) These are ornamental.

(9) v. supra 54b for the reason.

(10) They are not ornamental for the animal.

(11) V. p. 270, n. 6.

(12) It is shown below that this must refer to a metal seal; hence even if his master set it upon him he may not go out with it, for should it accidentally snap off the slave would be afraid to leave it in the street on account of its value, but would bring it home, which is forbidden. But the value of a clay seal is negligible, whilst if his master set it upon him he

is certainly afraid to remove it; hence he may go out with it. Consequently, the prohibition in the Mishnah, which treats of a clay seal, must refer to one that he set upon himself.

(13) On account of its value.

(14) I.e., the general appointments of an animal, its accoutrement and equipment, which rank as utensils.

(15) Of clay.

(16) Lit., 'the words of the scribes; v. Kid., Sonc. ed., p. 79, n. 7. These clay seals were not glazed or

(17) I.e., if something is woven into a garment, it may be worn on the Sabbath without fear of its falling off. V. supra 57b.

(18) I.e., liable to uncleanness.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 58b

but a door bell is clean.<sup>1</sup> A door [bell] appointed for an animal[‘s use] is unclean; an animal [bell] appointed for [fixing] to a door, even if attached to the door and fastened with nails, is unclean; for all utensils enter upon their uncleanness by intention, but are relieved from their uncleanness only by a change-effecting act?<sup>2</sup> — There is no difficulty: in the one case [the reference is] where it has a clapper: in the other where it has no clapper.<sup>3</sup> What will you: if it is a utensil, then even if it has no clapper [it is unclean]; if it is not a utensil, does the clapper make it one? Yes, as R. Samuel b. Nahmani said in R. Johanan's name, Viz.: How do we know that a metal object which causes sound is unclean?<sup>4</sup> Because it is said, Everything [dabar] that may abide the

burnt in a kiln, to be regarded as pottery, which can be defiled. Thus there is no point in teaching that they are free thereof, for no utensil of similar make is susceptible. fire, ye shall make go through the fire.<sup>5</sup> even speech [dibbur — i.e., sound] must pass through the fire.<sup>6</sup>

How have you interpreted it? as referring to [a bell] without a clapper! Then consider the middle clause: 'Nor with a bell around his neck, but he may go out with a bell on his garments, and both can contract uncleanness.' But if it has no clapper, can it become defiled? Surely the following contradicts this: If one makes bells for the mortar,<sup>7</sup> for a cradle,<sup>8</sup> for the mantles of Scrolls,<sup>9</sup> or for children's mantles, then if they have a clapper, they are unclean; if they have no clapper,<sup>10</sup> they are clean. If their clappers are removed,<sup>11</sup> they still retain their uncleanness.<sup>12</sup> — That is only in the case of a child, where its purpose is [to produce] sound.<sup>13</sup> But in the case of an adult, it is an ornament for him even without a clapper.

The Master said: 'If their clappers are removed, they still retain their uncleanness.' What are they fit for?<sup>14</sup> Said Abaye: [They are still utensils,] because an unskilled person can put it back. Raba objected: A bell and its clapper are [counted as] connected.<sup>15</sup> And should you answer, This is its meaning: Even when they are not connected, they are [counted as] connected,<sup>16</sup> — surely it was taught: A shears of separate blades<sup>17</sup> and the cutter of a [carpenter's] plane are [counted as] connected in respect of uncleanness, but not in respect of sprinkling. Now we objected, What will you: if they are [counted as] connected, [they should be so] even in respect of sprinkling too; [if they count] not as connected, they should not [be so] even in respect of defilement either? And Rabbah answered: By Scriptural law, when in use they are [counted as] connected in respect of both defilement and sprinkling; when not in use, they are [counted as] connected in respect of neither defilement nor sprinkling. But they [the Rabbis] enacted a preventive measure in respect of defilement when they are not in use on account of defilement when they are in use; and in respect of sprinkling, when they are in use, on account of when they are not in use!<sup>18</sup> Rather said Raba,

---

(1) The door being part of the house, it is not a utensil, and hence cannot become unclean; the bell, in turn, is part of the door.

(2) V. p. 238, n. 9. Here too the bells were left unchanged.

(3) If it has a clapper it is susceptible to defilement as a utensil.

- (4) I.e., it ranks as a utensil.
- (5) Num. XXXI, 23.
- (6) In order to cleanse it, which shows that it is liable to defilement. This connects *dabar* (E.V. thing) with *dibbur*, speech, i.e., a sound-producing object is a utensil.
- (7) In which the spices are pounded for use as frankincense in the Temple. Sound was thought to add to the efficacy of crushing; v. Ker. 6b.
- (8) To amuse the baby or lull it to sleep.
- (9) Of the Torah. It was customary to adorn these with bells.
- (10) From the very outset.
- (11) After the bells were defiled.
- (12) Because they do not lose the status of utensils and become as broken utensils through the removal of the clapper.
- (13) Hence without a clapper its purpose is not fulfilled, and it is not a utensil.
- (14) That they are not regarded as broken utensils.
- (15) And rank as a single utensil, so that if once becomes unclean the other is too. (This is, of course, when they are together.) Similarly, if one is besprinkled (v. Num. XIX, 18f), the other becomes clean. This shows that when they are separated, each is but a fragment of a utensil, though an unskilled person can replace it, and should therefore be clean.
- (16) Exactly as the sense in Abaye's explanation.
- (17) Lit., 'joints'.
- (18) For notes v. supra 48b and 49a. Now, obviously this must all refer to where the parts are joined, since we compare these utensils when not in use to same when in use. Hence it is implied that when not actually together they do not become defiled even by Rabbinical law, because each is regarded as a fragment, though all unskilled person can join them.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 59a

[The reason is] because they<sup>1</sup> are fit for beating on an earthen utensil.<sup>2</sup> It was stated likewise: R. Jose son of R. Hanina said: [The reason is] because they are fit for beating on an earthen utensil. R. Johanan said: Because they are fit for giving a child a drink of water therein.

Now, does not R. Johanan require [that it shall be fit for] a usage of its original nature?<sup>3</sup> Surely it was taught: And everything whereon he sitteth [shall be unclean];<sup>4</sup> I might think that if he [the zab] overturns a *se'ah*<sup>5</sup> and sits upon it, or a *tarkab*<sup>6</sup> and sits upon it, it is unclean: hence it is stated, 'whereon he sitteth', teaching, [only] that which is appointed for sitting, excluding this, where we say to him, 'Get up, that we may do our business!'<sup>7</sup> R. Eleazar said: In cases of *midras*<sup>8</sup> we say. 'Get up, that we may do our business'; but we do not say in the case of the defilement of the dead, 'Get up, that we may do our business!'<sup>9</sup> But R. Johanan maintained: In the case of defilement through the dead too we say. 'Get up, that we may do our business!'<sup>10</sup> — Reverse the former.<sup>11</sup> But what [reason] do you see to reverse the former; reverse the latter?<sup>12</sup> — Because we know R. Johanan to require [fitness for] usage of its original nature For we learnt an animal's shoe, [if] of metal, is unclean.<sup>13</sup> For what is it fit? — Rab said: It is fit for drinking water therein in battle.<sup>14</sup> R. Hanina said: It is fit for anointing oneself with oil from, it in battle.<sup>15</sup> R. Johanan said: When one is fleeing from the field of battle, he places this [shoe] on his [own] feet and runs over briars and thorns.<sup>16</sup> Wherein do Rab and R. Johanan differ? — Where it is repulsive.<sup>17</sup> R. Johanan and R. Hanina differ where it is [too] heavy.<sup>18</sup> NOR WITH A GOLDEN CITY, what is meant by, WITH A GOLDEN CITY? — Rabbah b. Bar Hanah said in R. Johanan's name: A golden Jerusalem.<sup>19</sup>

(1) The bells that had their clappers removed.

(2) Then they produce a bell-like sound just as when they have a clapper. Hence It is a utensil like before, and so remains unclean. But when the parts of a shears or of a plane are separated, they cannot be used at all.

(3) Where a utensil is damaged or divided, does not R. Johanan hold that in order to remain unclean or susceptible to defilement it must still be fit for the same usage as before, it being insufficient that it shall merely be fit for some purpose?

- (4) Lev. XV, 6. The reference is to a zab, q.v. Glos.
- (5) A measure of capacity. V. Glos.
- (6) Half a se'ah.
- (7) I.e., the zab would be told that the measure is needed for its main purpose; hence it is not unclean. This shows that as a general principle every article is regarded from the point of view of its original and primary function.
- (8) Lit., 'treading'. The uncleanness caused by a zab's treading, leaning against, or weighing down upon an article, even if he does not actually touch it with his body. This includes sitting.
- (9) I.e., in respect of an article's defilement through a corpse, or by a person who was himself defiled by a corpse, we do not say that in order to become unclean or remain unclean it shall be fit for its main purpose, but even if one has to say to the person using it, 'Get up, that we may do our business' it is still subject to the laws of uncleanness.
- (10) Thus he insists that it shall be fit for its original function. Rashi maintains that this can refer only to a utensil which is broken or divided after becoming defiled; it does not remain unclean unless fit for a usage of its original nature. R. Han. holds that it refers to its defilement from the very outset.
- (11) Transpose the reasons given by R. Jose b. Hanina and R. Johanan.
- (12) Transpose the views of R. Johanan and R. Eleazar.
- (13) I.e., liable to become unclean.
- (14) On a field of battle where no other utensils may be available, one can take up water in the cavity of the shoe into which the animal's foot fits.
- (15) This is a necessary part of one's toilet in the hot eastern countries; v. T.A., I, 229-233. The shoe might serve as an improvised oil pot.
- (16) Thus R. Johanan justifies its uncleanness only because it is still fit for a usage of the original nature.
- (17) For drinking. Hence, on Rab's view it is not subject to defilement, but on R. Hanina's it is. Rab disregards its possible use as an oil container, holding that soldiers dispense with oil on a field of battle.
- (18) For running. According to R. Hanina it is nevertheless susceptible to defilement, but not according to R. Johanan.
- (19) An ornament with the picture or the engraving of Jerusalem; v. T.A., I, p. 662, n. 961.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 59b

such as R. Akiba made for his wife.<sup>1</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: A woman must not go out with a golden city, and if she does, she incurs a sin-offering: this is R. Meir's view. The Sages maintain: She may not go out [therewith], but if she does, she is not liable. R. Eliezer ruled: A woman may go out with a golden city at the very outset. Wherein do they differ? — R. Meir holds that it is a burden; while the Rabbis hold that it is an ornament, [and it is forbidden only] lest she remove it to show [to a friend], and thus come to carry it [in the street];<sup>2</sup> but R. Eliezer reasons: Whose practice is it to go out with a golden city? [That of] a woman of rank; and such will not remove it for display.

As for a coronet,<sup>3</sup> Rab forbids it;<sup>4</sup> Samuel permits it. Where it is made of cast metal, all agree that it is forbidden;<sup>5</sup> they differ about an embroidered stuff:<sup>6</sup> one Master holds that the cast metal [sewn on to it] is the chief part;<sup>7</sup> while the other Master holds that the embroidered stuff is the chief part.<sup>8</sup> R. Ashi learnt it in the direction of leniency. As for an embroidered stuff, all agree that it is permitted. They differ only about what is made of cast metal: one Master holds [that it is forbidden] lest she remove it in order to show, and [thus] come to carry it; while the other Master holds: Whose practice is it to go out with a coronet? That of a woman of rank; and such will not remove it for display.

R. Samuel b. Bar Hanah said to R. Joseph: You explicitly told us in Rab's name that a coronet is permitted.<sup>9</sup>

Rab was told: A great, tall, and lame man has come to Nehardea, and has lectured: A coronet is permitted. Said he: Who is a great tall man who is lame? Levi. This proves that R. Afes is dead<sup>10</sup> and

R. Hanina [now] sits at the head [of the Academy], so that Levi has none for a companion,<sup>11</sup> and therefore he has come hither.<sup>12</sup> But perhaps R. Hanina had died, R. Afes remaining as before, and since Levi [now] had no companion he had come hither? — Had R. Hanina died, Levi would indeed have subordinated himself to R. Afes.<sup>13</sup> Moreover, it could not be that R. Hanina should not rule.<sup>14</sup> For when Rabbi was dying he ordered, ‘Let Hanina son of R. Hama sit at the head.’ And of the righteous men it is written, Thou shalt also decree a thing, and it shall be established unto thee.<sup>15</sup>

Levi lectured in Nehardea: A coronet is permitted; [whereupon] there went forth twenty-four coronets from the whole of Nehardea. Rabbah b. Abbuha lectured in Mahoza:<sup>16</sup> A coronet is permitted: [whereupon] there went forth eighteen coronets from a single alley.<sup>17</sup> Rab Judah said in the name of R. Samuel:<sup>18</sup> A girdle [kamra] is permitted.<sup>19</sup> Some say, That means of embroidered stuff,<sup>20</sup> and R. Safra said: It may be compared to a robe shot through with gold.<sup>21</sup> Others say, It means of cast metal; whereon R. Safra observed: It may be compared to a royal girdle.<sup>22</sup> Rabina asked R. Ashi: What about wearing a kamra over a [plain] girdle [HEMYANA]? — You ask about two girdles! he replied.<sup>23</sup> R. Ashi said: As for a piece of a garment, if it has fringes, it is permitted;<sup>24</sup> if not, it is forbidden.

NOR WITH A KATLA. What is a KATLA? — A trinket holder.<sup>25</sup>

NEZAMIM. [That is] ear-rings.

NOR WITH A FINGER-RING THAT HAS NO SIGNET. This [implies that] if it has a signet, she is liable;<sup>26</sup> hence it proves that it is not an ornament. But the following contradicts this: Women's ornaments are unclean.<sup>27</sup> And these are women's ornaments: Necklaces, ear-rings and finger-rings, and a finger-ring, whether it has a signet or has no signet, and nose-rings? — Said R. Zera, There is no difficulty: one agrees with R. Nehemiah; the other with the Rabbis. For it was taught: If it [the ring] is of metal and its signet is of coral, it is unclean; if it is of coral while the signet is of metal, it is clean.<sup>28</sup> But R. Nehemiah declares it unclean. For R. Nehemiah maintained: In the case of a ring, follow its signet; in the case of a yoke, go by its carved ends;<sup>29</sup> [

---

(1) V. Ned. 50a.

(2) Thus it is only Rabbinically forbidden, and involves no sacrifice.

(3) A wreath or chaplet worn on the forehead. Some were entirely of gold or silver; others of silk shot through with gold or silver.

(4) To be worn by a woman in the street on the Sabbath.

(5) This being very costly, a woman is more likely to remove it to show to her friends.

(6) I.e., where the chaplet or coronet is of a stuff with gold or silver embroidery, which would contain pieces of cast metal too.

(7) And therefore a woman may be tempted to remove and show it.

(8) And that is not worth showing. The translation follows what seems to be Rashi's interpretation. Jast.: they differ in respect of what is made of beaten, wrought metal, opp. to cast metal. One Master holds that what is made of cast metal is original (or perhaps, reading **מִיָּקָר**, v. MS.M., more precious), while the other holds the reverse.

(9) Hence R. Ashi's version must be correct, for on the other version there is no case where Rab permits it.

(10) Lit., ‘his soul has gone to rest’.

(11) Lit., ‘to be by his side’. On R. Afes' accession as head of the Academy R. Hanina, who would not recognize him as his superior, pursued his studies outside, where he was joined by Levi; v. Keth. 103b.

(12) Levi being in no way inferior to R. Hanina, he could not accept him as a head, and so he has come hither. Zuri, I. S. Toledoth, First Series, Bk. 2 pp. 137-139 observes that Levi was probably born in Babylon, whither he was now returning to resettle.

(13) Who was his senior.

(14) As head of the academy. Lit., ‘there is no way or path that R. Hanina’ etc.: i.e., it is impossible.

(15) Job XXII, 28.

- (16) The famous town on the Tigris where Raba had his great academy; v. Obermeyer, pp. 161-186,
- (17) V. I. S. Zuri, op. cit., Part I, Bk. 3, pp. 19-27 on the significance of numbers. He maintains that eighteen is often used symbolically to denote a large number. — Mahoza was a very wealthy town, owing to its central position and the great caravan and shipping trade that passed through it; this is reflected in the present statement. Obermeyer, p. 173.
- (18) Var. lec.: Mar Judah in the name of R. Shesheth, v. D.S.
- (19) Kamra was a costly girdle, made either of solid gold or of cloth adorned with gold and precious stones (Rashi).
- (20) V. p. 276, n. 7.
- (21) There is no fear of either being removed.
- (22) Which was likewise made of beaten gold. Rashi: all Israel are princes, and worthy to wear such belts.
- (23) Rashi: That is certainly forbidden, for one is superfluous and a burden. Rashi quotes another interpretation to the effect that it is permitted, but prefers the first.
- (24) For by their means it can be firmly tied to the wearer, so that it will not fall off and necessitate its being carried in the street.
- (25) A band or necklace on which beads, trinkets, etc., are suspended.
- (26) The deduction is from the end of the Mishnah.
- (27) I.e., susceptible to defilement.
- (28) V. supra 52b for notes.
- (29) Jast. Rashi: Two rods fitted into the yoke the breadth of an ox's shoulder apart. Jast.: if they are broken off, the yoke ceases to be susceptible to defilement. Rashi: if they are of metal, the yoke is susceptible to defilement. The yoke itself is a straight piece of wood, and wood utensils are not subject to uncleanness unless they possess a cavity which, e.g., can hold water.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 60a

in the case of a rack,<sup>1</sup> go after its nails;<sup>2</sup> in the case of a ladder, go after its rungs; in the case of a weighing machine, go after its chains.<sup>3</sup> But the Sages maintain: Everything depends on the support.<sup>4</sup>

Raba said: It is taught disjunctively:<sup>5</sup> if it has a signet, it is a man's ornament; if it has no signet, it is a woman's ornament. R. Nahman b. Isaac answered: Do you oppose uncleanness to the Sabbath!<sup>6</sup> [In respect to] uncleanness, the Divine Law said, utensils [fit] for work,<sup>7</sup> and this [a signet ring] is a utensil. But the Sabbath [interdiction] was imposed by the Divine Law on account of the burden: if it has no signet, it is an ornament; if it has a signet, it is a burden.

NOR WITH A NEEDLE WHICH IS UNPIERCED. What is it fit for?<sup>8</sup> — Said R. Joseph: Since a woman tidies<sup>9</sup> her hair with it [it is therefore ornamental]. Said Abaye objected: Let it be as a garter, which is clean, and hence permitted?<sup>10</sup> But R. Adda of Naresh<sup>11</sup> interpreted it before R. Joseph: Since a woman parts her hair with it, [it is ornamental]. What is it fit for on the Sabbath?<sup>12</sup> — Said Raba: It has a golden plaque at the end thereof:<sup>13</sup> on weekdays she parts her hair therewith, [while] on the Sabbath she lets it lie against her forehead.<sup>14</sup>

MISHNAH. A MAN MAY NOT GO OUT WITH A NAIL-STUDDED SANDAL, NOR WITH A SINGLE [SANDAL]. IF HE HAS NO WOUND ON HIS FOOT;<sup>15</sup> NOR WITH TEFILLIN, NOR WITH AN AMULET, IF IT IS NOT FROM AN EXPERT, NOR WITH A COAT OF MAIL [SHIRYON], NOR WITH A CASQUE [KASDA], NOR WITH GREAVES [MEGAFAYYIM]. YET IF HE GOES OUT, HE DOES NOT INCUR A SIN-OFFERING.<sup>16</sup>

GEMARA. A NAIL-STUDDED SANDAL: What is the reason? — Said Samuel: It was at the end of the period of persecution.<sup>17</sup> and they [some fugitives] were hiding in a cave. They proclaimed, 'He who would enter, let him enter,<sup>18</sup> but he who would go out, let him not go out.'<sup>19</sup> Now, the sandal of one of them became reversed, so that they thought that one of them had gone out and been seen by the enemies, who would now fall upon them. Thereupon they pressed against each other,<sup>20</sup> and they killed of each other more than their enemies slew of them. R. Ila'i b. Eleazar said: They

were stationed in a cave when they heard a sound [proceeding] from above the cave. Thinking that the enemy was coming upon them, they pressed against each other and slew amongst themselves more than the enemy had slain of them. Rami b. Ezekiel said: They were stationed in a Synagogue, when they heard a sound from behind the synagogue. Thinking that the enemy was coming upon them, they pressed against each other and slew amongst themselves more than the enemy had slain of them. In that hour it was enacted: A man must not go out with a nail-studded sandal.<sup>21</sup> If so, it should be forbidden on weekdays too? — The incident happened on the Sabbath.<sup>22</sup> Then let it be permitted on Festivals! Why did we learn:

- (1) Placed outside a shop and fitted with nails and hooks for exhibiting goods.
- (2) If they are of metal, the whole is susceptible to uncleanness.
- (3) The machine itself was of wood.
- (4) E.g., the ladder depends on its frame, not on the rungs, etc. — Hence, according to R. Nehemiah the signet is the chief part of the ring, and since a signet is not ornamental, a sin-offering is incurred. But the Rabbis hold that the ring itself is the chief part, and that is an ornament.
- (5) Lit., 'to (separate) sides'. The clause 'and a ring whether it has a signet etc.' is not included in the definition of 'women's ornaments'.
- (6) He likewise treats the clause 'and a ring etc.' as independent of the preceding but as referring to the general laws of uncleanness.
- (7) Num. XXXI. 51; i.e., which have a definite function.
- (8) How can it be regarded as an ornament? V. p. 266, n. 1.
- (9) Lit., 'gathers up': if some wisps of hair stray out from under her wig, they are wound about this needle or bodkin and pushed back (Rashi). Tosaf.: the needle is thrust through the wig to keep the hair in order and prevent it from straying out. 'Aruch reads: ogedeth, she fastens.
- (10) V. infra 63a. So here too, since the bodkin is required to keep the hair in order, and uncovered hair is considered disgraceful (v. Sanh. 58b), a woman will certainly not remove it for display.
- (11) Identical with Nahras or Nahr-sar, on the canal of the same name, which was a tributary falling into the Euphrates on its eastern bank; Obermeyer, pp. 307 seq.
- (12) When parting the hair is forbidden.
- (13) One end was needle-like while the other was flattened and broadened into a plaque.
- (14) She thrusts the needle end into her wig, letting the other end come over her forehead as an ornament.
- (15) Either because he may be suspected of carrying the other sandal under his garments (T.J.), or because he may evoke ridicule, which will cause him to remove and carry it. But when one foot is wounded, there is no fear of this. V. Rashi.
- (16) Because these are garments in war, hence do not rank as burdens.
- (17) So Jast. Rashi: There were fugitives from persecution. [The reference is generally held to be to the Syrian persecutions under Antiochus Epiphanes; v. Berliner, Hoffmann Magazin XX, p. 123].
- (18) As he could see beforehand whether the enemies' spies were on the watch.
- (19) For fear of spies, lest their whereabouts be disclosed.
- (20) Panic stricken, in order to flee.
- (21) According to Samuel, because this had led them astray. According to R. Ila'i b. Eleazar and Rami b. Ezekiel, because the carnage had been wrought by their nail-studded sandals.
- (22) The interdict was felt to be in memory of the disaster rather than through actual fear of its repetition, and therefore confined to the Sabbath.

## **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 60b**

But one may not [send] a nail-studded sandal or an unsewn shoe [on Festivals]?<sup>1</sup> — What is the reason of the Sabbath?<sup>2</sup> Because there is a gathering [of people]. So on Festivals too there is a gathering. But there is a gathering on a public fast day:<sup>3</sup> let it be forbidden [then too]? — The incident happened on a day of assembly when there is an interdict [against work]; but here it is [a day of] assembly when it is permitted [to work]. And even according to R. Hanina b. Akiba who maintained, They enacted a prohibition only in respect of the Jordan and a ship, just as the incident

that occurred:<sup>4</sup> that applies only to the Jordan, which differs from other rivers;<sup>5</sup> but Festivals and the Sabbath are alike, for we learnt: There is no difference between Festivals and the Sabbath save in respect of food consumption.<sup>6</sup> Rab Judah said in Samuel's name: They learnt this only [where the nails are] to strengthen [the sandal], but where they are ornamental, it is permitted.<sup>7</sup> And how many [nails] constitute an ornament? — R. Johanan said: Five on each; R. Hanina maintained: Seven on each<sup>8</sup> and one on [each of] the straps; according to R. Hanina, there are three on each side<sup>9</sup> and one in the strapping.

An objection is raised: For an inclining sandal<sup>10</sup> one inserts seven [nails]; this is R. Nathan's view. But Rabbi permits thirteen.<sup>11</sup> As for R. Hanina, It Is well: he rules as R. Nathan. But whose view does R. Johanan state? — He rules as R. Nehorai. For it was taught, R. Nehorai said: Five are permitted, but seven are forbidden. Efah said to Rabbah b. Bar Hanah: You, as disciples of R. Johanan, should act as R. Johanan; but we will act as R. Hanina.

R. Huna asked R. Ashi: What of five [nails]? — Even seven are permitted, he answered him. What of nine? Even eight are forbidden, was his reply. A certain shoe-maker asked R. Ammi: What if it is sewn from within?<sup>12</sup> It is permitted, replied he, but I do not know what is the reason.<sup>13</sup> Said R. Ashi, And does not the Master know what is the reason?<sup>14</sup> Since it was sewn from within, it becomes a shoe:<sup>15</sup> the Rabbis enacted a decree in respect to a sandal, but in respect of a shoe they did not enact any decree.

R. Abba b. Zabda asked R. Abba b. Abina: What if he arranged them [the nails] zigzag-shape?<sup>16</sup> — It is permitted, he answered him. It was stated likewise: R. Jose b. R. Hanina said: If they are arranged zigzag-shape, it is permitted.

R. Shesheth said: If the whole of it [the sole] is covered with nails [underneath] so that the ground should not wear it away. it is permitted. It was taught in accordance with R. Shesheth, A man may not go out wearing a nail-studded sandal, nor may he stroll [in it] from house to house,<sup>17</sup> and even from bed to bed. But it may be handled in order to cover a utensil or support the legs of a bed therewith;<sup>18</sup> but R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon forbids this.<sup>19</sup> If most of its nails are fallen out, but four or five are left, it is permitted; while Rabbi permits it up to seven. If one covers it with leather underneath and drives nails into it on top, it is permitted.<sup>20</sup> If one arranges them [the nails] zigzag-fashion,<sup>21</sup> or flattens [them] out, or points [them],<sup>22</sup> or covers the whole of it with nails so that the ground should not wear it out, it is permitted. Now, this is self-contradictory: You say, if most of the nails are fallen out, [implying], even if many are left [it may be worn]; then it is taught, only four or five, but not more? — Said R. Shesheth, There is no difficulty: in the one case they are scooped out; in the other they are pulled out.<sup>23</sup>

‘[If] four or five [are left], it is permitted.’ Seeing that it is permitted [with] five, need four be stated? — Said R. Hisda: [It means] four in a small sandal and five in a large sandal.

‘While Rabbi permits it up to seven.’ But it was taught: Rabbi permits it up to thirteen? An inclining [sandal] is different.<sup>24</sup> Now that you have arrived at this [distinction], on R. Johanan's view too there is no difficulty: an inclining [sandal] is different.<sup>25</sup>

R. Mattenah — others state, R. Ahadboi b. Mattenah in R. Mattenah's name — said: The halachah is not as R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon. But that is obvious: [where] one disagrees with many, the halachah is as the majority? — You might argue, R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon's view is logical here;<sup>26</sup> hence we are informed [that we do not follow him].

R. Hiyya said: But that I would be dubbed a Babylonian who permits forbidden things,<sup>27</sup> I would permit more. And how many, — In Pumbeditha they say, Twenty-four; in Sura, twenty-two. R.

Nahman b. Isaac said: And your sign [to remember this is]: by the time he [R. Hiyya] travelled from Pumbeditha to Sura<sup>28</sup> two [nails] were missing [from his sandals].

NOR WITH A SINGLE [SANDAL]. IF HE HAS NO WOUND [or, BRUISE] ON HIS FOOT.

(1) V. Bez. 14b. These may not be sent because they cannot be used for the Festival. — A sandal (סנדל) consists only of a sole and straps, while a shoe (מנעל) has uppers in addition, Levi, Worterbuch, s.v. סנדל.

(2) Why was it forbidden then?

(3) V. Ta'an. 15a.

(4) V. Hag. 23a. It once happened that the purification water (v. Num. XIX, 9 Seq.) was carried in a boat over the Jordan, when a portion of a corpse was found in the bottom of the boat, whereby the water itself was defiled. The Rabbis maintain that it was then enacted that the water of lustration must not be carried over any river, whether in a boat or over a bridge. But R. Hanina disputes this, as quoted. It might therefore be thought that in the matter under discussion he maintains that there was no prohibition in respect to Festivals.

(5) In breadth, depth, current, etc.

(6) Lit., 'food for a person', which may be prepared on Festivals (Ex. XII, 16) but not on the Sabbath.

(7) To go out wearing the sandal on the Sabbath. Nails are normally put in to strengthen the sandal, and such must have been worn on the occasion of the tragedy; hence the decree was only in respect of same.

(8) But if there are more, their purpose is to strengthen, not ornamental.

(9) Of the sandal, one at the heel and the other at the toe.

(10) The sole of which is thicker at one side than at the other. It is leveled by nails inserted at the thin end.

(11) These too are ornamental, not for strength. But if there are more, the sandal may not be worn on the Sabbath, as above.

(12) Rashi. i.e., a leather shoe was placed inside a sandal and sewn thereto.

(13) He had heard this ruling, but did not know why.

(14) [MS.M. omits 'but I do not know' and 'does not the Master ... reason'. This reading is preferable as R. Ashi and R. Ammi were not contemporaries].

(15) A sandal (סנדל) is merely a sole, while a shoe (מנעול) has uppers too.

(16) Kalbus is a tongs or pinchers, which presumably opened X-wise.

(17) Probably from room to room in the same house, where each room has a separate occupant.

(18) Because it ranks as a utensil; v. Supra 46a, p. 211.

(19) Lest he put it on.

(20) Because the sandal is not exactly similar to that which caused the disaster.

(21) Bah deletes this.

(22) These refer to the tops of the nails (Rashi).

(23) If they are levelled down, leaving marks of nails on the sole, then even if more than four or five are left it is permissible, since the sandal was obviously not made like this originally. But if they are clean pulled out, leaving no mark on the wood of the sole, the sandal may appear to have been originally manufactured thus, and therefore not more than five are permitted. Others reverse the translation, but the sense remains the same.

(24) All are necessary to level it up, and none are for strength.

(25) V. supra.

(26) V. p. 283, n. 4.

(27) He was a Babylonian who went to study in Palestine; Suk. 20a. This may indicate that the Palestinians on the whole were stricter.

(28) On his way to Palestine.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 61a

Hence if he has a wound on his foot, he may go out. With which of them does he go out?<sup>1</sup> — R. Huna said: With that [worn on the foot] which has the wound. This proves that he holds that the purpose of the sandal is [to save him] pain. Hiyya b. Rab said: With that [worn] where there is no wound. This proves that he holds that it is employed as a luxury, while this [foot] that has a wound,

its wound is evidence for it.<sup>2</sup> Now, R. Johanan too holds as R. Huna. For R. Johanan said to R. Shamen b. Abba: Give me my sandals. When he gave him the right one, he [R. Johanan] observed, You treat it as though it had a wound.<sup>3</sup> [No]. Perhaps he agrees with Hiyya b. Rab, and he meant thus: You treat the left [foot] as though it had a wound? Now, R. Johanan [here] follows his general view. For R. Johanan said: Like tefillin, so are shoes: just as tefillin [are donned] on the left [hand], so are shoes [put on] the left [foot first]. An objection is raised: When one puts on his shoes, he must put on the right first and then the left? — Said R. Joseph: Now that it was taught thus, while R. Johanan said the reverse, he who acts in either way acts [well].<sup>4</sup> Said Abaye to him: But perhaps R. Johanan did not hear this Baraitha, but if he had heard it, he would have retracted? Or perhaps he heard it and held that the halachah is not as that Mishnah?<sup>5</sup> R. Nahman b. Isaac said: A God-fearing person satisfies both views. And who is that? Mar, the son of Rabina. What did he do? He put on the right foot [sandal] but did not tie it. Then he put on the left, tied it, and then tied the right [sandal]. R. Ashi said: I saw that R. Kahana was not particular.

Our Rabbis taught: When one puts on his shoes, he must put on the right first and then the left; when he removes [them], he must remove the left [first] and then the right.<sup>6</sup> When one washes, he must [first] wash the right [hand, foot] and then the left. When one anoints [himself] with oil,<sup>7</sup> he must anoint the right and then the left. But one who desires to anoint his whole body must anoint his head first, because it is the king of all the limbs.<sup>8</sup>

NOR WITH TEFILLIN. R. Safra said: Do not think that this is [only] according to the view that the Sabbath is not a time for tefillin; but even on the view that the Sabbath is a time for tefillin,<sup>9</sup> one must not go out [with them], lest he come to carry them [four cubits] in the street.<sup>10</sup> Others learn this in reference to the last clause: YET IF HE GOES OUT, HE DOES NOT INCUR A SIN OFFERING: Said R. Safra: Do not think that this is [only] according to the view that the Sabbath is a time for tefillin; but even on the view that the Sabbath is not a time for tefillin, he is [nevertheless] not liable to a sin-offering. What is the reason? He treats it as a garment.<sup>11</sup>

NOR WITH AN AMULET, IF IT IS NOT FROM AN EXPERT. R. Papa said: Do not think that both the man [issuing it] and the amulet must be approved; but as long as the man is approved, even if the amulet is not approved.<sup>12</sup> This may be proved too for it is stated, NOR WITH AN AMULET, IF IT IS NOT FROM AN EXPERT; but it is not stated, if it is not approved.<sup>13</sup> This proves it.

Our Rabbis taught: What is an approved amulet? One that has healed [once], a second time and a third time; whether it is an amulet in writing or an amulet of roots, whether it is for an invalid whose life is endangered or for an invalid whose life is not endangered. [It is permitted] not [only] for a person who has [already] had an epileptic fit, but even [merely] to ward it off.<sup>14</sup> And one may tie and untie it even in the street, providing that he does not secure it

---

(1) Wearing the sandal on which foot?

(2) For the sandal is obviously being worn merely as a luxury, and no one will suspect him of carrying the other (v. p. 280, n. 4) which he is not wearing, because he cannot put it on on account of the wound.

(3) R. Johanan holds that the left sandal must be put on first (infra). Hence if he put on the right, the other foot would have to be left unshod, and people would think that his right foot was wounded. Thus he holds with R. Huna that the sandal is donned on the wounded foot as a protection.

(4) [It is left to each individual to decide for himself whether to assign pride of place to the right or left side each enjoys in some respects distinction over the other. V. Tosaf.].

(5) It is really a Baraitha, not a Mishnah.

(6) The right half of the body being stronger, more honour must be shown to it. Removing the left first is likewise a mark of honour to the right, for the right shoe remains longer on the foot.

(7) V. p. 275, n. 8.

(8) I.e., the most important.

(9) V. 'Er. 95b.

(10) In his hand, in case of need.

(11) By donning it in the usual manner.

(12) It may be worn on the Sabbath.

(13) Heb. mumheh describes both the practitioner who issues it and the charm itself. The Mishnah, however, refers only to the former.

(14) Even if the wearer has not actually suffered but fears an attack of epilepsy.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 61b

with a ring or a bracelet and go out therewith into the street, for appearances sake.<sup>1</sup> But it was taught: What is an approved amulet? One that has healed three men simultaneously?<sup>2</sup> — There is no difficulty: the one is to approve the man; the other is to approve the amulet.<sup>3</sup> R. Papa said: It is obvious to me that if three amulets<sup>4</sup> [are successful for] three people, each [being efficacious] three times,<sup>5</sup> both the practitioner<sup>6</sup> and the amulets are [henceforth] approved. If three amulets [are successful for] three people, each [being efficacious] once, the practitioner is [henceforth] approved, but not the amulets. If one amulet [is efficacious] for three men, the amulet is approved but not the practitioner. [But] R. Papa propounded: What if three amulets [are efficacious] for one person?<sup>7</sup> The amulets are certainly not rendered approved: but does the practitioner become approved or not? Do we say, Surely, he has healed him! Or perhaps, it is this man's fate<sup>8</sup> to be susceptible to writings?<sup>9</sup> The question stands over.

The scholars propounded: Have amulets sanctity or not? In respect of what law? Shall we say, in respect of saving them from a fire?<sup>10</sup> Then come and hear: Benedictions<sup>11</sup> and amulets, though they contain the [divine] letters and many passages from the Torah, may not be saved from a fire, but are burnt where they are. Again, in respect of hiding,<sup>12</sup> — Come and hear: If it [the Divine Name] was written on the handles of utensils or on the legs of a bed,<sup>13</sup> it must be cut out and hidden.<sup>14</sup> Rather [the problem is] what about entering a privy with them? Have they sanctity, and it is forbidden; or perhaps they have no sanctity, and it is permitted? — Come and hear: NOR WITH AN AMULET, IF IT IS NOT FROM AN EXPERT. This [implies that] if it is from an expert, one may go out [with it]; now if you say that amulets possess sanctity, it may happen that one needs a privy, and so come to carry it four cubits in the street?<sup>15</sup> The reference here is to an amulet of roots.<sup>16</sup> But it was taught. Both a written amulet and an amulet of roots? — The reference here is to an invalid whose life is endangered.<sup>17</sup> But it was taught: 'Both an invalid whose life is endangered and one whose life is not endangered'? — Rather [this is the reply]: since it heals even when he holds it in his hand, it is well.<sup>18</sup>

---

(1) If secured with a ring or a bracelet it looks like being worn as an ornament, which it is not, and it would be forbidden to wear it as such.

(2) 'Simultaneously' is absent from Rashi's version, but present in cur. edd. and Tosaf., which explains that it refers to three amulets (presumably of exactly the same pattern) worn by three men. Whereas by the previous definition it is sufficient if it has healed three times, even the same person.

(3) In order that the practitioner may rank as an expert, he must have healed three different men with three different amulets; these three men would be suffering from three diverse maladies, and the amulets likewise would be different, i.e., contain different charms. Whatever amulet he subsequently issues is approved. The second Baraita must now accordingly be translated thus: What is an amulet of an approved person? (An amulet issued by) one who has healed three persons. But the first Baraita refers to the approving of the amulet itself; once it has healed three times, whether the same person or three different persons suffering from the same complaint, it is now approved for all men. Or, the same charm can now be written by any man, and it is approved.

(4) Each with a different charm and all written or prepared by the same man.

(5) Even for the same person.

(6) Who prepared them.

- (7) V. p. 286, n. 7.
- (8) Lit., 'planetary destiny', v. infra 156a, h.
- (9) Sc. written amulets. But the practitioner might not be successful for another.
- (10) That if a fire breaks out in a house, it shall be permitted to carry these into a courtyard which is not formally joined to the house by means of an 'erub (v. Glos.). Nothing may be taken out of a house into this courtyard, except sacred writings, to save them from fire; infra 115a.
- (11) In writing.
- (12) When sacred writings are worn out and not fit for use, they may not be thrown away or burnt, but must be 'hidden', i.e., buried; Meg. 26b.
- (13) For magical purposes; v. A. Marmorstein in MGWJ. (1928), pp. 391 seq.
- (14) Thus whatever contains the Divine Name must be treated as sacred in this respect.
- (15) He may have to remove it in order to deposit it somewhere and carry it thither.
- (16) This certainly does not possess sanctity, since the Divine Name is not there.
- (17) If the amulet is removed. He may take it into a privy even if it possesses sanctity.
- (18) Permitted as a kind of cure. For even if one does carry it in the street in his hands, it is not a culpable act.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 62a

But it was taught: R. Oshaia said: Providing one does not hold it in his hand and carry it four cubits in the street? But the reference here is to [an amulet that is] covered with leather.<sup>1</sup> But tefillin are leather-covered,<sup>2</sup> yet it was taught: When one enters a privy, he must remove his tefillin at a distance of four cubits and then enter? There it is on account of the [letter] shin, for Abaye said: The shin of tefillin is a halachah of Moses at Sinai.<sup>3</sup> Abaye also said: The dalet of tefillin is a halachah of Moses at Sinai. Abaye also said: The yod of tefillin is a halachah of Moses at Sinai.<sup>4</sup>

NOR WITH A SHIRYON, NOR WITH A KASDA, NOR WITH MEGAFAYYIM. SHIRYON is a coat of mail. KASDA, — Rab said: It is a polished metal helmet.<sup>5</sup> MEGAFAYYIM, — Rab said: These are greaves. MISHNAH. A WOMAN MAY NOT GO OUT WITH A NEEDLE THAT IS PIERCED, NOR WITH A RING BEARING A SIGNET, NOR WITH A KOKLIAR,<sup>6</sup> NOR WITH A KOBELETH,<sup>7</sup> NOR WITH A BALSAM PHIAL; AND IF SHE DOES GO OUT, SHE IS LIABLE TO A SIN-OFFERING; THIS IS R. MEIR'S VIEW.<sup>8</sup> BUT THE SAGES RULE THAT SHE IS NOT CULPABLE IN THE CASE OF A KOBELETH AND A BALSAM PHIAL.

GEMARA. 'Ulla said: And it is the reverse in the case of a man.<sup>9</sup> Thus we see that 'Ulla holds that whatever is fit for a man is not fit for a woman, and whatever is fit for a woman is not fit for a man.<sup>10</sup> R. Joseph objected: Shepherds may go out [on the Sabbath] with sackcloths;<sup>11</sup> and not only of shepherds did they [the Sages] say [thus], but of all men, but that it is the practice of shepherds to go out with sacks.<sup>12</sup> Rather said R. Joseph. 'Ulla holds that women are a separate [independent] people.

Abaye put an objection to him: If one finds tefillin,<sup>13</sup> he must bring them in<sup>14</sup> pair by pair;<sup>15</sup> [this applies to] both a man and a woman. Now if you say that women are a separate people, surely it is<sup>16</sup> a positive command limited in time, and from all such women are exempt?<sup>17</sup> — There R. Meir holds that night is a time for tefillin, and the Sabbath [too] is a time for tefillin: thus it is a positive precept not limited by time, and all such are incumbent upon women. But it is carrying out in a 'backhanded' manner?<sup>18</sup> — Said R. Jeremiah: The reference is to a woman who is a charity overseer.<sup>19</sup> Raba said [to him]: You have answered the case of a woman; but what can be said of a man?<sup>20</sup> Said Raba, [This is the answer:] Sometimes a man gives a signet-ring to his wife to take it to a chest, and she places it on her hand<sup>21</sup> until she comes to the chest. And sometimes a woman gives a non-signet ring to her husband to take it to an artisan to be repaired, and he places it on his hand until he comes to the artisan.<sup>22</sup>

NOR WITH A KOKLIAR, NOR WITH A KOBELETH. What is a KOKLIAR? — Said Rab: A brooch.<sup>23</sup> KOBELETH? — Said Rab: A charm [bead] containing phyllon; and thus did R. Assi explain it: A charm containing phyllon.

Our Rabbis taught: She may not go out with a kobelet, and if she does, she incurs a sin-offering, this is R. Meir's view; while the Sages maintain: She may not go out, but if she does, she is not culpable. R. Eliezer ruled: A woman may go out with a kobelet at the very outset. Wherein do they differ? R. Meir holds that it is a burden. Whereas the Rabbis hold that it is an ornament, and [she hence may not wear it at the outset] lest she remove it for display, and so come to carry it. But R. Eliezer argues: Whose practice is it to wear this? A woman with an unpleasant odour;<sup>24</sup> and such a woman will not remove it for display, and so will not come to carry it four cubits in the street. But it was taught: R. Eliezer declares [her] non culpable on account of a kobelet and a flask of spikenard oil?<sup>25</sup> — There is no difficulty: the one [ruling] is in reference to R. Meir; the other, in reference to the Rabbis. [Thus:] when referring to R. Meir, who maintained that she is liable to a sin-offering, he [R. Eliezer] said to him that she is not culpable. When treating of the Rabbis who maintained that there is no culpability, yet it is forbidden, he ruled that it is permitted at the outset.

- 
- (1) Or, skin. This may be taken into a privy.
- (2) I.e., the strips of parchment bearing the Biblical passages are encased in leather capsules.
- (3) V. supra 28b, p. 123. n. 7. Thus part of the Divine Name itself is uncovered; therefore one may not enter a privy with it.
- (4) The strap of the head-phyllactery is knotted at the back of the head in the shape of a dalet (ד); that of the hand-phyllactery forms a noose and is knotted near the capsule in the shape of a yod (י). Cf. Heilprin. Seder ha-Doroth, I, p. 208 ed. Maskileison. Warsaw, 1897. Thus the three together make up the word 'יהוה' Almighty. Tosaf., however, s.v. 'יהוה', deletes Abaye's last two statements on the dalet and yod.
- (5) Jast. Rashi: a leather helmet worn under the metal helmet.
- (6) A pin of the shape of a cochlea, which is a part of the inner ear.
- (7) 'Aruch reads: kokeleth, a perfume charm.
- (8) He regards these as burdens, not ornaments.
- (9) This refers to a ring. If it bears a signet he is not culpable; if not, he is.
- (10) So that what is an ornament for one is a burden for the other.
- (11) As a protection from the rain.
- (12) This shows that even when people are not in the habit of wearing it, yet since it is an ornament for one it is the same for the other.
- (13) In the street on the Sabbath.
- (14) To a safe place, where they will not be exposed to misuse.
- (15) I.e., he dons one pair on the hand and the head as they are usually worn, and walks with them as with an ordinary article of attire to his destination; then he returns and does the same with the second pair, and so on. This is R. Meir's view: Erub. 96b.
- (16) The precept of donning tefillin.
- (17) V. Kid. 29a. The difficulty is based on the assumption that tefillin are not to be worn on the Sabbath, nor at night. Since women are exempt, and at the same time they rank as a separate people, tefillin can surely not be accounted for them an article of attire?
- (18) V. p. 188, n. 2. This raises a difficulty on the Mishnah. Why is a woman culpable for going out wearing a signet ring, seeing that this is not the usual manner of carrying out an object? [Liability is incurred only when the work done is performed in the usual manner.]
- (19) Lit., 'treasurer'. She impresses the seal of her signet ring upon her orders for charity disbursements. Thus she usually wears the ring on her finger, and that is her way of carrying it out into the street. Yet since women do not generally wear such rings, this cannot be regarded as an ornament. — It is interesting to observe a woman occupying this position.
- (20) 'Ulla states that a man is culpable for wearing a non-signet ring; but that too is a backhanded manner?
- (21) I.e., on her finger.
- (22) Thus in both cases this becomes the usual manner of carriage. Hence the reference in the Mishnah is to any woman, not particularly a treasurer.
- (23) V. note on Mishnah.
- (24) Which the kobelet counteracts.
- (25) This implies that they may nevertheless not be worn.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 62b

And what is [this reference to] R. Meir?<sup>1</sup> - As it was taught: A woman may not go out with a key in her hand, and if she does, she incurs a sin-offering; this is R. Meir's view. R. Eliezer holds her non-culpable in the case of a kobelet and a flask of spikenard oil. Who mentioned a kobelet?<sup>2</sup> — There is a lacuna, and it was thus taught: And she may likewise not go out with a kobelet or a flask of spikenard oil; and if she does, she incurs a sin-offering: this is R. Meir's view. R. Eliezer holds her non-culpable in the case of a kobelet and a flask of spikenard oil. When is that said? When they contain perfume;<sup>3</sup> but if they do not contain perfume, she is culpable.<sup>4</sup> R. Adda b. Ahabah said: This implies that if one carries out less than the statutory quantity of food in a utensil, he is culpable. For

when it [the flask] does not contain perfume, it is analogous to less than the statutory quantity [of food carried out] in a utensil, and yet it is taught that she is culpable.<sup>5</sup> R. Ashi said: In general I may hold that there is no liability, but here it is different, because there is nothing concrete at all.<sup>6</sup> And anoint themselves with the chief ointments:<sup>7</sup> Rab Judah said in Samuel's name: This refers to spikenard oil. R. Joseph objected: R. Judah b. Baba forbade spikenard oil too, but they [the Sages] did not agree with him.<sup>8</sup> Now if you say [that the prophet's objection] is on account of its being a luxury,<sup>9</sup> why did they not agree with him? Said Abaye to him, Then on your view, when it is written, that drink in bowls of [mizreke] wine,<sup>10</sup> [which] R. Ammi and R. Assi — one interpreted it [as meaning] kenishkanim,<sup>11</sup> while the other said, It means that they threw [mezarkim] their goblets to each other<sup>12</sup> — is that too forbidden? Surely Rabbah son of R. Huna visited the house of the Resh Galutha,<sup>13</sup> who drank from a kenishkanim, yet he said nothing to him!<sup>14</sup> But whatever provides both enjoyment and rejoicings, the Rabbis forbade; but that which is a luxury but not associated with rejoicing, the Rabbis did not forbid.

That lie upon beds of ivory, and stretch themselves [seruhim] upon their couches.<sup>15</sup> R. Jose son of R. Hanina said: This refers to people who urinate before their beds naked.<sup>16</sup> R. Abbahu derided this: If so, is that why it is written: Therefore shall they now go captive with the first that go captive:<sup>17</sup> because they urinate before their beds naked they shall go captive with the first that go captive! Rather said R. Abbahu: This refers to people who eat and drink together, join their couches, exchange their wives, and make their couches foul [maserihim] with semen that is not theirs.

R. Abbahu<sup>7</sup> said — others say, In a Baraita it was taught: Three things bring man to poverty. viz., urinating in front of one's bed naked, treating the washing of the hands with disrespect,<sup>18</sup> and being cursed by one's wife in his presence. 'Urinating in front of one's bed naked': Raba said, This was said only when his face is turned to the bed: but if it is turned in the opposite direction, we have nought against it. And even when his face is turned to the bed, this was said only when it is on to the ground;<sup>19</sup> but if it is into a vessel, we have nought against it. 'And the treating of the washing of the hands with disrespect': Raba said, This was said only when one does not wash his hands at all; but if he washes them inadequately,<sup>20</sup> we have nought against it. (But this is not so, for R. Hisda said: I washed with full handfuls of water and was granted full handfuls of prosperity).<sup>21</sup> 'And being cursed by one's wife in his presence': Said Raba: [That is when she curses him] on account of her adornments.<sup>22</sup> But that is only when he has the means but does not provide them.<sup>23</sup>

Raba son of R. Ilai lectured: What is meant by, Moreover the Lord said, Because the daughters of Zion are haughty?<sup>24</sup> That means that they walked with haughty bearing.<sup>25</sup> And walk with outstretched necks<sup>26</sup> — they walked heel by toe.<sup>27</sup> And wanton [mesakrothh] eyes:<sup>28</sup> they filled their eyes with stibium and beckoned.<sup>29</sup> Walking and mincing: they walked, a tall woman by the side of a short one. And making a tinkling [te'akasnah] with their feet: R. Isaac of the School of R. Ammi said: This teaches that they placed myrrh and balsam in their shoes and walked through the market-places of Jerusalem, and on coming near to the young men of Israel, they kicked their feet and spurted it on them, thus instilling them with passionate desire like with serpent's poison.<sup>30</sup>

And what is their punishment? — As Rabbah b. 'Ulla lectured: And it shall come to pass, that instead of sweet spices [bosem] there shall be rotteness:<sup>31</sup> the place where they perfumed themselves [mithbasmoth] shall be decaying sores. And instead of a girdle a rope [nikpeh]: the place where they were girded with a girdle shall become full of bruises [nekafim]. And instead of well-set hair baldness: the place where they adorned themselves shall be filled with bald patches. And instead of a stomacher [pethigil] a girding of sackcloth: the openings that lead to [sensual] joy<sup>32</sup> shall be for a girding of sackcloth. Branding [ki] instead of beauty: Said Raba, Thus men say, Ulcers instead of beauty.

Therefore the Lord will smite with a scab [wesipah] the crown of the head of the daughters of

Zion.<sup>33</sup> R. Jose son of R. Hanina said: This teaches that leprosy broke out in them: here is written *wesipah*; whilst elsewhere it is written, [This is the law for all manner of plagues of leprosy ...] and for a rising and for a scab [*sapahath*].<sup>34</sup> And the Lord will lay bare [*ye'areh*] their secret parts.<sup>35</sup> Rab and Samuel — one maintained: This means that they were poured out like a cruse,<sup>36</sup> while the other said: Their openings became like a forest.

Rab Judah said in Rab's name: The men of Jerusalem were vulgar. One would say to his neighbour, On what did you dine to-day: on well-kneaded bread or on bread that is not well kneaded,<sup>37</sup> on white wine<sup>38</sup> or

- 
- (1) Where is R. Meir's view found without that of the Rabbis that R. Eliezer should refer exclusively to his ruling?
  - (2) R. Eliezer's ruling does not bear upon R. Meir's statement.
  - (3) Then they are ornaments.
  - (4) Because they are burdens.
  - (5) V. 76b; also 93b for an opposing view. Liability is incurred for carrying out any quantity of perfume, no matter how little. Now even a flask without any perfume at all contains its fragrance: this fragrance may be regarded as less than the minimum quantity of food which imposes liability, and R. Eliezer rules that when it is together with the utensil it does involve culpability. — The opposing view on 93b is that the utensil is merely subordinate in purpose to the food, and since the food does not impose liability, the utensil does not either.
  - (6) Mere fragrance is not a concrete object; hence the utensil cannot be subordinate to it, but is an independent article, for which liability is incurred. But even a very small quantity of food may render the utensil subordinate to it.
  - (7) Amos VI, 6.
  - (8) This was during the Hadrianic persecutions, when luxuries were proscribed.
  - (9) The people, by setting their minds on such things, disregarded the essentials, viz., the teachings of the prophets.
  - (10) Ibid.
  - (11) A cup with spouts, enabling several persons to drink from it; v. T.A. II, pp. 280 and 64 1 (n. 237).
  - (12) Both derive *mizreke* from *zarak*, to throw, the first holds that the wine was 'thrown', i.e., passed from one spout to the other. — Thus the prophet criticizes this too as an unnecessary luxury.
  - (13) V. p. 217. n. 7.
  - (14) In reproof.
  - (15) Ibid. 4.
  - (16) Translating *seruhim* that act indecently.
  - (17) Ibid. 7.
  - (18) Eating without washing the hands.
  - (19) Their floors were of earth.
  - (20) Lit., 'he washes and does not wash', — i.e., he uses the barest minimum.
  - (21) Lit., 'goodness'. This shows that water must be used generously.
  - (22) Because he refuses them.
  - (23) Cf. this with Raba's statement *supra* 32b, 33a.
  - (24) Isa. III, 16.
  - (25) Lit., 'erect stature'.
  - (26) Ibid.
  - (27) I.e., with short mincing steps. One who walks with outstretched neck must take short steps, because he cannot see his feet (Rashi).
  - (28) Ibid.
  - (29) To the men.
  - (30) Reading 'akus (serpent) and connecting *te'akasnah* with it by a play on words.
  - (31) Ibid. 24.
  - (32) Reading *pethigil* as an abbreviation for *pethahim* (openings) of *gilah* (joy).
  - (33) Isa. III, 17.
  - (34) Lev. XIV, 56.
  - (35) Isa. III, 17.

(36) I.e., they discharged an abundance of matter. Ye'areh (E. V. lay bare) is translated, will empty; cf. Gen. XXIV, 20: and She emptied (wate'ar) her pitcher.

(37) The whole is a vulgar metaphor for the satisfaction of one's lust.

(38) Gurdeli fr. garad, to scrape, means scraper, a nickname for an inferior white wine.

### **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 63a**

on dark [i.e., mustard-coloured] wine; on a broad couch or on a narrow couch; with a good companion or with a poor companion? R. Hisda observed: And all these are in reference to immorality.

Rahabah said in R. Judah's name: The [fuel] logs of Jerusalem were of the cinnamon tree, and when lit their fragrance pervaded the whole of Eretz Israel. But when Jerusalem was destroyed they were hidden, only as much as a barley grain being left, which is to be found in the queen's collections of rarities.<sup>1</sup> MISHNAH. A MAN MUST NOT GO OUT WITH A SWORD, BOW, SHIELD, LANCE [ALLAH], OR SPEAR; AND IF HE DOES GO OUT, HE INCURS A SIN-OFFERING. R. ELIEZER SAID: THEY ARE ORNAMENTS FOR HIM. BUT THE SAGES MAINTAIN, THEY ARE MERELY SHAMEFUL, FOR IT IS SAID, AND THEY SHALL BEAT THEIR SWORDS INTO PLOWSHARES, AND THEIR SPEARS INTO PRUNING HOOKS: NATION SHALL NOT LIFT UP SWORD AGAINST NATION, NEITHER SHALL THEY LEARN WAR ANY MORE.<sup>2</sup> A KNEE-BAND [BERITH] IS CLEAN, AND ONE MAY GO OUT WITH IT ON THE SABBATH; ANKLE-CHAINS [KEBALIM] ARE UNCLEAR,<sup>3</sup> AND ONE MAY NOT GO OUT WITH THEM ON THE SABBATH.

GEMARA. What is, WITH AN ALLAH? — A lance.

R. ELIEZER SAID: THEY ARE ORNAMENTS FOR HIM. It was taught: Said they [the Sages] to R. Eliezer: Since they are ornaments for him, why should they cease in the days of the Messiah? Because they will not be required, he answered, as it is said, nation shall not lift up sword against nation. Yet let them exist merely as ornaments? — Said Abaye. It may be compared to a candle at noon.<sup>4</sup>

Now this disagrees with Samuel.<sup>5</sup> For Samuel said, This world differs from the Messianic era only in respect to servitude of the exiled, for it is said, For the poor shall never cease out of the land.<sup>6</sup> This supports R. Hiyya b. Abba,<sup>7</sup> who said, All the prophets prophesied only for the Messianic age, but as for the world to come, the eye hath not seen, O Lord, beside thee [what he hath prepared for him that waiteth for him].<sup>8</sup> Some there are who state: Said they [the Sages] to R. Eliezer:

Since they are Ornaments for him, why should they cease in the days of the Messiah? In the days of the Messiah too they shall not cease, he answered. This is Samuel's view, and it disagrees with R. Hiyya b. Abba's.

Abaye asked R. Dimi — others state, R. Awia, — others again state, R. Joseph [asked] R. Dimi — and others state, R. Awia whilst others state, Abaye [asked] R. Joseph: What is R. Eliezer's reason for maintaining that they are ornaments for him? — Because it is written, Gird thy sword upon thy thigh, O mighty one, Thy glory and thy majesty.<sup>9</sup> R. Kahana objected to Mar son of R. Huna: But this refers to the words of the Torah?<sup>10</sup> — A verse cannot depart from its plain meaning, he replied.<sup>11</sup> R. Kahana said: By the time I was eighteen years old I had studied the whole Shas,<sup>12</sup> yet I did not know that a verse cannot depart from its plain meaning.<sup>13</sup> until to-day. What does he inform us? — That a man should study and subsequently understand.<sup>14</sup>

(Mnemonic: Zaruth.)<sup>15</sup> R. Jeremiah said in R. Eleazer's name: When two scholars sharpen each

other in halachah,<sup>16</sup> the Holy One, blessed be He, gives them success, for it is said, and in thy majesty [wa-hadareka] be successful:<sup>17</sup> read not wa-hadareka but wa-hadadeka [thy sharpening]. Moreover, they ascend to greatness, as it is said, 'ride on prosperously' [successfully]. One might think [that this is so] even if it is not for its own sake, therefore it is taught, 'In behalf of truth'. I might think [that this is so] even if he becomes conceited; therefore it is taught, 'and meekness of righteousness'. But if they do thus, they are privileged to acquire<sup>18</sup> the Torah, which was given by the right Hand,<sup>19</sup> as it is said, and thy right hand shall teach thee awe-inspiring things.<sup>20</sup> R. Nahman b. Isaac said: They will obtain the things which were promised at the right hand of the Torah. For Raba b. R. Shila said — others state, R. Joseph b. Hama — said in R. Shesheth's name: What is meant by the verse, Length of days is in her right hand, In her left hand are riches and honour:<sup>21</sup> is there in her right hand length of days only, but not riches and honour? But to those who go to the right hand thereof there is length of days, and riches and honour a fortiori; but for those that go to the left hand thereof there is riches and honour, but not length of days.<sup>22</sup>

R. Jeremiah said in the name of R. Simeon b. Lakish:<sup>23</sup> When two scholars are amiable to each other in [their discussions in] halachah, the Holy One, blessed be He, gives heed to them, for it is said, Then they that feared the Lord spake [nidberu] one with another: and the Lord hearkened, and heard;<sup>24</sup> now speech [dibbur] can 'only mean [with] gentleness, for it is said, He shall subdue [yadber] the peoples under us.<sup>25</sup> What is meant by, and that thought upon his name?<sup>26</sup> — Said R. Ammi: Even if one thinks of doing a good deed but is forcibly prevented and does not do it, the Writ ascribes it to him as though he did it.

R. Hinena b. Idi said: Whoever fulfils a precept as it is commanded,<sup>27</sup> no evil tidings are told to him, for it is said, Whoso keepeth the commandment shall know no evil thing.<sup>28</sup> R. Assi — others state, R. Hanina — said: Even if the Holy One, blessed be He, makes a decree, He annuls it,<sup>29</sup> for it is said, Because the king's word hath power; and who may say unto him, what doest thou;<sup>30</sup> in proximity to which [is written,] Whoso keepeth the commandment shall know no evil thing.<sup>31</sup>

R. Abba said in the name of R. Simeon b. Lakish: When two scholars pay heed to each other in halachah, the Holy One, blessed be He, listens to their voice, as it is said, Thou that dwellest in the gardens, The companions hearken to thy voice: Cause me to hear it.<sup>32</sup> But if they do not do thus, they cause the Shechinah to depart from Israel, as it is said, Flee, my beloved, and be thou like, etc.<sup>33</sup>

R. Abba said in the name of R. Simeon b. Lakish: When two disciples form an assembly<sup>34</sup> in halachah,<sup>35</sup> the Holy One, blessed be He, loves them, as it is said, and his banner over me was love.<sup>36</sup> Said Raba: Providing they know the features of a subject;<sup>37</sup> providing also that there is no greater [scholar] in the town from whom to learn.

R. Abba also said in the name of R. Simeon b. Lakish: He who lends [money] is greater than he who performs charity;<sup>38</sup> and he who forms a partnership<sup>39</sup> is greater than all. R. Abba also said in the name of R. Simeon b. Lakish: [Even] if a scholar is vengeful and bears malice like a serpent.<sup>40</sup> gird him on thy loins;<sup>41</sup> [whereas even] if an 'am ha-arez is pious, do not dwell in his vicinity.<sup>42</sup>

R. Kahana said in the name of R. Simeon b. Lakish — others state, R. Assi said in the name of R. Simeon b. Lakish — others state, R. Abba said in the name of R. Simeon b. Lakish: He who breeds a wild dog in his house keeps loving kindness away from his house,<sup>43</sup> as it is said, To him that is ready to faint [lamos]

---

(1) Jast. Rashi: of Queen Zimzamai.

(2) Isa. II, 4.

(3) 'Clean' and 'unclean' mean not susceptible and susceptible to uncleanness respectively.

(4) Being unnecessary then, it is not beautiful either. Thus, when war will be abolished, the instruments of war will not

be adornments. Now, however, that they may be needed, they are also ornamental.

(5) Sc. the view that they will cease to be in the days of the Messiah.

(6) Deut. XV, 11 . This implies that poverty will continue in the Messianic era. Hence the prophets' tidings of a new state of affairs cannot refer to the Messianic era, which will be the same as the present, save in this matter.

(7) Sc. the Baraitha which states that weapons of war will cease to exist in the Messianic age.

(8) Isa. LXIV, 3. — The conception of the future world is rather vague in the Talmud. In general, it is the opposite of עולם הזה, this world. In Ber, I, 5, 'this world' is opposed to the days of the Messiah, and this in turn is differentiated here from the future world. The following quotation from G. Moore, 'Judaism' (Vol. 2, p. 389) is apposite: 'Any attempt to systematize the Jewish notions of the hereafter imposes upon them an order and consistency which does not exist in them'.

(9) Ps. XLV, 4.

(10) 'Thy sword' is metaphorical for learning, which is Israel's weapon. It is indicative of the peace-loving spirit of the Rabbis and their exaltation of Torah that they regarded it as axiomatic that such a verse could not be taken literally.

(11) Granted that it is metaphorical, yet the Torah would not have been likened to the sword, unless the latter were ornamental.

(12) An abbreviation of shishah sedarim, the six orders into which the Talmud is divided: v. supra 31a. [MS.M. Talmud, Shas being a correction by the censor].

(13) [In the narrative and poetical passages v. Chayyes. Z. H. Glosses].

(14) Even when one does not understand all he learns he should nevertheless study, and understanding will come eventually.

(15) V. p. 110, n. 1 . For the explanation of this Mnemonic v. Hyman, Toledoth, p. 18.

(16) By means of debating, etc.

(17) Ibid. 5.

(18) Zakah implies to acquire through one's merit.

(19) V. Deut. XXXIII, 2.

(20) Ps. XLV, 5.

(21) Prov. III, 16.

(22) Rashi: '... to the right hand' means that they study the Torah profoundly and intensively, just as the right hand is the stronger for work; alternatively, it refers to those who study the Torah for its own sake. '... to the left hand' implies the opposite of these.

(23) Otherwise known as Resh Lakish.

(24) Mal. III, 16.

(25) Ps. XLVII, 3. Subdue implies lowliness, which in turn implies gentleness.

(26) Mal. III, 16.

(27) In the proper spirit.

(28) Eccl. VIII, 5.

(29) 'He' may refer either to God or to the observer of the precept, who is given power to annul God's decree — a daring thought. The former interpretation is indicated in the parallel passage in B.M. 85a (Sonc. ed., p. 488); the latter in M.K. 16b; but v. Weiss, Dor, I, p. 145.

(30) Ibid. 4.

(31) I.e., in spite of the king's word, viz., God's decree, whoso keepeth, etc.

(32) Cant. VIII, 13. The Song of Songs was allegorically interpreted as a dialogue between God and Israel. 'In the gardens' thus means in the academies, and when one scholar hearkens to another's voice, God says. 'Cause me to hear it'.

(33) Ibid. 14.

(34) Rashi, deriving the word from degel, a flag, i.e., who come under one flag. Tosaf. in A.Z. 22b, s.v. אגל, interprets: even when two students outwit each other by sophistries, without seeking the real truth, yet God loves them.

(35) In the absence of a teacher.

(36) Ibid. II, 4.

(37) I.e., they have a general understanding of the subjects to be studied, so that a teacher is not indispensable.

(38) Rashi: because the poor man is not ashamed to borrow. Also perhaps because one generally lends a larger sum than he would give as charity, and that may suffice to make the poor man independent.

- (39) With a poor man, providing the capital for him to trade with on agreed terms. Lit., 'who throws (money) into a (common) purse'.
- (40) The serpent was probably given that character on account of its part in the sin of Adam and Eve; cf. also Ta'an., Sonc. ed., 8a, Yoma 23a.
- (41) Cleave to him, for you will benefit by his scholarship.
- (42) His piety is tainted by his ignorance, which may influence his neighbour too. Cf. Ab. II, 6 (Sonc. ed., p. 15, n. 5).
- (43) The poor are afraid to call. Thus he can show no lovingkindness to them, nor can he earn the love of God.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 63b

kindness should be shewed from his friend;<sup>1</sup> and in Greek a dog is called lamos.<sup>2</sup> R. Nahman b. Isaac said: He also casts off the fear of Heaven from himself, as it is said, and he forsaketh the fear of the Almighty.<sup>3</sup>

A certain woman entered a house to bake. The dog barked at her, [whereupon] her child<sup>4</sup> moved [from its place]. Said the householder to her, 'Fear not: his fangs and claws have been extracted.' 'Take your favours and throw them on the thorns,' she retorted, 'the child has already moved.'

R. Huna said: What is meant by the verse, Rejoice, O young man, In thy youth; and let thy heart cheer thee in the days of thy youth, and walk in the ways of thine heart, and in the sight of thine eyes: but know thou, that for all these things God will bring thee into judgement?<sup>5</sup> Thus far are the words of Evil Desire; thereafter are the words of Good Desire.<sup>6</sup> Resh Lakish said: Thus far the reference is to study;<sup>7</sup> thereafter, to good deeds.<sup>8</sup> A BERITH IS CLEAN. Rab Judah said: A berith is a bracelet.<sup>9</sup> R. Joseph objected: A BERITH IS CLEAN, AND ONE MAY GO OUT WITH IT ON THE SABBATH; but a bracelet is [liable to become] unclean? — He meant this: A berith stands in the place of a bracelet.<sup>10</sup>

Rabin and R. Huna were sitting before R. Jeremiah, and R. Jeremiah was dozing. Now Rabin sat and said: A berith is on one [leg]; whilst kebalim [ankle-chain] is on two.<sup>11</sup> Said R. Huna to him, Both are on two, but a chain is placed between them and they become kebalim [anklets]. Does then the chain turn it into a utensil?<sup>12</sup> And should you answer, This is in accordance with R. Samuel b. Nahmani, for R. Samuel b. Nahmani said in R. Jonathan's name: How do we know that a metal object which causes sound is unclean? Because it is said: Everything [dabar] that may abide the fire, ye shall make go through the fire.<sup>13</sup> even speech [dibbur — i.e., sound] is implied.<sup>14</sup> — As for there, it is well: it [the utensil] is needed for sound<sup>15</sup> and it performs an action;<sup>16</sup> but here, what action does it perform?<sup>17</sup> — Here too it performs an action, for Rabbah b. Bar Hanah said in R. Johanan's name: There was a certain family in Jerusalem that had large steps, whereby their virginity was destroyed. So they made them leg-suspenders and placed a chain between them, that their steps should not be large, and then their virginity was not destroyed. R. Jeremiah awoke at that and exclaimed to them, Well spoken!<sup>18</sup> and thus did R. Johanan say [too].

When R. Dimi came,<sup>19</sup> he said in the name of R. Johanan: How do we know that woven [material] of whatever size is [liable to become] unclean? From the ziz.<sup>20</sup> Said Abaye to him, Was then the ziz woven? But it was taught: The ziz was a kind of golden plate two fingerbreadths broad, and it stretched round [the forehead] from ear to ear, and upon it was written in two lines 'yod he' above and 'Holy lamed' below.<sup>21</sup> But R. Eliezer son of R. Jose said: I saw it in the city of Rome,<sup>22</sup> and 'Holy unto the Lord' was written in one line.<sup>23</sup> When R. Dimi went up to Nehardea, he sent word: The things that I told you were erroneous. But in truth it was thus said on R. Johanan's authority: How do we know that an ornament of whatever size is [liable to become] unclean? From the headplate. And how do we know that woven material of whatever size is unclean? From [the phrase] or raiment.<sup>24</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: Woven stuff of whatever size is unclean, and an ornament of whatever size is unclean. [An object partly] woven and [partly] an ornament of whatever size is unclean.<sup>25</sup> A sack goes beyond a garment, in that it is unclean as woven material.<sup>26</sup> Raba said: Woven stuff of whatever size is unclean: this is [deduced] from, 'or raiment'. An ornament of whatever size is unclean: [this is learnt] from the headplate. [An object partly] woven and [partly] an ornament of whatever size is unclean: this is [deduced] from, every serviceable utensil.<sup>27</sup> Said one of the Rabbis to Raba, But that is written in reference to Midian?<sup>28</sup> We learn

- 
- (1) Job. VI, 14.
  - (2) Perhaps from the Gk. \*\*. Thus he translates: on account of a (wild) dog, love is kept back from one's neighbour.
  - (3) Ibid.
  - (4) She was pregnant.
  - (5) Eccl. XI, 9.
  - (6) From 'Rejoice' to 'thine eyes' is spoken by the Tempter (sin personified), urging man to sin; 'but know thou, etc.' is the warning of Good Desire, man's better nature (Rashi). Maharsha explains it differently.
  - (7) Lit., 'the words of the Torah'.
  - (8) Rejoice in your youth, when you can study, and apply your heart and eyes. i.e. , your full understanding, to same. But know that you will be judged for non-fulfilment of the precepts learned by you in your studies.
  - (9) For the hand.
  - (10) It corresponds to a bracelet, i.e., the bracelet encircles the arm while the berith encircles the foot.
  - (11) V. Krauss, T.A. I, pp. 205 and 665 (n. 977) on these terms.
  - (12) That it is susceptible to uncleanness, as taught in the Mishnah. Surely not!
  - (13) Num. XXXI, 23.
  - (14) V. supra 58b for notes.
  - (15) E.g., a bell.
  - (16) Viz., it makes a sound.
  - (17) Though, of course, it holds up the stockings, that does not make it a utensil, which must serve an independent function, whereas this is merely an adjunct, as it were, to the stockings.
  - (18) Lit., (with **תב** understood) 'thy strength be well'.
  - (19) V. p. 12, n. 9.
  - (20) The headplate worn by the High Priest, v. Ex. XXVIII, 36ff. Though quite small, it was counted among the High Priest's adornments, and was therefore susceptible to uncleanness.
  - (21) I.e., the Divine Name on the upper line and 'Holy unto' on the lower line.
  - (22) Whither it was taken after the destruction of the Temple.
  - (23) From this Baraitha we see that the ziz was not of woven material.
  - (24) Lev. XI, 32. 'Or' is an extension.
  - (25) Tosaf. observes that this implies that nevertheless some minimum is required in the size of woven material and ornaments.
  - (26) This is explained below.
  - (27) Num. XXXI, 51 (E. V.: all wrought jewels).
  - (28) Which treats of defilement through the dead. Such is graver than uncleanness through dead reptiles (sherazim), which it is sought to prove here.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 64a

the meaning of utensil' [here] from [the employment of] 'utensil' there, answered he.<sup>1</sup> 'A sack goes beyond a garment, in that it is unclean as woven material.' Is then a garment not woven material? — This is its meaning: A sack goes beyond a garment, for though it is not of woven material, yet it is unclean.<sup>2</sup> For what is it fit? — Said R. Johanan: A poor man plaits three threads [of goats' hair]<sup>3</sup> and suspends it from his daughter's neck.

Our Rabbis taught: [And upon whatsoever any of them . . . doth fall, it shall be unclean; whether it

be any vessel of wood ... or] sack:<sup>4</sup> I know it only of a sack:<sup>5</sup> how do we know to include a horse cover and the saddle band?<sup>6</sup> Therefore it is said, 'or sack'.<sup>7</sup> I might think that I can include ropes and cords;<sup>8</sup> therefore 'sack' is stated: just as a sack is spun and woven, so must everything be spun and woven.<sup>9</sup> Now, concerning the dead it is stated, and all that is made of skin, and all work of goats' hair ... ye shall purify yourselves:<sup>10</sup> this is to include a horse cover and the saddle band.<sup>11</sup> I might think that I can include ropes and cords. (But it [the reverse] is logical:<sup>12</sup> [the Divine Law] teaches defilement by a dead reptile, and it teaches defilement by the dead: just as when it teaches defilement by a reptile, it declares unclean only that which is spun and woven; so when it teaches defilement by the dead, it declares unclean only that which is spun and woven. How so! If it is lenient in respect to defilement through a reptile, which is lighter, shall we be lenient<sup>13</sup> in respect to defilement by the dead, which is graver?)<sup>14</sup> Therefore 'raiment and skin' is stated twice, to provide a gezerah shawah.<sup>15</sup> Thus: raiment and skin are mentioned in connection with reptiles,<sup>16</sup> and also in connection with the dead:<sup>17</sup> just as the 'raiment and skin' which are mentioned in connection with reptiles, it [Scripture] declares unclean only that which is spun and woven, so the 'raiment and skin' which are stated in connection with the dead, it declares unclean only that which is spun and woven;<sup>18</sup> and just as 'raiment and skin' which are stated in connection with the dead, anything made of goats' hair is unclean, so 'raiment and skin' which are stated in connection with reptiles, anything made of goats' hair is unclean.<sup>19</sup> Now, I know it only of that which comes from goats: how do I know to include what is produced from the tail of a horse or a cow? Therefore it is stated, 'or sack'.<sup>20</sup> (But you have utilized it in respect of a horse cover and saddle bands? — That was only before the gezerah shawah was adduced; but now that we have the gezerah shawah, it [sc. the 'or'] is superfluous.)<sup>21</sup> And I know this only in the case of a reptile: how do we know it in respect to defilement by the dead? But it is logical:<sup>22</sup> [Scripture] declares uncleanness through the dead, and also declares uncleanness through reptiles: just as when it declares uncleanness through the dead, it treats that which is produced from the tail of a horse or cow as that which is made of goats' hair, so when it declares uncleanness through the dead, it treats that which is produced from the tail of a horse or a cow as that which is made of goats' hair. How so! If it [Scripture] includes [this] in defilement until evening, which is extensive, shall we include [it] in seven days' defilement, which is limited?<sup>23</sup> Therefore 'raiment and skin' are stated twice, to provide a gezerah shawah. 'Raiment and skin' are stated in connection with reptiles, and 'raiment and skin' are stated also in connection with the dead; just as raiment and skin,' which are stated in connection with reptiles, that which comes from the tail of a horse or cow is treated as that which is made of goats' hair, so 'raiment and skin' which are stated in connection with the dead, that which is produced from the tail of a horse or cow is treated as that which is made of goats' hair. And this must be redundant.<sup>24</sup> For if it is not redundant, one can refute [the deduction]: as for a reptile, that is because it defiles by the size of a lentil.<sup>25</sup> In truth, it is redundant. For consider: a reptile is likened to semen, for it is written, a man whose seed goeth from him,<sup>26</sup> in proximity to which it is written, or whosoever toucheth any creeping thing;<sup>27</sup> while in respect to semen it is written, and every garment and every skin, whereon is the seed of copulation,<sup>28</sup> then what is the purpose of 'raiment and skin' written by the Divine Law in connection with reptiles? Infer from this that its purpose is to leave it redundant.<sup>29</sup> Yet it is still redundant [only] on one side:<sup>30</sup> this is well on the view that where it is redundant on one side we can learn [identity of law] and cannot refute [the deduction]; but on the view that we can learn, but also refute,<sup>31</sup> what can be said? — That [stated] in connection with the dead is also redundant. For consider: the dead is likened to semen, for it is written, 'and whoso toucheth anything that is unclean by the dead, or a man whose seed goeth from him'; while in respect to semen it is written, 'and every garment and every skin, whereon shall be the seed of copulation. What then is the purpose of 'raiment and skin' written by the Divine Law in connection with the dead? Infer from this that its purpose is to leave it redundant.

And we have brought the Lord's oblation, what every man hath gotten, of jewels of gold, ankle chains, and bracelets, signet-rings, ear-rings, and armllets.<sup>32</sup> R. Eleazar said: 'Agil is a cast of female breasts; kumaz is a cast of the womb. R. Joseph observed: Thus it is that we translate it<sup>33</sup> mahok, [meaning] the place that leads to obscenity [gihuk]. Said Rabbah to him, It is implied in the very

Writ itself: Kumaz=here [Ka-an] is the place [Mekom] of unchastity [Zimmah].<sup>34</sup>

And Moses was wroth with the officers of the host.<sup>35</sup> R. Nahman said in Rabbah b. Abbuha's name: Moses said to Israel: 'Maybe ye have returned to your first lapse [sin]?'<sup>36</sup> 'There lacketh not one man of us,'<sup>37</sup> they replied. 'If so,' he queried, 'Why an atonement?' 'Though we escaped from sin,' said they. 'yet we did not escape from meditating upon sin.' Straightway, 'and we have brought the Lord's offering'<sup>38</sup> The School of R. Ishmael taught: Why were the Israelites of that generation in need of atonement? Because

---

(1) Concerning defilement by dead reptiles it is written, every utensil wherewith any work is done (Lev. XI, 32), and the meaning of 'utensil' is learnt from 'utensil' mentioned in connection with the dead, where ornaments are referred to. Tosaf explains the passage differently: But that ... Midian, i.e., it treats of the spoil of Midian and has no bearing upon uncleanness at all? To which Raba replied that as 'utensil' in Lev. XI, 32 refers to uncleanness, so 'utensil' in Num. XXXI, 51 provides a teaching on uncleanness, notwithstanding that this does not appear so from the context.

(2) The words are explained: ... it is unclean as woven material though it is not woven. — By 'sack' a few plaited strands of goats' hair is meant.

(3) Which are first spun.

(4) Lev. XI, 32. — The reference is to defilement by dead reptiles (sherazim).

(5) Which is usually worn by shepherds.

(6) The band with which the saddle or housing of a horse is fastened to its belly. Others: the housing itself. It was made of goats' hair spun and woven.

(7) 'Or' is an extension.

(8) Used for measuring. These were of unspun plaited goats' hair.

(9) Before it is susceptible to uncleanness.

(10) Num. XXXI, 20. These become unclean through contact with the dead.

(11) 'All' is an extension.

(12) This is a parenthesis. A verse will be quoted to show that they are not included, but before that it is parenthetically argued that it is logical not to include them, so that no verse for their exclusion is required. But it is shown that logic does not suffice to exclude them, so that a verse is required.

(13) I.e., shall we deduce a lenient ruling by analogy?

(14) Surely not! Hence logic does not prove the exclusion of cords and ropes, and therefore a verse is necessary.

(15) V. Glos.

(16) Lev. XI, 32.

(17) Num. XXXI, 51. E.V. garment.

(18) Though an analogy between the two cannot be drawn, as shown, because the uncleanness of one is graver than that of the other, yet one can deduce equality of law through the *gezerah shawah*.

(19) Providing it is spun and woven.

(20) 'Or' being an extension.

(21) For the susceptibility of a horse cover and a saddle band to uncleanness follows from the *gezerah shawah*, on the same lines as before.

(22) V. p. 302, n. 11; the same applies here.

(23) Uncleanness through a reptile ceases on the evening after the defiled object is subjected to ritual immersion, but uncleanness caused by the dead lasts seven days (v. Lev. XI, 32; Num. XIX, 11 seq.). Now, defilement until evening is extensive, in that it can be caused by many agencies, e.g., reptiles, the carcase of all animal (*nebelah*), semen, the touch of a *zab* and the touch of one who is himself unclean through the dead. Therefore it is logical that many objects too shall be susceptible to such uncleanness. But seven days' defilement is limited to the direct action of a corpse; hence it is probable that it does not extend to many objects either. Therefore the fact that what is made from the tail of a horse or cow is subject to defilement by reptiles is no warrant that it is also liable to defilement through the dead.

(24) In a *gezerah shawah* the word used as a basis of deduction must be redundant (*mufneh*). Otherwise the deduction may be refuted if a point of known dissimilarity is found between the two subjects which are linked by the *gezerah shawah*. On this redundancy there are two views: (i) the redundancy is required in one passage only; (ii) the redundancy is necessary in both subjects. — There is a third view, that of R. Akiba, that no redundancy at all is required in order to

make the deduction conclusive and incapable of being refuted.

(25) Whereas the smallest portion of corpse to defile must be the size of an olive. In this matter defilement by a reptile is more stringent, and thus it may also be more stringent in the matter under discussion.

(26) Lev. XXII, 4.

(27) (Ibid. 5. Proximity indicates likeness in law.

(28) Lev. XV, 17. Thus raiment and skin are defiled by semen, and therefore by reptiles too.

(29) For the gezerah shawah.

(30) I.e., in one of the two passages.

(31) V. p. 656, n. 2.

(32) Num. XXXI, 50.

(33) Metargemanan, i.e., in the Targum, the Aramaic version of the Scriptures. The citation given here by R. Joseph is from the Targum ascribed to Onkelos the proselyte.

(34) Treating Kumaz as an abbreviation.

(35) Ibid. 14.

(36) When they sinned with the daughters of Moab; v. Num. XXV.

(37) Ibid. 49.

(38) V. 50, to make atonement for their impure thoughts.

### **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 64b**

they gratified their eyes with lewdness. R. Shesheth said: Why does the Writ enumerate the outward ornaments with the inner?<sup>1</sup> To teach you: Whoever looks upon a woman's little finger is as though he gazed upon the pudenda.<sup>2</sup>

MISHNAH. A WOMAN MAY GO OUT WITH RIBBONS MADE OF HAIR,<sup>3</sup> WHETHER THEY ARE OF HER OWN [HAIR] OR OF HER COMPANIONS, OR OF AN ANIMAL, AND WITH FRONTLETS AND WITH SARBITIN<sup>4</sup> THAT ARE FASTENED TO HER. [SHE MAY GO OUT] WITH A HAIR-NET [KABUL] AND WITH A WIG<sup>5</sup> INTO A COURTYARD; WITH WADDING IN HER EAR, WITH WADDING IN HER SANDALS,<sup>6</sup> AND WITH THE CLOTH PREPARED FOR HER MENSTRUATION; WITH A PEPPERCORN, WITH A GLOBULE OF SALT AND ANYTHING THAT IS PLACED IN HER MOUTH,<sup>7</sup> PROVIDING THAT SHE DOES NOT PUT IT IN HER MOUTH IN THE FIRST PLACE ON THE SABBATH, AND IF IT FAILS OUT,<sup>8</sup> SHE MAY NOT PUT IT BACK. AS FOR AN ARTIFICIAL TOOTH, [OR] A GOLD TOOTH,<sup>9</sup> — RABBI PERMITS BUT THE SAGES FORBID IT.

GEMARA. And it is necessary [to state all the cases].<sup>10</sup> For if we were told about her own [hair], that might be because it is not ugly; but as for her companions', which is unbecoming.<sup>11</sup> I might say [that it is] not [permitted].<sup>12</sup> While if we were informed about her companions', that might be because she is of her own kind; but an animal's, that is not of her own kind, I might say [that it is] not [permitted].<sup>13</sup> Thus they are necessary.

It was taught: Providing that a young woman does not go out with an old woman's [hair], or an old woman with a young woman's.<sup>14</sup> As for an old woman [not going out] with a young woman's hair, that is well, because it is an improvement for her; but [that] a young woman [may not go out] with an old woman's [hair]. why [state it], seeing that it is unsuitable for her?<sup>15</sup> — Because he teaches of an old woman's [going out] with a young woman's [hair], he also teaches of a young woman's [going out] with an old woman's hair.

WITH A HAIR-NET AND A WIG INTO A COURTYARD. Rab said: Whatever the Sages forbade to go out therewith into the street, one may not go out therewith into a courtyard,<sup>16</sup> except a hair-net and a wig. R. 'Anani b. Sason said on the authority of R. Ishmael son of R. Jose: It is all like a hair-net. We learnt: WITH A HAIR-NET AND A WIG INTO A COURTYARD. As for Rab, it is

well; but according to R. ‘Anani b. Sason it is a difficulty? — On whose authority does R. ‘Anani b. Sason say this? On that of R. Ishmael son of R. Jose! R. Ishmael son of R. Jose is a Tanna, and can disagree.<sup>17</sup>

Now, according to Rab, why do these differ? — Said ‘Ulla, [They are permitted] lest she become repulsive to her husband.<sup>18</sup> As it was taught: And she that is sick shall be in her impurity:<sup>19</sup> the early Sages<sup>20</sup> ruled: That means that she must not rouge nor paint nor adorn herself in dyed garments; until R. Akiba came and taught: If so, you make her repulsive to her husband, with the result that he will divorce her! But what [then] is taught by, ‘and she that is sick shall be it, her impurity’? She shall remain in her impurity until she enters Into water.<sup>21</sup>

Rab Judah said in Rab's name: Wherever the Sages forbade [aught] for appearances' sake, it is forbidden even In one's innermost chambers.<sup>22</sup>

We learnt: Nor with a bell, even if it is plugged.<sup>23</sup> And it was elsewhere taught.<sup>24</sup> One may plug the bell around its [the animal's] neck and saunter with it in the courtyard?<sup>25</sup> — It is [a controversy of] Tannaim. For it was taught:

- 
- (1) In this verse, according to the translation given above of ‘agil and kumaz.
  - (2) The first is where the finger-ring is worn, and since it is enumerated, it follows that even for looking upon that they needed atonement.
  - (3) With which she dresses her hair.
  - (4) V. supra 57b.
  - (5) Lit., ‘strange (false) curls’.
  - (6) I.e., any soft substance to ease the foot.
  - (7) Before the commencement of the Sabbath.
  - (8) On the Sabbath.
  - (9) Rashi regards these as one: an artificial tooth of gold.
  - (10) Referring to ribbons of hair.
  - (11) I.e, ribbons made of another woman's hair may not match her own.
  - (12) She may be ridiculed and thereby tempted to remove it, and thus carry it in the street.
  - (13) For there the disharmony is even more striking.
  - (14) Young hair on old — e.g. black on grey — or vice versa is ugly, and so the wearer might remove it in the street.
  - (15) No young woman would dream of wearing ribbons made from an old woman's hair. — The translation follows one interpretation given in Tosaf. Tosaf. offers another, which is based on a reversed order of the text.
  - (16) Lest she forget herself and go out into the street too.
  - (17) It is axiomatic that an amora cannot disagree with a Tanna, but another Tanna of course can. The Mishnah certainly disagrees with R. ‘Anani b. Sason, but it does not matter, as he is supported by another Tanna.
  - (18) Hence some ornaments must be permitted.
  - (19) Lev. XV, 33. The reference is to a menstruant.
  - (20) Lit., ‘elders’.
  - (21) I.e., until she has a ritual bath.
  - (22) E.g., one must not lead on Sabbath a number of animals tied together, lest he be suspected of going to market with them (supra 54a). Accordingly he may not do so even in the utmost privacy.
  - (23) V. supra 54b Mishnah.
  - (24) Var. lec.: and it was taught thereon.
  - (25) This refutes Rab, for though it may not be done publicly in the street, it may be done privately in one's courtyard.

## **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 65a**

He may spread them out in the sun, but not in the sight of people; R. Eleazar and R. Simeon forbid it.<sup>1</sup>

AND WITH THE WADDING IN HER EAR. Rami b. Ezekiel learnt: Providing it is tied to her ear.

AND WITH THE WADDING IN HER SANDALS. Rami b. Ezekiel learnt: Providing it is tied to her sandal.

AND WITH THE CLOTH SHE PREPARED FOR HER MENSTRUATION. Rami b. Ezekiel thought to say, Providing it is fastened between her thighs. Said Raba, Even if it is not tied to her: since it is repulsive, she will not come to carry it.<sup>2</sup> R. Jeremiah asked R. Abba: What if she made a handle for it?<sup>3</sup> — It is permitted, replied he.<sup>4</sup> It was stated likewise: R. Nahman b. Oshaia said in R. Johanan's name: [Even] if she made a handle for it, it is permitted.

R. Johanan used to go out with them<sup>5</sup> to the Beth Hamidrash, but his companions disagreed with him.<sup>6</sup> R. Jannai would go out with it into a karmelith<sup>7</sup> but all his contemporaries disagreed with him. But Rami b. Ezekiel learnt: Providing it is tied to her ear?<sup>8</sup> — There is no difficulty: in the one case it is firmly placed;<sup>9</sup> in the other it was not.<sup>10</sup>

WITH A PEPPERCORN, AND WITH A GLOBULE OF SALT. A peppercorn is for [counteracting] the [evil] breath of the mouth; a globule of salt is for the gum.<sup>11</sup>

AND WITH ANYTHING THAT SHE PLACES<sup>12</sup> IN HER MOUTH. [Sc.] ginger, or cinnamon.

AN ARTIFICIAL TOOTH, [OR] A GOLD TOOTH, — RABBI PERMITS BUT THE SAGES FORBID IT. R. Zera said: They taught this only of a gold [tooth], but as for a silver one, all agree that it is permitted.<sup>13</sup>

Abaye said: Rabbi, R. Eliezer, and R. Simeon b. Eleazar all hold that whatever detracts from a person[’s appearance], one will not come to display it. Rabbi, as stated.<sup>14</sup> R. Eliezer, for it was taught: R. Eliezer declares [her] non-culpable on account of a kobelet and a flask of spikenard oil.<sup>15</sup> R. Simeon b. Eleazar, for it was taught: R. Simeon b. Eleazar stated a general rule: Whatever is [worn] beneath the net, one may go out therewith; whatever is [worn] above the net, one may not go out with it.<sup>16</sup>

MISHNAH. SHE MAY GO FORTH WITH THE SELA’<sup>17</sup> ON A ZINITH [CALLUS]. YOUNG GIRLS<sup>18</sup> MAY GO OUT WITH THREADS, AND EVEN WITH CHIPS IN THEIR EARS.<sup>19</sup> ARABIAN WOMEN MAY GO FORTH VEILED, AND MEDIAN WOMEN MAY GO FORTH WITH THEIR CLOAKS THROWN OVER THEIR SHOULDERS.<sup>20</sup> INDEED, ALL PEOPLE [MAY DO LIKEWISE]. BUT THAT THE SAGES SPOKE OF NORMAL USAGE.<sup>21</sup> A WOMAN MAY WEIGHT [HER CLOAK] WITH A STONE, NUT, OR COIN, PROVIDING THAT SHE DOES NOT ATTACH THE WEIGHT IN THE FIRST PLACE ON THE SABBATH.

GEMARA. What is ZINITH? A growth caused by the soil.<sup>22</sup> And why particularly a sela’? Shall we say that anything hard is beneficial thereto? Then let a shard be prepared for it? Again, if it is on account of the corrosion,<sup>23</sup> let a metal foil be used? But if it is on account of the figure,<sup>24</sup> let him use any circular plate?<sup>25</sup> Said Abaye: This proves that all [these things] are beneficial for it.<sup>26</sup>

YOUNG GIRLS MAY GO OUT WITH THREADS. Samuel's father did not permit his daughters to go out with threads, nor to sleep together; and he made mikwa'oth<sup>27</sup> for them in the days of Nisan, and had mats placed in the days of Tishri.<sup>28</sup> ‘He did not permit them to go out with threads’. But we learnt, YOUNG GIRLS MAY GO OUT WITH THREADS! — The daughters of Samuel's father had coloured ones.<sup>29</sup> ‘He did not permit them to sleep together’. Shall we say that this supports R. Huna?

For R. Huna said: Women that commit lewdness with one another are unfit for the priesthood.<sup>30</sup> -

- 
- (1) This refers to one whose garments are accidentally wetted on the Sabbath. The first Tanna forbids them to be spread out in the sight of the people, lest they suspect him of having washed them on the Sabbath, yet he permits it to be done privately, thus agreeing with the Baraita just quoted. While R. Eleazar and R. Simeon forbid it even in private, which agrees with Rab.
- (2) If it drops out.
- (3) Sewing on to it a piece that she could hold in her hand. This is not repulsive, and so she may carry it.
- (4) It is repulsive none the less.
- (5) Sc. the wadding in his ear, because he had a copious discharge of pus, and with wadding in his sandals. This must be the explanation according to cur. edd. which reads 'with them'; this appears to be Alfasi's version too (v. Korban Nethanel on Asheri a.l.). Rashi reads: with it, and refers it to the first mentioned.
- (6) Rashi: because he did not have it tied to his ear.
- (7) V. Glos. and supra 6a.
- (8) Whereas R. Johanan did not have it tied to his ear.
- (9) [In which case tying to the ear is not necessary. Hence the practice of R. Johanan.
- (10) Rami b. Ezekiel refers to the latter case.
- (11) Jast. Rashi: toothache.
- (12) Sic. The reading in the Mishnah is slightly different.
- (13) Rashi: a gold tooth being valuable, the woman may take it out of her mouth for display, and meanwhile carry it in the street; but this does not apply to a silver tooth.
- (14) This being the reason that he permits a gold tooth, in spite of its being valuable.
- (15) V. supra 62a.
- (16) V. supra 57b.
- (17) A coin.
- (18) Lit., 'daughters'.
- (19) To prevent the hole pierced for ear-rings from closing up.
- (20) Parap, p.p. parup. f.p. perupoth, means to fasten a garment over the shoulder by attaching a weight to its overhanging corner (Jast.).
- (21) Arabian and Median women affect these fashions.
- (22) The pressure or chafing of the ground on the foot causing a wound or a bunion.
- (23) Of the metal, which softens the callus.
- (24) Stamped on the coin, which may protect the growth.
- (25) Rashi: of wood, upon which a figure is impressed.
- (26) Viz., the hardness, corrosion, and the figure, and only a coin possesses all three.
- (27) Mikweh, pl. mikwa'oth, ritual bath.
- (28) A mikweh made of collected rain water is efficacious only if its water is still, not running or flowing. But 'a well or spring, with its waters gushing forth from its source, is efficacious even when they flow onward. Now, during the whole year the river may contain more rain water or melted snow (which is the same) than its own natural waters; consequently it is all considered as rain water, which does not cleanse when in a running state. But in Tishri when the rains have ceased, nor is there any melted snow in the river, it is like a well or spring, and even though running its waters are efficacious. — According to this the river's rise is caused mainly by rain. — Hence in Nisan he did not permit them to take their ritual bath in the river, but made special enclosed baths for them. But in Tishri they could perform their ablutions in the river. Yet since the bed of the river is miry, and should the feet sink into it, the water cannot reach the soles, thus rendering the immersion invalid, he placed mats on the river bed for them to stand on (Rashi). R. Tam a.l. and Rab in Ned. 40b explain: he hung up mats on the shore, to serve as a screen.
- (29) Which they might remove and show.
- (30) Sc. to marry a High Priest, who must marry none but a virgin (Lev. XXI, 13), for their lewdness destroys their virginity. Though there were no High Priests in his days, he nevertheless objected to this on grounds of decency, and therefore may have taken steps to prevent it. — V. Weiss, Dor, II, 23.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 65b

No: it was in order that they should not become accustomed to a foreign body. 'And he made a mikweh for them in the days of Nisan'. This supports Rab, for Rab said: Rain in the West [Palestine] is strongly testified to by the Euphrates;<sup>1</sup> and he [Samuel's father] feared that the rainwater might exceed the running water.<sup>2</sup> Now, he differs from Samuel, who said: A river increases in volume from its beds.<sup>3</sup> But this conflicts with another [statement] of his. For Samuel said: No water purifies when flowing, save the Euphrates in the days of Tishri alone.<sup>4</sup>

A WOMAN MAY WEIGHT [HER CLOAK] WITH A STONE, etc. But you say in the first clause, that she may weight it?<sup>5</sup> — Said Abaye: The second clause refers to a coin.<sup>6</sup> Abaye asked: May a woman evade [the Sabbath prohibition] by weighting [her cloak] with a nut in order to carry it out to her infant child on the Sabbath? This is a problem on the view of both him who maintains that an artifice may be used and him who holds that an artifice may not be used.<sup>7</sup> It is a problem on the view that all artifice may be used in the case of a conflagration: that is only there, because if you do not permit it to him, he will come to extinguish it; but here, if you do not permit it, one will not come to carry it [sc. the nut] out.<sup>8</sup> Or perhaps, even on the view that all artifice may not be used; there that is a normal way of carrying [clothes] out;<sup>9</sup> but here this is not a usual way of carrying it, and therefore I might say that it is well.<sup>10</sup> The question stands over.

MISHNAH. A STUMP-LEGGED PERSON MAY GO FORTH WITH HIS WOODEN STUMP:<sup>11</sup> THIS IS R. MEIR'S VIEW;

---

(1) Rashi: for when it rains in Palestine the water flows down to Babylon and causes the swelling of the Euphrates. Obermeyer, p 45 and n. 2 rejects this on hydrographical grounds, and explains that in most cases the rains in northern Mesopotamia in the Taurus range, where the Euphrates has its source, are the precursors of rain in Palestine. — Thus Rab too holds that the swelling of a river is caused chiefly through rain.

(2) I.e., the added rain water might exceed the normal volume of the river, in which case it is all regarded as rain water; v. p. 310, n. 11.

(3) Lit., 'rock'. Though it seems to swell through the rains, actually more water gushes upward from the river bed than is added by the rain.

(4) Which is in accordance with his father and with Rab.

(5) Which certainly means that she may do so in the first place on the Sabbath, since the preceding clause has already taught that she may wear a weighted cloak.

(6) Which may not be handled on the Sabbath.

(7) V. infra 120a.

(8) Hence it is possibly forbidden.

(9) E.g., clothes; merchants wear the clothes they have to sell (Rashi).

(10) Since the first is the normal way of carrying, when one puts on more than he requires the excess is a mere burden, carried out in the normal manner; hence it is forbidden. But in the case under discussion, even if a person intentionally carries a nut out thus, without any subterfuge, he does not transgress by Biblical law and is not liable to a sin-offering, which is incurred only for doing a thing in its normal fashion. Hence a subterfuge may be permitted even by Rabbinical law (R. Jacob Emden, *Novellae*).

(11) A log of wood hollowed out to receive the stump.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 66a

WHILE R. JOSE FORBIDS IT. AND IF IT HAS A RECEPTACLE FOR PADS,<sup>1</sup> IT IS UNCLEAN.<sup>2</sup> HIS SUPPORTS<sup>3</sup> ARE UNCLEAN THROUGH MIDRAS,<sup>4</sup> AND ONE MAY GO OUT THEREWITH ON THE SABBATH,<sup>5</sup> AND ENTER THE TEMPLE COURT WHILST WEARING THEM.<sup>6</sup> HIS STOOL AND SUPPORTS<sup>7</sup> ARE UNCLEAN AS MIDRAS, AND ONE MAY NOT GO OUT WITH THEM ON THE SABBATH,<sup>8</sup> AND ONE MAY NOT ENTER THE TEMPLE COURT WITH THEM.<sup>9</sup> AN ARTIFICIAL ARM [LUKITMIN]<sup>10</sup> IS CLEAN, BUT ONE MAY

## NOT GO OUT THEREWITH.<sup>11</sup>

GEMARA. Raba asked R. Nahman, How do we learn [this]?<sup>12</sup> 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.].<sup>13</sup> 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 signalled to them that it was the reverse? R. Nahman b. Isaac observed: And your token is samek samek.<sup>14</sup>

Now, Samuel too retracted.<sup>15</sup> For we learnt: If she performs halizah<sup>16</sup> with a shoe that is not his,<sup>17</sup> 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]?<sup>18</sup> 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.<sup>19</sup>

Now, R. Huna too retracted. For it was taught: A lime burner's shoe<sup>20</sup> 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:<sup>21</sup> They agree with him? — Said R. Huna, Who agreed with him? R. Meir.<sup>22</sup> And who did not agree with him? R. Jose.<sup>23</sup> 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:<sup>24</sup> . R. Akiba declares it unclean; while R. Johanan b. Nuri declares it clean.<sup>25</sup>

The Master said: 'A lime-burner's shoe is unclean as midras'. But it is not made for walking?<sup>26</sup> — 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.<sup>27</sup> Said Raba: Whence do I know it? For we learnt: A child's waggonette<sup>28</sup> 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.<sup>29</sup> And Raba?<sup>30</sup> — 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, 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 paralysed. 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 זרע ישראל on Mishnah seems to translate סמוכות 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. **אֲנָקְטָמִין**: 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 (י'וס') forbids (אוסר), 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?

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 66b

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

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 him, I learn, A woman can perform halizah therewith,<sup>3</sup> 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.<sup>4</sup> 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.<sup>5</sup> (Abaye said, Mother<sup>6</sup> told me: Three<sup>7</sup> 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!)<sup>8</sup> Why [then] particularly BOYS; even girls too [may go out therewith]? And why particularly children; even adults too?<sup>9</sup> — 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].<sup>10</sup> R. Nahman b. Isaac said: And your token is phylacteries.<sup>11</sup> But if the reverse there is danger.<sup>12</sup>

Abin b. Huna said in the name of R. Hama b. Guria: The placing of a [hot] cup upon the navel on Sabbath<sup>13</sup> 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.<sup>14</sup> Like R. Huna at Rab's college, and Rab at R. Hiyya's, and R. Hiyya at Rabbi's,<sup>15</sup> 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,<sup>16</sup> so let So-and-so's wine become clear.'<sup>17</sup> 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.'<sup>18</sup>

Abin b. Huna also said in the name of R. Hama b. Guria: One may reset [a laryngeal muscle]<sup>19</sup> 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.<sup>20</sup> R. Papa recited [two dicta about] children, [while] R. Zebid recited [one dictum] about a child.<sup>21</sup> R. Papa recited [the two dicta about] children,<sup>22</sup> 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 knots<sup>23</sup> 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 stone<sup>24</sup> on the Sabbath. On the authority of R. Meir it was said: Even with the counterweight of a preserving stone.<sup>25</sup> And not only when one has miscarried,<sup>26</sup> 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.<sup>27</sup> Abaye asked: What about the counterweight of the counterweight? The question stands over.

Abaye also said: Mother told me, For a daily fever<sup>28</sup> one must take a white zuz,<sup>29</sup> go to a salt deposit,<sup>30</sup> take its weight in salt, and tie it up in the nape of the neck with a white 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.<sup>31</sup> 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?<sup>32</sup> 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 mummers.
  - (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.

## Talmud - Mas. 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.<sup>1</sup>

R. Johanan said: For an inflammatory fever let one take an all-iron knife, go whither thorn-hedges<sup>2</sup> are to be found, and tie a white twisted thread thereto.<sup>3</sup> On the first day he must slightly notch it, and say, 'and the angel of the Lord appeared unto him, etc.'<sup>4</sup> 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.'<sup>5</sup> R. Aha son of Raba said to R. Ashi, Then let him say, 'Draw not nigh hither?'<sup>6</sup> 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 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-so<sup>7</sup> 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 Sodom<sup>8</sup> to heal boils and aches: bazak, bazik, bizbazik, mismasik, kamun kamik,<sup>9</sup> thy colour [be confined] within thee, thy colour [be confined] within thee,<sup>10</sup> thy seat be within thee,<sup>11</sup> thy seed be like a kalut<sup>12</sup> 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.'<sup>13</sup> Against ulcers<sup>14</sup> 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 Tina<sup>15</sup> as Shamgez, 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,<sup>16</sup> 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.'<sup>17</sup> 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.<sup>18</sup> 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 sikra<sup>19</sup> and loads it with stones. Now, as for loading it with stones, that is in order to lessen its strength.<sup>20</sup> But when he paints it with sikra, what remedy does he effect?<sup>21</sup> — 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':<sup>22</sup> 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 practices<sup>23</sup> 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 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 Shabbath, which deals with these.

## **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 67b**

He who says, 'Be lucky, my luck [gad gedi] and tire not by day or night,'<sup>1</sup> 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.<sup>2</sup> If husband and wife exchange their names,<sup>3</sup> 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.<sup>4</sup> 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,'<sup>5</sup> 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,'<sup>6</sup> 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,<sup>7</sup> or imposes silence for lentils, or cries for beans,<sup>8</sup> 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.<sup>9</sup> 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,<sup>10</sup> and mud and clay may be placed under a lamp in order that it should burn slowly.<sup>11</sup>

R. Zutra said: He who covers an oil lamp or uncovers a naphtha [lamp] infringes the prohibition of wasteful destruction.<sup>12</sup> 'Wine and health to the mouth of our teachers!'<sup>13</sup> 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!'

## CHAPTER VII

MISHNAH. A GREAT PRINCIPLE WAS STATED IN RESPECT TO THE SABBATH: HE WHO FORGETS THE FUNDAMENTAL LAW OF THE SABBATH<sup>14</sup> 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,<sup>15</sup> 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.

### Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 68a

PRIMARY LABOUR.<sup>1</sup> HE WHO PERFORMS MANY LABOURS BELONGING TO THE SAME CATEGORY OF WORK<sup>2</sup> 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',<sup>3</sup> he [therefore] states here, A GREAT PRINCIPLE?<sup>4</sup> And in respect to shebi'ith<sup>5</sup> too, because he wishes to teach another principle, he states, This is a great principle?<sup>6</sup> But what of tithes, though 'another principle' is taught, he nevertheless does not teach [elsewhere] 'a great principle'?<sup>7</sup> — Said R. Jose b. Abin: As for the Sabbath and shebi'ith, since they possess both primaries and derivatives,<sup>8</sup> 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,<sup>9</sup> what primaries and what derivatives are there? But surely

this must be the reason:<sup>10</sup> 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].<sup>11</sup> 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.<sup>12</sup> 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:<sup>13</sup> for whereas [the law of] tithes operates in figs and vegetables [too], pe’ah does not operate in figs and vegetables.<sup>14</sup> 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,<sup>15</sup> and is collected for storage,<sup>16</sup> is liable to pe’ah. ‘Foodstuff’ excludes the aftergrowth of woad<sup>17</sup> and madder;<sup>18</sup> ‘is guarded’ excludes hefker;<sup>19</sup> ‘grows from the earth’ excludes mushrooms and truffles;<sup>20</sup> ‘is [all] gathered simultaneously’ excludes the fig-tree;<sup>21</sup> ‘and is taken in to be stored’ excludes vegetables.<sup>22</sup> 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.

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.<sup>23</sup> But if one knew and subsequently forgot, he is liable [to a sin-offering] for every Sabbath.<sup>24</sup> 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 unknown<sup>25</sup> 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 labours are forbidden, each labour is a separate fact, and he is liable for each separately. — For primary (Heb. *ab*, lit., ‘father’) labours v. p. 3, n. 2.

(2) I.e., all derivatives (toledoth) of the same primary labour (*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 labour forbidden during the seventh year is likewise divided into primaries and derivatives: sowing, harvesting, reaping and fruit gathering, are primaries, other forms of labour 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) Gr. \*\*, 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'.

### **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 68b**

What if he did not forget it?<sup>1</sup> He is liable for each labour? 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 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 labours 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 labours 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,<sup>2</sup> and one on account of idolatry.<sup>3</sup> But Monabaz exempts him. And thus did Monabaz argue before R. Akiba: Since a wilful transgressor is designated a sinner, and an unwitting transgressor [too] is designated a sinner;<sup>4</sup> then just as wilful transgression implied that he had knowledge,<sup>5</sup> so when unwittingly transgressing he must have had the knowledge.<sup>6</sup> Said R. Akiba to him, Behold, I will add to your words. If so, just as wilful 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.<sup>7</sup> Even so, he replied, and all the more so since you have added [this argument]. As you define it,<sup>8</sup> such is not designated unwitting, but wilful transgression, he retorted. Now after all it is stated, 'E.g., if a child' [etc.]: as for Rab and Samuel, it is well.<sup>9</sup> 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?<sup>10</sup> Because it is written, Ye shall have one law for him that doeth unwittingly;<sup>11</sup> and in proximity thereto [it is written], And the soul that doeth aught with a high hand:<sup>12</sup> hence unwitting is assimilated to wilful transgression:<sup>13</sup> just as wilful transgression involves that he shall have had knowledge, so unwitting transgression implies that he shall have had knowledge.<sup>14</sup> 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 wilful transgressor v. Lev. V, 1: And if any one sin, etc. That refers to wilful 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 wilful 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.

## **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 69a**

and when ye shall err, and not observe all these commandments;<sup>1</sup> 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 something for the wilful transgression of which kareth<sup>2</sup> is incurred, and for the unwitting transgression a sin-offering is incurred,<sup>3</sup> so for everything the wilful transgression of which involves kareth, its unwitting transgression involves a sin-offering.<sup>4</sup> But according to Monabaz, wherein lies his non-wilfulness?<sup>5</sup> E.g., if he was ignorant in respect of the sacrifice.<sup>6</sup> 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 wilfully sins in respect of the negative command;<sup>7</sup> 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:<sup>8</sup> hence he must err both as to the negative injunction and its attendant kareth.<sup>9</sup> 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.<sup>10</sup> R. Simeon b. Eleazar said on the authority of R. Simeon:<sup>11</sup> [. . . sin unwittingly in doing any of the things which the Lord hath commanded] not to be done, and be guilty: he who would refrain<sup>12</sup> 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.<sup>13</sup>

We learnt: The primary forms of labour are forty less one.<sup>14</sup> Now we pondered thereon, Why state the number?<sup>15</sup> And R. Johanan replied: [To teach] that if one performs all of them in a single state of unawareness,<sup>16</sup> 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.<sup>17</sup> 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

labour 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?<sup>18</sup> — He knew of [the law of] boundaries,<sup>19</sup> this being in accordance with R. Akiba.<sup>20</sup>

Who is the authority for the following which was taught by the Rabbis: If one is unaware of both,<sup>21</sup> he is the erring sinner mentioned in the Torah;<sup>22</sup> if one wilfully 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 labours or the reverse, or if he declares, 'I knew that this labour is forbidden, but not whether it entails a sacrifice or not, he is culpable? With whom does this agree? With Monabaz.<sup>23</sup>

Abaye said: All agree in respect to an 'oath of utterance'<sup>24</sup> that a sacrifice is not incurred on account thereof unless one is unaware of its interdict.<sup>25</sup> 'All agree': who is that? R. Johanan?<sup>26</sup> 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,<sup>27</sup> for we do not find in the whole Torah that for a [mere] negative injunction<sup>28</sup> 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.<sup>29</sup>

---

(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 wilful 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.

(6) He knew that the wilful 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 ( מ ), 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 labours 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 labours.

(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 labour 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 wilful 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.

## Talmud - Mas. 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?<sup>1</sup> Where one says, 'I know that this oath is forbidden,<sup>2</sup> but I do not know whether it entails a sacrifice or not,' he is culpable?<sup>3</sup> — 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!<sup>4</sup> Hence it must surely be the Rabbis, and this refutation of Abaye is indeed a refutation.)<sup>5</sup> 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.<sup>6</sup> '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,<sup>7</sup> 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.<sup>8</sup>

R. Huna said: If one is travelling on a road or<sup>9</sup> in the wilderness and does not know when it is the Sabbath, he must count six days and observe one.<sup>10</sup> Hiyya b. Rab said: He must observe one<sup>11</sup> and count six [weekdays]. Wherein do they differ? One Master holds that it is as the world's Creation,<sup>12</sup> the other Master holds that it is like [the case of] Adam.<sup>13</sup>

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],<sup>14</sup> 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*.<sup>15</sup>

Raba said: If he recognizes the relationship to the day of his departure,<sup>16</sup> he may do work the whole of that day.<sup>17</sup> 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;<sup>18</sup> 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;<sup>19</sup> and it is written, and ye shall keep my Sabbaths.<sup>20</sup> How is this to be explained?<sup>21</sup> ‘Wherefore the children of Israel shall keep the Sabbath’ [implies] one observance for many Sabbaths;<sup>22</sup> [whereas] ‘and ye shall keep my Sabbaths’ [implies] one observance for each separate Sabbath.<sup>23</sup> 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.<sup>24</sup>

#### **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.
  - (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.

## Talmud - Mas. 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 labours [are forbidden]; and does one refrain from labours for aught save because of the Sabbath?<sup>1</sup> 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.<sup>2</sup>

HE IS LIABLE FOR EVERY SEPARATE LABOUR. Whence do we know the division of labors?<sup>3</sup> — Said Samuel: Scripture saith, every one that profaneth it shall surely be put to death:<sup>4</sup> the Torah decreed many deaths for one desecration. But this refers to wilful [desecration]? — Seeing that it is irrelevant in connection with wilful transgression, for it is written, whosoever doeth any work therein shall be put to death,<sup>5</sup> apply it to an unwitting offender;<sup>6</sup> then what is meant by, shall be put to death? He shall be amerced<sup>7</sup> in money.<sup>8</sup>

But let the division of labours 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:<sup>9</sup> why is this stated?<sup>10</sup> 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:<sup>11</sup> ‘words’ [debarim], ‘the words’ [ha-debarim], ‘these [eleh] are the words’: this indicates the thirty-nine labours taught to Moses at Sinai.<sup>12</sup> I might think that if one performs all of them in a single state of unawareness,<sup>13</sup> he incurs only one [sin-offering]: therefore it is stated, from ploughing and from harvesting thou shalt rest.<sup>14</sup> Yet I might still argue, For ploughing 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 labour and it entails a separate liability,<sup>15</sup> so for every principal labour a separate liability is incurred.<sup>16</sup> — Samuel holds as R. Jose, who maintained: Kindling is singled out to teach that it is [merely the object of] a negative precept.<sup>17</sup> 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.<sup>18</sup>

Now, let division of labours 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 things which ought not to be done,] and shall do of one of them:<sup>19</sup> 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?<sup>20</sup> [Of one of them teaches that liability is incurred for] one [complete act]; [for one which is but part] of one; for performing labours forbidden in themselves [i.e. ‘them’], and [for labours 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’],<sup>21</sup> [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 labours 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 labour, 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 labour.

(11) Ibid. 1f.

(12) 'Words' implies at least two; 'the' (Heb. הַ ) is regarded as an extension, whereby two is extended to three; 'these' (Heb. אֵלֶּם ) is given its numerical value, which is thirty-six, thus totalling 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 labours are forbidden, but remaining in ignorance from the first labour 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 labours, wilfully 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. מִאֶחָד מֵהֵנָּה 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 labours); and for the derivatives 'of them' (toledoth — labours forbidden because they partake of the same nature as the fundamentally prohibited labours). Also, each pronoun reacts upon the other, as explained in the text.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 70b

[the writing of] Shem as part of Simeon.<sup>1</sup> Labours forbidden in themselves' [i.e., 'them']-the primary labours,' [labours 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.<sup>2</sup> 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.<sup>3</sup> — 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.<sup>4</sup>

Raba asked R. Nahman: What if one forgot both?<sup>5</sup> — Said he, Surely he is unaware of the Sabbath; hence he incurs only one [sacrifice].<sup>6</sup> On the contrary, he has forgotten the labours; hence he is liable for each?<sup>7</sup> But said R. Ashi: We see: if he would desist [from these labours] on account of the Sabbath,<sup>8</sup> his unawareness is of the Sabbath, and he incurs only one sacrifice. While if he would desist on account of the labours,<sup>9</sup> his unawareness is [chiefly] of the labours, 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] labours; and would he desist on account of [the forbidden nature of his] labours save because of the Sabbath?<sup>10</sup> Hence there is no difference.<sup>11</sup>

We learnt: The primary labours 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.<sup>12</sup> But if you maintain that this is [mainly] an unawareness of the Sabbath [and] entails only one sacrifice, then how is this possible?<sup>13</sup> [Presumably] by awareness of the Sabbath and ignorance of the [forbidden] labours. Now, that is well if he<sup>14</sup> 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:<sup>15</sup> 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?<sup>16</sup> — He knew of boundaries, this being in accordance with R. Akiba.<sup>17</sup>

Raba said: If one reaped and ground [corn] of the size of a dried fig<sup>18</sup> in unawareness of the Sabbath but awareness in respect of the labours,<sup>19</sup> 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,<sup>20</sup> and then he was apprised of the reaping and/or grinding [performed] in unawareness of the Sabbath but awareness of the labours,<sup>21</sup> then he was apprised of the reaping and/or grinding [performed] in awareness of the Sabbath but unawareness in respect of the labours:

- 
- (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, שִׁמְעוֹן SHimeon in Hebrew, but writes only the first two letters thereof, viz., SHeM שֵׁמ, he is also liable, though his intention is only partly fulfilled, because SHeM is a complete word in itself. This is called one labour 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 labours.
- (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 labours 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 labours 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 labour.
- (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 labour: v. n. 1.
- (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 labours. In this case he is separately culpable on account of each. In the interval between his first labours and his second he did not learn of his offence.

(21) Whereupon he set aside one sacrifice on account of both labours — this being before he learnt of his second series of offences.

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

Now, does then Raba hold the theory of involvement?<sup>5</sup> But it was stated: If one eats two olive-sized pieces of heleb<sup>6</sup> in one state of unawareness,<sup>7</sup> 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,<sup>8</sup> 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.<sup>9</sup> 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?<sup>10</sup> — He accepts the theory of [direct], but not that of indirect involvement.<sup>11</sup> The matter that is clear to Abaye and Raba<sup>12</sup> was a problem to R. Zera: For R. Zera asked R. Assi — others state, R. Jeremiah asked R. Zera: What if one reaped or<sup>13</sup> ground [corn] of the quantity of half a dried fig in unawareness of the Sabbath but awareness in respect of the labours, 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 labours; can they be combined?<sup>14</sup> — Said he to him: They are distinct in respect of sin-offerings,<sup>15</sup> therefore they do not combine.<sup>16</sup>

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 piggul<sup>17</sup> 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],<sup>18</sup> 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?<sup>19</sup> And Resh Lakish said on the authority of Bar Tutani: The reference here is to one e.g., who ate [them] from two tureens,<sup>20</sup> this being according to R. Joshua, who ruled: Tureens divide.<sup>21</sup> 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.<sup>22</sup> 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.<sup>23</sup> 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: 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 labours 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.

## Talmud - Mas. 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?<sup>1</sup> — Said R. Huna: The circumstances here dealt with are e.g., that he was aware in between,<sup>2</sup> this agreeing with Rabban<sup>3</sup> Gamaliel, who maintained: Knowledge of half the standard quantity is of no consequence.<sup>4</sup>

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].<sup>5</sup> While Resh Lakish rules, He is not liable [for the second], [interpreting,] of his sin . . . and he shall be forgiven.<sup>6</sup> But according to Resh Lakish too, surely it is written, 'for his sin . . . he shall bring?' — That holds good after atonement.<sup>7</sup> 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],<sup>8</sup> was apprised concerning the size of an olive,<sup>9</sup> and then ate again as much as half an olive in the unawareness of the second [half].<sup>10</sup> Now you might say, let these combine; therefore it<sup>11</sup> informs us [otherwise].<sup>12</sup>

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,<sup>13</sup> whilst the other Master holds, [Only] separations [of sacrifices] divide;<sup>14</sup> 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;<sup>15</sup> 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’.<sup>16</sup> 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.<sup>17</sup> [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:<sup>18</sup>

- 
- (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. **וּמִן**) 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.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 72a

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

When R. Dimi came<sup>6</sup> 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,<sup>7</sup> yet R. Johanan and Resh Lakish differ [therein]?<sup>8</sup> He remained silent. Said he to him, Perhaps you refer to an act after separation [of the sacrifice], and as R. Hammuna?<sup>9</sup> Even so, he replied.

When Rabin came,<sup>6</sup> he said: All agree about a betrothed bondmaid [in one respect], and all agree about a betrothed bondmaid [in another respect], and there is disagreement about a betrothed bondmaid [in a third respect].<sup>10</sup> [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. Hammuna. 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.<sup>11</sup> 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.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 72b

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

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 [labours] 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 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 [labours] 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,<sup>6</sup> 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].<sup>7</sup> 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 wilful sinner; while if he did not accept it as a god, he has not committed idolatry at all!<sup>8</sup> Hence it must mean [that he worshipped it idolatrously] through love or fear:<sup>9</sup> now this agrees with Abaye's view that a penalty is incurred,<sup>10</sup> 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.<sup>11</sup> 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,<sup>12</sup> 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 labours it is tantamount to ignorance of the Sabbath altogether, and is thus analogous to the belief that idolatry is permitted.

## **Talmud - Mas. 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.<sup>1</sup> [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 attached [instead], he is not culpable.<sup>2</sup> But Abaye [maintains:] how is an unwitting and unintentional offence meant? When one thinks that it [heleb] is spittle and swallows it.<sup>3</sup> [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,<sup>4</sup> Raba said: He is not culpable; Abaye ruled: He is culpable.<sup>5</sup> 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.<sup>6</sup> 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,<sup>7</sup> 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.<sup>8</sup> 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] labors. 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]:<sup>9</sup> then it is possible where he knew [that his labors 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?<sup>10</sup> — He knew it by the law of boundaries, this being in accordance with R. Akiba.<sup>11</sup>

MISHNAH. THE PRIMARY LABOURS ARE FORTY LESS ONE, [VIZ.:] SOWING,<sup>12</sup> PLOUGHING, REAPING, BINDING SHEAVES, THRESHING, WINNOWING, SELECTING,<sup>13</sup> GRINDING, SIFTING, KNEADING, BAKING, SHEARING WOOL, BLEACHING, HACKLING, DYEING, SPINNING, STRETCHING THE THREADS,<sup>14</sup> THE MAKING OF TWO MESHES, WEAVING TWO THREADS, DIVIDING TWO THREADS,<sup>15</sup> TYING [KNOTTING] AND UNTYING, SEWING TWO STITCHES, TEARING IN ORDER TO SEW TWO STITCHES,<sup>16</sup> CAPTURING A DEER, SLAUGHTERING, OR FLAYING, OR SALTING IT,<sup>17</sup> 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,<sup>18</sup> [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 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 fulfil 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 labour.

(17) Sc. its skin.

(18) I.e., giving the finishing blow with the hammer.

## **Talmud - Mas. 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 PLOUGHING. Let us see: ploughing is done first, then let him [the Tanna] state PLOUGHING first and then SOWING? — The Tanna treats of<sup>1</sup> Palestine, where they first sow and then plough.<sup>2</sup>

A Tanna taught: Sowing, pruning, planting, bending,<sup>3</sup> and grafting are all one labour. What does this inform us? — This: that if one performs many labours of the same nature, he is liable only to one [sacrifice]. R. Abba<sup>4</sup> 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?<sup>5</sup> — Say: on account of planting too.<sup>6</sup>

R. Kahana said: If one prunes and needs the wood [too], he is liable to two [penalties],<sup>7</sup> one on account of reaping<sup>8</sup> and one on account of planting.<sup>9</sup> R. Joseph said: He who cuts hay is liable to two [penalties], one on account of reaping and the other on account of planting.<sup>10</sup> Abaye said: He who trims beets [in the ground] is liable to two [penalties], one on account of reaping<sup>11</sup> and one on account of planting.<sup>12</sup>

PLOUGHING. A Tanna taught: Ploughing, digging, and trenching are all one [form of] work.<sup>13</sup> R. Shesheth said: If one has a mound [of earth] and removes it, in the house, he is liable on the score of building;<sup>14</sup> if in the field, he is liable on the score of ploughing. 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 ploughing.<sup>15</sup>

R. Abba said: If one digs a pit on the Sabbath, needing only the earth thereof,<sup>16</sup> he is not culpable

on its account. And even according to R. Judah, who ruled: One is liable on account of a labour which is not required on its own account:<sup>17</sup> that is only when he effects an improvement, but this man causes damage.<sup>18</sup>

**REAPING:** A Tanna taught: Reaping, vintaging, gathering [dates], collecting [olives], and gathering [figs] are all one [form of] labour. 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 detaching<sup>19</sup> and one on account of stripping.<sup>20</sup> R. Ashi said: This is not the mode of detaching, nor is it the mode of stripping.<sup>21</sup>

**BINDING SHEAVES.** Raba<sup>22</sup> said: He who collects salt out of a salina<sup>23</sup> is liable on the score of binding sheaves.<sup>24</sup> Abaye said: Binding sheaves applies only to products of the soil.

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

**WINNOWER, SELECTING, GRINDING AND SIFTING.** But winnowing, selecting, and sifting are identical?<sup>25</sup> — 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.

## **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 74a**

even if there are [labours] similar thereto, is counted [separately].<sup>1</sup> Then let him also enumerate

pounding [wheat]?<sup>2</sup> — Said Abaye: Because a poor man eats his bread without pounding.<sup>3</sup> Raba said: This agrees with Rabbi, who said: The primary labours are forty less one; but if pounding were enumerated, there would be forty.<sup>4</sup> 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?<sup>5</sup> 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;<sup>6</sup> 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?<sup>7</sup> 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.<sup>8</sup> He may not select with a sieve or a basket-sieve, and if he does he incurs a sin-offering.<sup>9</sup> 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, and if he does, he incurs a sin-offering.<sup>10</sup> 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;<sup>11</sup> 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.<sup>12</sup> The Rabbis reported this to Raba. Said he to them, Nahmani<sup>13</sup> has said well.

If two kinds of food lie before a person, and he selects and eats or selects and puts aside,<sup>14</sup> — R. Ashi learnt: He is not culpable: R. Jeremiah of Difti<sup>15</sup> learnt: He is culpable, ‘R. Ashi learnt: He is not culpable’! but it was taught:<sup>16</sup> ‘He is culpable’? — There is no difficulty: the one treats of a reed-basket and a plate;<sup>17</sup> the other refers to a sieve and a basket-sieve.

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

Hezekiah said: One who picks lupines [after boiling] out of their husks<sup>22</sup> 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 labours is learnt from the Tabernacle (v. 49b). All these labours 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 labour forbidden on the Sabbath.

(4) Rabbi deduces even the number of labours 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 labour 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 labour, 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) **סָטַף** 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'.

### Talmud - Mas. 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.<sup>1</sup>

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.<sup>2</sup>

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

R. Aha son of R. Awira said: He who throws a tent peg into a stove<sup>6</sup> is liable on account of cooking. But that is obvious? — You might say, His intention is to strengthen [harden] the article,<sup>7</sup> therefore we are informed that it [first] softens and then hardens.<sup>8</sup>

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

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.<sup>13</sup> R. Kahana said: Neither shearing, hackling, nor spinning is [done] in this manner.<sup>14</sup> 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:<sup>15</sup> which proves that spinning direct from the animal is designated spinning? — Superior skill is different.<sup>16</sup>

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?<sup>17</sup> — Said Raba: The tent-pegs were tied. But that was tying with the intention of [subsequent] untying?<sup>18</sup> 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?<sup>19</sup> [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?<sup>20</sup> Rather said Raba — others state, R. Elai: Those who caught the hillazon<sup>21</sup> tied and untied.<sup>22</sup>

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

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. **האיפה**.

(4) Which has nothing to do with the Tabernacle (Rashi).

(5) I.e., he takes bread as an example and enumerates the various principal labours 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 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 labour to complete it.

(11) It entails this number of labours: (i and ii) cutting the reeds is a two-fold labour: (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 labours.

(14) Hence he is not liable at all, for one is liable only when he performs a labour 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.

## Talmud - Mas. 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 seam<sup>1</sup> on the Sabbath is liable to a sin-offering; and he who learns a single thing from a Magian<sup>2</sup> is worthy of death;<sup>3</sup> and he who is able to calculate the cycles<sup>4</sup> and planetary courses but does not, one may hold no conversation with him.<sup>5</sup>

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],<sup>6</sup> [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.<sup>7</sup> 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:<sup>8</sup> what wisdom and understanding is in the sight of the peoples?<sup>9</sup> Say, that it is the science of cycles and planets.

CAPTURING A DEER, etc. Our Rabbis taught: He who captures a purple-fish<sup>10</sup> and crushes it is liable to one [sin-offering];<sup>11</sup> 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 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.<sup>12</sup> Raba said: You may even explain that he crushed it whilst alive: in respect to the taking of life he is but incidentally occupied.<sup>13</sup> But Abaye and Raba both maintain: R. Simeon admits in a case of 'cut off his head but let him not die!'<sup>14</sup> Here it is different, because he is more pleased that it should be alive, so that the dye should be clearer.<sup>15</sup>

AND SLAUGHTERING IT. As for him who slaughters, on what score is he culpable? — Rab said: On the score of dyeing;<sup>16</sup> 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 priestcraft 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 labour 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 labour. 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.

## **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 75b**

On the score of dyeing but not on the score of taking life!<sup>1</sup> 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 it<sup>2</sup> and come and buy from him.

SALTING AND CURING IT. But salting and tanning are identical?<sup>3</sup> — R. Johanan and Resh Lakish both said: Omit one of these and insert the tracing of lines.<sup>4</sup> 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;<sup>5</sup> 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 columns<sup>6</sup> 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 beams<sup>7</sup> on the Sabbath is culpable on account of cutting.<sup>8</sup> 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 Sabbath<sup>9</sup> is liable on the score of striking with the hammer.<sup>10</sup> 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,<sup>11</sup> is liable on the score of striking with a hammer. Rab Judah said: He who removes threads<sup>12</sup> from garments on the Sabbath is liable on the score of striking with the hammer;<sup>13</sup> but that is only when he objects to them.<sup>14</sup> 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, 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.<sup>15</sup>

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

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.<sup>17</sup> 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 AWAY<sup>18</sup> AND SUCH IS [GENERALLY] PUT AWAY,<sup>19</sup> 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.<sup>20</sup>

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.<sup>21</sup> 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,<sup>22</sup> 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.<sup>23</sup>

#### 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 labour.
  - (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.

#### Talmud - Mas. 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 a certain person<sup>1</sup> 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 [‘EZAH], 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].<sup>2</sup> AND THEY DO NOT COMBINE WITH EACH OTHER,<sup>3</sup> BECAUSE THEY ARE NOT ALIKE IN THEIR STANDARDS.

GEMARA. What is ‘EZAH? — Said Rab Judah: The stalks of certain kinds of peas. When R. Dimi came,<sup>4</sup> 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 sufficient<sup>5</sup> for a camel. Said Abaye to him: On the contrary, logic supports his original view, since it is sufficient for a cow.<sup>6</sup> But when Rabin came,<sup>7</sup> 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,<sup>8</sup> 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].<sup>9</sup> Yet can anything combine when their standards are not alike?<sup>10</sup> But surely we learnt: A garment<sup>11</sup> three [handbreadths] square, a sack<sup>12</sup> four square, a hide five square, and [reed] matting six square [are susceptible to uncleanness as midras].<sup>13</sup> Now it was taught thereon: A garment, sacking, a hide, and matting combine with each other.<sup>14</sup> And R. Simeon observed: What is the reason? Because they are liable to the uncleanness of sitting.<sup>15</sup> Thus the reason is that they are liable to the uncleanness of sitting;<sup>16</sup> 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.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 76b

Here too they are fit for patterns.<sup>1</sup>

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, HUSKS<sup>2</sup> AND COARSE BRAN.<sup>3</sup> R. JUDAH SAID: EXCLUDING THE SHELLS OF LENTILS, BECAUSE THEY ARE BOILED TOGETHER WITH THEM.<sup>4</sup>

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,<sup>5</sup> [including] that itself [sc. the flour], the husks and the bran?<sup>6</sup> — Said Abaye: That is because a poor man eats his bread [baked] of unsifted dough.<sup>7</sup>

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],<sup>8</sup> the other to old. Why not old ones? Said R. Abbahti: Because they look like flies in the dish.<sup>9</sup>

## CHAPTER VIII

MISHNAH. HE WHO CARRIES OUT [RAW] WINE, [THE STANDARD IS THAT IT BE] ENOUGH FOR THE MIXING OF A CUP;<sup>10</sup> MILK, AS MUCH AS IS QUAFFED AT A TIME; HONEY, SUFFICIENT TO PLACE ON A SCAB;<sup>11</sup> OIL, AS MUCH AS IS REQUIRED TO RUB IN A SMALL LIMB; WATER, ENOUGH FOR RUBBING COLLYRIUM;<sup>12</sup> AND ALL OTHER LIQUIDS, [THE STANDARD IS] A REBI'ITH;<sup>13</sup> AND ALL WASTE WATER,<sup>14</sup> 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.<sup>15</sup>

GEMARA. A Tanna taught: Enough for the mixing of a full-measured<sup>16</sup> cup. And what is a full-measured cup? The cup of benediction.<sup>17</sup> 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. **ס** 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.

## Talmud - Mas. 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.<sup>1</sup> Now Raba is consistent with his view [expressed elsewhere]. For Raba said: 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.<sup>2</sup> Secondly, the water is in the jug and it is to combine!<sup>3</sup> 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,<sup>4</sup> 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.<sup>5</sup>

A Tanna taught: As for congealed<sup>6</sup> [wine], the standard is the size of an olive:<sup>7</sup> 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.<sup>8</sup> The blood of a nebelah,<sup>9</sup> Beth Shammai declare it clean;<sup>10</sup> 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.<sup>11</sup> 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?<sup>12</sup> R. Nahman b. Isaac cited, Give me to drink [hagmi'ini], I pray thee, a little water of thy pitcher.<sup>13</sup> 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 colours of blood which are unclean. If it is of the colour of a two to one mixture, it is unclean; but a three to one mixture is paler, and blood of that colour 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.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 77b

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

Our Rabbis taught: When one carries out cow's milk, [the standard is] as much as one 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.<sup>7</sup> R. Ashi asked: [Does that mean] as much as is required for dissolving. or as much as is required for holding and dissolving?<sup>8</sup> 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,<sup>9</sup> or perhaps [it means] on the top of the scab,<sup>10</sup> thus excluding [sufficient for] going all round the sore, which is not required?<sup>11</sup> 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];<sup>12</sup> 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':<sup>13</sup> 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'<sup>14</sup> over the lion; the fear of the mosquito upon the elephant;<sup>15</sup> the fear of the spider upon the scorpion;<sup>16</sup> the fear of the swallow upon the eagle;<sup>17</sup> the fear of the kilbith<sup>18</sup> over the Leviathan.<sup>19</sup> Rab Judah said in Rab's name: What verse [alludes to these]? That strengtheneth the despoiled [i.e., weak] over the strong.<sup>20</sup>

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.<sup>21</sup> Why are the latter covered, while the former are uncovered?<sup>22</sup> — 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.<sup>23</sup> 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?<sup>24</sup> — Because it dwells among the rafters, and if dust entered [its eyes] it would go blind.<sup>25</sup>

[The word] Dashsha [entrance] [implies] Derek SHam [there is the way];<sup>26</sup> Darga [stairs, ladder]; Derek Gag [a way to the roof]; mathkulithat [a relish]; mathay thikleh da [when will this end]?<sup>27</sup> Betha [a house] [implies] Bo we-ethib [come and sit therein]; Biketha [a small house]: Be aketha [a confined narrow house].<sup>28</sup> Kuftha [an inverted vessel, a low seat]: Kof we-THab [invert it and sit down]; libne [bricks]: libene bene [unto children's children];<sup>29</sup> huza [prickly shrubbery, hedge]: haziza [barrier]. Hazba [pitcher] [is so called] because hozeb [it draws]<sup>30</sup> water from the river; kuzah [small jug]: kazeh [like this];<sup>31</sup> shotitha [myrtle branch]: shetutha [folly];<sup>32</sup> meshikla [wash basin]: mashe kulah [washing everybody]; mashkiltha: [wash-basin]<sup>33</sup> mashya kalatha [washing brides];<sup>34</sup>

asitha [mortar]: hasirtha [missing],<sup>35</sup> bukana [a club used as a pestle]: bo we-akkenah [‘come, and I will strike it’]; lebrushah [upper garment]: lo bushah [no shame]. Gelima [a cloak] [is so called] because one looks in it like a shapeless mass [golem].<sup>36</sup> Golitha [a long woollen 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]<sup>37</sup> Bor Zeh naki [this well is empty],<sup>38</sup> sudra [turban]: sod adonai lire'aw [the secret of the Lord is revealed to those that fear him],<sup>39</sup> Apadna [palace] Apithha Din [at the door is judgment].<sup>40</sup>

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 limb<sup>41</sup> 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.<sup>42</sup>

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 coloured, 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. **בְּקֵתָא** q.v. 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'.

## Talmud - Mas. 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.<sup>1</sup> 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.<sup>2</sup>

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.<sup>3</sup> In the case of milk, the drinking<sup>4</sup> thereof is common, whilst its employment as a remedy<sup>5</sup> 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.<sup>6</sup> 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.<sup>7</sup> Raba said: You may even say that this refers to other places, thus agreeing with Samuel. For Samuel said: All liquids<sup>8</sup> heal [eye sickness] but dim [the eyesight], save water, which heals without dimming.<sup>9</sup>

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.<sup>10</sup> And your token is: within for within, without for without.<sup>11</sup> Now this applies only to him who carries it out; but if one puts it away, no matter how little, he is liable.<sup>12</sup> 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?<sup>13</sup> 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,<sup>14</sup> he is guilty on its account; if not, he is not guilty.<sup>15</sup>

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?<sup>16</sup> 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?<sup>17</sup> 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 THE MEASURE OF A CHILD'S SHOE. PAPER, LARGE ENOUGH TO WRITE A TAX-COLLECTOR'S RECEIPT ON IT.<sup>18</sup> (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.

## **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 78b**

ERASED PAPER,<sup>1</sup> 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,':<sup>2</sup>

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

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 basketsieve? — Since it chafes the utensil, people do not make it [thus].<sup>13</sup>

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:<sup>14</sup> 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.<sup>15</sup> 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?<sup>16</sup> — 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.

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.<sup>17</sup> 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?<sup>18</sup> 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;<sup>19</sup> after having shewn it to the collector, he is not culpable.<sup>20</sup> 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.<sup>21</sup> Raba said: They differ in respect to the higher and the lesser collectors.<sup>22</sup> 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.'<sup>23</sup>

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;<sup>24</sup> while R. Judah holds: One may keep a settled note.<sup>25</sup> 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.<sup>26</sup> 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.
- (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.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 79a

If the debtor pleads that it has been settled or not settled [respectively].<sup>1</sup> 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.<sup>2</sup> The first Tanna holds: We write a quittance;<sup>3</sup> while R. Judah holds: A quittance<sup>4</sup> 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,<sup>5</sup> 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.<sup>6</sup> And if one weaves two threads together, the standard is a full span.<sup>7</sup> This shows that since it stands to be spun,<sup>8</sup> 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.<sup>9</sup> [the standard is] as much as is required for dyeing a sample of wool.<sup>10</sup> Whereas of undissolved dyes we learnt: [In the case of] nutshells,<sup>11</sup> pomegranate shells, woad, and madder,<sup>12</sup> [the standard is] as much as is required for dyeing the small piece of cloth at the opening [top] of a network?<sup>13</sup> — 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?'<sup>14</sup> 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.<sup>15</sup>

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?<sup>16</sup> — 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. Mazzah<sup>17</sup> 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.<sup>18</sup> Hippa is a skin that is salted but not treated with flour and gall-nut. And what is its standard? Even as we 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.<sup>19</sup> 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?<sup>20</sup> — There it treats of a steaming hide.<sup>21</sup> But we learnt: A garment three [handbreadths] square is susceptible to midras,<sup>22</sup> sacking four square, a hide five square and reed matting six square<sup>23</sup> 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!<sup>24</sup> — That refers to a leather spread.<sup>25</sup> [

---

(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.

## **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 79b**

PARCHMENT, AS MUCH AS IS REQUIRED FOR WRITING THE SHORTEST PASSAGE, [etc.]. But the following contradicts this: Parchment [kelaf] and dukstos,<sup>1</sup> as much as is required for the writing of a mezuzah?<sup>2</sup> — What is meant by mezuzah? A parchment slip of the tefillin.<sup>3</sup> Are then tefillin designated mezuzah? Yes, and it was taught [likewise]: tefillin straps, when together with the tefillin, defile the hands;<sup>4</sup> when apart, they do not defile the hands. R. Simeon b. Judah said on the authority of R. Simeon,<sup>5</sup> 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.<sup>6</sup> 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 dukstos, what are their standards? Dukstos, as much as is required for writing a mezuzah;<sup>7</sup> parchment, for writing the shortest passage of the tefillin, which is 'Hear O Israel'.

Rab said: Dukstos is as parchment: just as tefillin may be written upon parchment, so may they be written upon dukstos. We learnt: PARCHMENT, FOR WRITING THEREON THE SHORTEST PASSAGE OF THE TEFILLIN, WHICH IS HEAR O ISRAEL. [Thus, only parchment, but not dukstos?]<sup>8</sup> — That is for the [most preferable observance of the] precept.<sup>9</sup> Come and hear: It is a halachah of Moses from Sinai<sup>10</sup> that tefillin [should be written] upon parchment, and a mezuzah upon dukstos; parchment is [the skin] on the side<sup>11</sup> of the flesh, and dukstos is [that] on the side of the hair?<sup>12</sup> — 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 dukstos facing the flesh.<sup>13</sup> 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 paper<sup>14</sup> or on a cloth strip, it is unfit; on parchment, gewil,<sup>15</sup> or dukstos, 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?<sup>16</sup> But that was taught of a Torah Scroll.<sup>17</sup>

Shall we say that the following supports him: When tefillin or a Torah Scroll wear out, a mezuzah may not be made of them,<sup>18</sup> because we may not debase [anything] from a higher<sup>19</sup> 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 dukstos?<sup>20</sup> — 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 it<sup>21</sup> upon kelaf, because it keeps [better]. Now that you have arrived at this [conclusion],<sup>22</sup> according to Rab too, do not say. Dukstos is as kelaf but say, kelaf is as dukstos: just as a mezuzah may be written upon dukstos, 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 dukstos, the same standard would apply to that too.
- (9) Kelaf being superior, phylacteries are normally written thereon, and not upon dukstos, though it is permissible. Hence one would not keep dukstos 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 dukstos. Tosaf. s.v. קֶלַף reverses the reading.
- (13) I.e., the parchment and the dukstos were manufactured from the wrong portions of the hide.
- (14) פַּיִר, 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.
- (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.

#### Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 80a

It was taught: Two letters in ink, two letters on a pen, or two letters in an inkstand [involve culpability].<sup>1</sup> 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?<sup>2</sup> 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.<sup>3</sup> 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,<sup>4</sup> he is not culpable. What is the reason? By the time he carries out the second, the standard of the first is defective.<sup>5</sup>

Raba also said: If one carries out half a dried fig and deposits it,<sup>6</sup> and then carries out another half of a dried fig and deposits it,<sup>7</sup> 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,<sup>8</sup> 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,<sup>9</sup> he is liable. But why: surely it does not rest [in the street]? E.g., if he carries it within three [handbreadths].<sup>10</sup> But Raba said: [An article brought] within three [handbreadths] must, according to the Rabbis, be deposited upon something of small size [at least]?<sup>11</sup> — There is no difficulty. The latter reference is to throwing;<sup>12</sup> the former is to carrying.<sup>13</sup>

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,<sup>14</sup> he is not culpable. Rabbah said: Providing that there lies between them a domain involving liability to a sin-offering;<sup>15</sup> but a karmelith<sup>16</sup> does not [effect a separation].<sup>17</sup> Abaye said: Even a karmelith [separates them], but not a board.<sup>18</sup> 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.<sup>19</sup>

STIBIUM, FOR PAINTING ONE EYE: But one eye [alone] is not painted? — Said R. Huna: Because modest women paint [only] one eye.<sup>20</sup> 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;<sup>21</sup> 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.<sup>22</sup>

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.<sup>23</sup>

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

CLAY, FOR MAKING A HOLE IN A GOLD-REFINER'S POT, etc.<sup>25</sup> 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?<sup>26</sup> — Say, as much as is required for plastering [the splits in] the tripod leg of a small stove.<sup>27</sup>

---

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

## **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 80b**

Our Rabbis taught: If one carries out hair, [the standard is] as much as is required for the kneading of clay;<sup>1</sup> [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.<sup>2</sup> Rab Judah said in Rab's name: When maidens of Israel attain puberty before the proper age:<sup>3</sup> 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.<sup>4</sup> What is oil of myrrh? — R. Huna b. Hiyya said: Satkath.<sup>5</sup> 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.<sup>6</sup> 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.<sup>7</sup>

R. JUDAH SAID: ENOUGH TO PLASTER<sup>8</sup> A KILKUL.<sup>9</sup> 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!<sup>10</sup> 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 lime,

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

MISHNAH. [IF ONE CARRIES OUT] EARTH [A KIND OF CLAY], [THE STANDARD IS] AS MUCH AS IS REQUIRED FOR A SEAL ON PACKING BAGS;<sup>20</sup> THIS IS R. AKIBA'S VIEW. BUT THE SAGES SAY; AS MUCH AS IS REQUIRED FOR THE SEAL ON LETTERS.<sup>21</sup> [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,<sup>22</sup> [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.<sup>23</sup> R. Judah said: Straw is permitted, but sand is forbidden, because it becomes cement.<sup>24</sup> Raba said, You may say that it agrees even the Rabbis: The spoiling thereof makes it fit.<sup>25</sup>

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?]<sup>26</sup> He was silent. Have you then heard anything on this? he<sup>27</sup> 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 [he<sup>27</sup> 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). קטנה שבנות 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 Gr. \*\*)

(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 labour 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 favour of teetotalism!

(8) Sic. The reading in the Mishnah is, produce, make.

(9) Mishnah: KALKAL.

(10) V. Mishnah 78a.

(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 colour is nevertheless an improvement, for the sand strengthens it.

(26) Jast.: a small bird, supposed to be the humming bird.

(27) The son.

## **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 81a**

MISHNAH. [IF ONE CARRIES OUT] BONE, [THE STANDARD IS AS MUCH AS IS REQUIRED FOR MAKING A SPOON;<sup>1</sup> R. JUDAH MAINTAINED: FOR MAKING THEREOF<sup>2</sup> 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.<sup>3</sup>

GEMARA. Shall we say that R. Judah's standard is larger: but we know the standard of the Rabbis to be larger?<sup>4</sup> — Said 'Ulla: [It means] the wards of a lock.<sup>5</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: The wards of a lock are clean;<sup>6</sup> [but] when one fits them into the lock, they are [liable to become] unclean.<sup>7</sup> But if it [the lock] is of a revolving door,<sup>8</sup> 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.<sup>9</sup>

GLASS, LARGE ENOUGH FOR SCRAPING [etc.]. A Tanna taught: Glass,<sup>10</sup> 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.<sup>11</sup>

Zonin entered the Beth Hamidrash [and] said to them [the students]: My masters, what is the standard of the stones of a privy?<sup>12</sup> 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.<sup>13</sup> Shall one take [them] in a [gold] balance! he objected.<sup>14</sup> [Thereupon] they voted and decided: A handful.<sup>15</sup> 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 stones<sup>16</sup> into a privy. And what is their size? R. Meir said: As [large as] a nut; R. Judah maintained: As [large as] an egg. Rafram b. Papa observed in R. Hisda's name: Even as they differ here, so do they differ in respect to an ethrog.<sup>17</sup> But there it is a Mishnah, whereas here it is [only] a Baraita?<sup>18</sup> Rather [say:] Just as they differ in respect to an ethrog, so do they differ here.

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

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.<sup>21</sup>

R. Jannai said: If there is a fixed place for the privy,<sup>22</sup> [one may carry in] a handful [of stones];<sup>23</sup> if not, [only] the size of the leg of a small spice mortar [is permitted].<sup>24</sup> R. Shesheth said: If there is evidence upon it,<sup>25</sup> it is permitted.<sup>26</sup> 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 flesh<sup>27</sup> 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 neighbour has [already] used thus.<sup>28</sup> And some say, Suspending oneself in a privy too.<sup>29</sup> — There is no difficulty; the one refers to a damp [stone];<sup>30</sup> the other to a dry one. Alternatively, here the reference is to the same side [of the stone];<sup>31</sup> there, to the other side. Another alternative: the one refers to his own;<sup>32</sup> the other, to his neighbour'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.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 81b

Is it permissible to carry them up [the stones] after one to the roof?<sup>1</sup> Human dignity is very important, he replied, and it supersedes a negative injunction of the Torah.<sup>2</sup> 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;<sup>3</sup> but the Sages maintain: He may take only from an animal's trough?<sup>4</sup> How compare! There, one appoints a place for his meal;<sup>5</sup> but here, does one appoint a place for a privy?<sup>6</sup>

R. Huna said: One may not obey the call of nature on a ploughed field on the Sabbath. What is the reason? Shall we say, because of treading down?<sup>7</sup> Then the same holds good even on weekdays? Again, if it is on account of the grasses,<sup>8</sup> — 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 level<sup>9</sup> and throw it below,<sup>10</sup> 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 ploughing.

[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.<sup>11</sup> R. Kahana demurred: If they said [that it is permitted] in case of need,<sup>12</sup> shall they say [thus] where there is no need!<sup>13</sup>

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.<sup>14</sup>

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?<sup>15</sup> Then on weekdays too [let it be forbidden]? Again if it is on account of witchcraft:<sup>16</sup> 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;<sup>17</sup> but on the Sabbath, since it bears the rank of a utensil, [I might think that] it is permitted:<sup>18</sup> 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.<sup>19</sup> 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;<sup>20</sup> 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 ploughed soil, thus spoiling it, the reference being to a neighbour'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 **תשובת הגאונים**).
  - (12) Sc. for cleansing, which is necessary.
  - (13) Surely not!
  - (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.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 82a

seeing that you do not cleanse yourselves with a shard,<sup>1</sup> 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’?<sup>2</sup>

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!’<sup>3</sup> [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,’<sup>4</sup> 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;<sup>5</sup> but R. Hisda ruled: He must cleanse himself with the shard, and not with the pebble.<sup>6</sup> 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.<sup>7</sup>

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;<sup>8</sup> whilst the other ruled: He must cleanse himself with the grass, not with the pebble.<sup>9</sup> An objection is raised: If one cleanses himself with inflammable material,<sup>10</sup> his lower teeth<sup>11</sup> will be torn away? — There is no difficulty: the one refers to wet [grass];<sup>12</sup> 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;<sup>13</sup> the other said: He is infected by an offensive smell.<sup>14</sup> 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.<sup>15</sup>

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.<sup>16</sup> 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,<sup>17</sup> 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.<sup>18</sup> 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 REBI'ITH. R. MEIR OBSERVED: THOUGH THERE IS NO PROOF OF THE MATTER, YET THERE IS A HINT: SO THAT THERE SHALL NOT BE FOUND AMONG THE PIECES THEREOF A SHARD TO TAKE FIRE FROM THE HEARTH.<sup>19</sup> SAID R. JOSE TO HIM, THENCE IS PROOF [OF MY VIEW, VIZ.]: OR TO TAKE WATER WITHAL OUT OF THE CISTERN.<sup>20</sup>

GEMARA. (The Scholars asked: Is R. Meir's standard greater or R. Jose's standard greater?)<sup>21</sup> 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!<sup>22</sup> — Said Abaye: Our Mishnah too [means] to scrape out a fire from a large hearth.<sup>23</sup>

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?<sup>24</sup> BECAUSE IT IS SAID, THOU SHALT CAST THEM [SC. THE IDOLS] AWAY AS A MENSTRUOUS THING; THOU SHALT SAY UNTO IT, GET THEE

HENCE:<sup>25</sup> JUST AS A NIDDAH DEFILES BY CARRIAGE, SO DOES AN IDOL DEFILE BY CARRIAGE.<sup>26</sup>

GEMARA. We learnt elsewhere:<sup>27</sup> If one's house adjoins an idol,<sup>28</sup> and it collapses, he must not rebuild it.<sup>29</sup> 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.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 82b

If it belongs to him and to the idol, it is judged as half and half.<sup>1</sup> The stones, timber and earth thereof defile like a [dead] creeping thing [sherez], for it is said, Thou shalt treat a creeping thing.<sup>2</sup> 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.<sup>3</sup>

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:<sup>4</sup> 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?<sup>5</sup> -In respect of its service utensils.<sup>6</sup> 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?<sup>7</sup> That indeed is so, but [the analogy with niddah teaches:] just as a niddah is not [a source of contamination] through her [separate] limbs,<sup>8</sup> 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,<sup>9</sup> 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. אָמַר ).

(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.

## Talmud - Mas. 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 [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];<sup>1</sup> R. Akiba maintained: They and their hesset. Now, as for R. Eleazar, it is well;<sup>2</sup> 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.]:<sup>3</sup> 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 zabim in all respects.<sup>4</sup> 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].<sup>5</sup>

R. Ashi objected thereto: [If so,] what is [the meaning of] they themselves'?<sup>6</sup> -Rather said R. Ashi: This is the meaning: In the case of a heathen man or woman, whether they move others<sup>7</sup> or others move them,<sup>8</sup> [these others] are unclean.<sup>9</sup> If idol moves others, they are clean;<sup>10</sup> if others move it,<sup>11</sup> 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<sup>12</sup>,

---

(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.

(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 Baraita. 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.

## **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 83b**

if they out weigh [him], they are clean.<sup>1</sup>

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 analogy<sup>2</sup> 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.<sup>3</sup>

R. Hama b. Guria asked: Does the law of an idol operate in respect to its limbs or not?<sup>4</sup> 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;<sup>5</sup> or perhaps it is actually not defective?<sup>6</sup> 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?<sup>7</sup> — let it be no more than the fly [zebug] of Baal Ekron,<sup>8</sup> for it was taught: And they made Baal-berith their God:<sup>9</sup> this refers to the fly-god of Baal Ekron. It teaches that everyone made a likeness of his idol<sup>10</sup> and put it in his bag: whenever he thought of it he took it out of his bag and embraced and kissed it!<sup>11</sup> But [the question is] in respect of uncleanness: what [is the law]? since it is assimilated to sherez<sup>12</sup> then just as sherez [defiles] by the size of a lentil,<sup>13</sup> so an idol too [defiles] by the size of a lentil; or perhaps it is [also] likened to a corpse:<sup>10</sup> just as a corpse [defiles] by the size of an olive,<sup>14</sup> 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:<sup>15</sup> 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!<sup>16</sup> [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?<sup>17</sup> 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.<sup>18</sup>

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

**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 from a sack:<sup>21</sup> 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.<sup>22</sup> 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 sack<sup>23</sup> 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:<sup>24</sup> he who quotes, 'a ship in the midst of the sea', [holds that] this too is a ship in the midst of the sea;<sup>25</sup> 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:<sup>26</sup> even in the hour of death one should be engaged in [the study of] the Torah.<sup>27</sup> Resh Lakish said: The words of the Torah can endure only with him who sacrifices<sup>28</sup> himself for it, as it is said, This is the Torah, when a man dieth in a tent.<sup>29</sup>

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 82zb.
- (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, Dorothe, I, 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.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 84a

Now according to Hananiah, carrying by means of oxen is regarded as carrying.<sup>1</sup> For we learnt: There are three waggons: That which is built like a cathedra<sup>2</sup> is liable to uncleanness as midras;<sup>3</sup> that which is like a bed<sup>4</sup> is liable to uncleanness through the defilement caused by a corpse;<sup>5</sup> that of stones<sup>6</sup> 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.<sup>7</sup> There are three chests: a chest with an opening at the side is liable to uncleanness as midras;<sup>8</sup> at the top, is liable to uncleanness through the defilement of a corpse;<sup>9</sup> but an extremely large one<sup>10</sup> is completely clean.<sup>11</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: The midras of an earthen vessel is clean;<sup>12</sup> R. Jose said: A ship too. What does he mean?<sup>13</sup> — Said R. Zebid. He means this: The midras of an earthen vessel is clean, but contact there with renders it unclean,<sup>14</sup> while an earthen ship is unclean, in accordance with Hananiah;<sup>15</sup> R. Jose ruled: An [earthen] ship too is clean, in agreement with our Tanna. R. Papa demurred: [if so,] why say, A ship too?<sup>16</sup> 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.<sup>17</sup> this assimilates 'his bed' to himself [the zab]: just as he can be cleansed in a mikweh,<sup>18</sup> 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]:<sup>19</sup> 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.<sup>20</sup> 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 waggon 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.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 84b

This follows a fortiori: if small [earthen] pitchers which cannot be defiled by a zab<sup>1</sup> can be defiled through the dead,<sup>2</sup> then a mat, which is defiled by a zab,<sup>3</sup> is surely defiled through the dead? But why so [it may be asked], seeing that it cannot be cleansed in a mikweh?<sup>4</sup> 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].<sup>5</sup> The All Merciful save us from this view! he exclaimed.<sup>6</sup> On the contrary, he retorted, The All Merciful save us from your view! And what is the reason?<sup>7</sup> Two verses are written: [i] and whosoever touches his bed; and [ii] every bed whereon he that hath the issue lieth [shall be unclean].<sup>8</sup> 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]:<sup>9</sup> hence, if it has a covering bound upon it, it is clean.<sup>10</sup> 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.<sup>11</sup>

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?<sup>12</sup> BECAUSE IT IS SAID, FOR AS THE EARTH BRINGETH FORTH HER BUD, AND AS THE GARDEN CAUSETH ITS SEEDS TO SPRING FORTH:<sup>13</sup> NOT ITS SEED, BUT ITS SEEDS IS STATED.<sup>14</sup>

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,<sup>15</sup> 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 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.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 85a

and the Rabbis ascertained that five [species sown] in six [handbreadths square] do not draw [sustenance] from each other.<sup>1</sup> And how do we know that that which the Rabbis ascertain is of consequence?<sup>2</sup> For R. Hiyya b. Abba said in R. Johanan's name: What is meant by, Thou shalt not remove thy neighbour's landmark, which they of old have set?<sup>3</sup> The landmark which they of old have set thou shalt not encroach upon.<sup>4</sup> 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:<sup>5</sup> 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.<sup>6</sup> 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].<sup>7</sup> R. Aha b. Jacob said: Horite [hori] implies that they become free [horin] from [the cares of] their property.<sup>8</sup>

R. Assi said: The internal area of the seed-bed must be six [handbreadths square], apart from its borders.<sup>9</sup> It was taught likewise: The internal area of the seed-bed must be six [handbreadths square]. How much must its borders be?<sup>10</sup> — 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:<sup>11</sup> 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.<sup>12</sup> But there is the corner space?<sup>13</sup> — The School of Rab<sup>14</sup> answered in Rab's name: It refers to one who fills up the corners. Yet let one sow on the outside,<sup>15</sup> 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 neighbour'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 sub. 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.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 85b

— It is a preventive measure, lest he fill up the corners. Yet let it not be other than a triangular plot<sup>1</sup> of vegetables? Did we not learn, If a triangular plot of vegetables enters another field,<sup>2</sup> this is permitted, because it is evidently the end of a field?<sup>3</sup> — [The permissibility of] a triangular plot does not apply to a seed-bed.<sup>4</sup>

But Samuel maintained: We learnt of a seed-bed in the midst of [other] seed-beds. But 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?<sup>5</sup> R. Shesheth maintained: The intermingling comes and annuls the strips.<sup>6</sup> 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;<sup>7</sup> one row of cucumbers, one row of gourds and one of Egyptian beans, they are forbidden?<sup>8</sup> — Here it is different, because there is entanglement.<sup>9</sup>

R. Kahana said in R. Johanan's name: If one desires to fill his whole garden with vegetables,<sup>10</sup> he can divide it into<sup>11</sup> bed[s] six [handbreadths] square, describe in each a circle five [handbreadths in diameter], and fill its corners with whatever he pleases.<sup>12</sup> But there is the [space] between [the beds]?<sup>13</sup> — Said the School of R. Jannai: He leaves the interspaces waste.<sup>14</sup> R. Ashi said: If they [the beds] are sown in the length, he sows them [the interspaces] in the breadth, and vice versa.<sup>15</sup> Rabina objected to R. Ashi: The planting<sup>16</sup> of one vegetable with another [requires] six handbreadths [square],<sup>17</sup> 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.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 86a

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

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.<sup>3</sup> HOW DO WE KNOW THAT A CIRCUMCISED CHILD<sup>4</sup> 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.<sup>5</sup> HOW DO WE KNOW THAT A CRIMSON-COLOURED STRAP IS TIED TO THE HEAD OF THE GOAT THAT IS SENT [TO 'AZAZ'EL]?<sup>6</sup> BECAUSE IT IS SAID, IF YOUR SINS BE AS SCARLET, THEY SHALL BE AS WHITE AS SNOW.<sup>7</sup> HOW DO WE KNOW THAT ANOINTING IS THE SAME AS DRINKING ON THE DAY OF ATONEMENT?<sup>8</sup> THOUGH THERE IS NO PROOF OF THIS, YET THERE IS A SUGGESTION THEREOF, FOR IT IS SAID, AND IT CAME INTO HIS INWARD PARTS LIKE WATER, AND LIKE OIL INTO HIS BONES.<sup>9</sup>

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?<sup>10</sup> — 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] Tannaim<sup>11</sup> [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.<sup>12</sup> R. Ishmael said: This [interval] sometimes comprises four periods,<sup>13</sup> sometimes five, and sometimes six periods.<sup>14</sup> R. Akiba maintained: It [the interval for uncleanness] is always [up to] five periods. And if part of the first period has gone,<sup>15</sup> a part of the sixth period is given her.<sup>16</sup> 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.<sup>17</sup> Again, R. Ishmael holds with R. Jose that abstention was effected on Wednesday. But with whom does R. Akiba agree?<sup>18</sup> — 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;<sup>19</sup> 'he descended early in the morning', for it is written, Go, get thee down; and thou shalt come up, thou, and Aaron with thee.<sup>20</sup> this likens descent to the ascent: just as ascent was early in the morning, so was descent early in the morning.<sup>21</sup> 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!<sup>22</sup> — 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. (14) After cohabitation.
- (3) 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.
- (4) Lit., 'the circumcised'.
- (5) 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.
- (6) V. Lev. XVI, 22-26.
- (7) Isa. I, 18. By a miracle this crimson coloured strap turned white, thus showing the people that they were forgiven of their sins; V. Buchler, Sin and Atonement, p. 327.
- (8) That the former is interdicted equally with the latter?
- (9) Ps. CIX, 19. The former is a simile from drinking, the latter from anointing, and the two similes are treated as parallel.
- (10) V. infra.
- (11) V. B.M. 41a.
- (12) 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.
- (13) 'Onah, pl, 'onoth, is the technical term of a day or a night when these are equal.
- (14) 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.
- (15) When intimacy takes place.
- (16) A discharge up to then defiles her.
- (17) Whilst the giving of the Law took place on the Sabbath, at the very beginning of which they 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.
- (18) 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.
- (19) 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.
- (20) Ibid. XIX, 24.
- (21) 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.
- (22) So Moses could have waited for the end of the day.

## **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 86b**

But they were tebul yom?<sup>1</sup> — 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.<sup>2</sup> Yet they should have bathed at twilight and received the Torah at twilight?<sup>3</sup> — R. Isaac quoted [as an answer], from the beginning I have not spoken in secret.<sup>4</sup> Yet they could have bathed on the Sabbath morning and received the Torah on the Sabbath morning?<sup>5</sup> — Said R. Isaac. It was unfitting that some should go to receive the Torah whilst others went to Tebillah.<sup>6</sup>

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 six<sup>7</sup> full periods.<sup>8</sup> R. Hisda said: This controversy is [only] where it [the semen] issues from the woman; but if it issues from a man,<sup>9</sup> 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]:<sup>10</sup> this excludes semen that is foul.<sup>11</sup> 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?<sup>12</sup> [Do we say,] Because Israelites are anxious about [the observance of] precepts, their bodies are heated,<sup>13</sup> 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?<sup>14</sup> [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;<sup>15</sup> whilst elsewhere it is written, This month shall be unto you the beginning of months:<sup>16</sup> just as there the first of the month,<sup>17</sup> 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;<sup>18</sup> whilst elsewhere it is written, And Moses said unto the people, Remember this day:<sup>19</sup> just as there, [he spoke] on that very day,<sup>20</sup> so here too it was on that very day.<sup>21</sup> [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;<sup>22</sup>

---

(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. **במזאי**

(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.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 87a

on Tuesday he informed them of the order to set boundaries,<sup>1</sup> and on Wednesday they separated themselves [from their wives].<sup>2</sup> 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:<sup>3</sup> this is difficult in the view of R. Jose?<sup>4</sup> — R. Jose can answer you: Moses added one day of his own understanding.<sup>5</sup> For it was taught, Three things did Moses do of his own understanding, and the Holy One, blessed be He, gave His approval:<sup>6</sup> he added one day of his own understanding, he separated himself from his wife,<sup>7</sup> 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.<sup>8</sup> 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,<sup>9</sup> 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.<sup>10</sup> ‘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:<sup>11</sup> here is the whole Torah, and the Israelites are apostates, how much more so!<sup>12</sup> And how do we know that the Holy One, blessed be He, gave His approval? Because it is said, which thou brakest,<sup>13</sup> and Resh Lakish interpreted this: All strength to thee<sup>14</sup> that thou brakest it.

Come and hear: And be ready against the third day: this is a difficulty according to R. Jose?<sup>15</sup> — 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:<sup>16</sup> this is a difficulty according to the Rabbis?<sup>17</sup> — 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;<sup>18</sup> and it is written, And Moses told the words of the people unto the Lord.<sup>19</sup> 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?<sup>20</sup> This is the order of setting boundaries:<sup>21</sup> 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.<sup>22</sup> 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?<sup>23</sup> — 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.

## **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 87b**

[In respect] of their encamping.<sup>1</sup> R. Aha b. Jacob said: [In respect] of their journeying.<sup>2</sup> Now, they disagree about [the precept of] the Sabbath [as communicated to them at at Marah, for it is written, [Observe the Sabbath day ... ] as the Lord my God commanded thee,<sup>3</sup> whereon Rab Judah commented in Rab’s name: As he commanded thee at Marah.<sup>4</sup> One Master holds: They were commanded concerning the Sabbath [in general], but not concerning *tehumim*.<sup>5</sup> Whilst the other Master holds: They were commanded concerning *tehumim* too.<sup>6</sup>

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!<sup>7</sup> 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,<sup>8</sup> and the first of Siwan was on a Sunday,<sup>9</sup> which is a difficulty according to the Rabbis?—The Rabbis answer you: Iyar in that year was indeed made full.<sup>10</sup>

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.<sup>11</sup> Now that day was the Sabbath, for it is written, and in the morning, then ye shall see the glory of the Lord,<sup>12</sup> and it is written, six days ye shall gather it.<sup>13</sup> 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. Assi<sup>14</sup> of Hozna'ah<sup>15</sup> 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;<sup>16</sup> [and with reference to this] a Tanna taught: That day took ten crowns.<sup>17</sup> It was the first of the Creation,<sup>18</sup> the first for the princes,<sup>19</sup> the first for the priesthood,<sup>20</sup> the first for [public] sacrifice, the first for the fall of fire [from Heaven],<sup>21</sup> the first for the eating of sacred food,<sup>22</sup> the first for the dwelling of the Shechinah in Israel, the first for the [priestly] blessing of Israel,<sup>23</sup> the first for the interdict of the high places,<sup>24</sup> [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 ‘Azereth<sup>25</sup> and another, and between one New Year[’s day] and another, there can be a difference of only four days,<sup>26</sup> and in a leap year, five [days].<sup>27</sup> 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;<sup>28</sup>

(1) The Baraitha 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 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.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 88a

in that of the Rabbis', eight months were declared defective.<sup>1</sup>

Come and hear: For it was taught in the Seder 'Olam.<sup>2</sup> 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;<sup>3</sup> on the third he ascended and descended;<sup>4</sup> on the fourth he descended and ascended no more.<sup>5</sup> But since he did not go up,<sup>6</sup> 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?<sup>7</sup> — No: it was on account of the preparations for<sup>8</sup> the Sabbath.<sup>9</sup>

A certain Galilean lectured before R. Hisda: "Blessed be the Merciful One who gave a three-fold Torah<sup>10</sup> to a three-fold people<sup>11</sup> through a third[-born]<sup>12</sup> on the third day<sup>13</sup> in the third month. With whom does this agree? With the Rabbis.<sup>14</sup>

And they stood under the mount:<sup>15</sup> 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.<sup>16</sup> 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.]:<sup>17</sup> [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:<sup>18</sup> 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,<sup>19</sup> 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;<sup>20</sup> What is the purpose of the additional 'the'?<sup>21</sup> 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.'<sup>22</sup>

R. Simla lectured: When the Israelites gave precedence to 'we will do' over 'we will hearken,'<sup>23</sup> six hundred thousand ministering angels came and set two crowns upon each man of Israel, one as a reward for<sup>24</sup> 'we will do,' and the other as a reward for 'we will hearken'. But as soon as Israel sinned,<sup>25</sup> 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.<sup>26</sup> 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.<sup>27</sup> 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;<sup>28</sup> the joy from of old<sup>29</sup> 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 fulfil his word, That hearken unto the voice of his word:<sup>30</sup> first they fulfil 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]:<sup>31</sup> why were the Israelites compared to an apple tree? To teach you: just as the fruit of the apple tree precedes its leaves,<sup>32</sup> so did the Israelites give precedence to 'we will do' over 'we will hearken'. There was a certain Sadducee who saw Raba<sup>33</sup> 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. (12) 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').

(10) I.e., the Torah (Pentateuch), Prophets and Hagiographa.

(11) Israel consisting of Priests, Levites, and Israelites.

(12) Sc. Moses, born third after Miriam and Aaron.

(13) Of their separation from their wives.

(14) For according to R. Jose it was on the fourth day of their separation, Moses having added a day (supra 87a).

(15) Ex. XIX. 17. The translation is literal. E.V. nether part.

(16) It provides an excuse for non-observance, since it was forcibly imposed in the first place.

(17) Esth. IX, 27.

(18) Ps. LXXVI, 9.

(19) It feared lest Israel would reject the Torah, and became tranquil when Israel accepted it.

(20) Gen. I, 31.

(21) In the case of the other days it is simply stated, a second day, a third day, etc., 'a' being altogether unexpressed in Hebrew.

(22) 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.

(23) V. Ex. XXIV, 7. Thus they promised to obey God's commands even before hearing them.

(24) Lit., 'corresponding to'.

(25) Through the Golden Calf

(26) I.e., which they had received at Mount Horeb. Ibid. XXXIII, 6. E.V. from mount onwards'.

(27) Ibid. 7 — The reference is not clear. V. Rashi.

(28) Isa. XXXV, 10.

(29) The verse may be translated thus.

(30) Ps. CIII, 20.

(31) Cant. II, 3. The two lovers in this poem were regarded as God and Israel.

(32) 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.

(33) 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.)].

## **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 88b**

who walked in integrity, of us it is written, The integrity of the upright shall guide them.<sup>1</sup> 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?<sup>2</sup> In the beginning with one of thine eyes; when thou fulfillest, with both thine eyes.<sup>3</sup>

'Ulla said: Shameless is the bride that plays the harlot within her bridal canopy!<sup>4</sup> 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].<sup>5</sup> 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.<sup>6</sup>

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

R. Hananel b. Papa said: What is meant by, Hear, for I will speak princely things:<sup>12</sup> 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 thereof<sup>13</sup> 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.<sup>14</sup>

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?<sup>15</sup> 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.<sup>16</sup> My beloved is unto me as a cluster [eshkol] of henna-flowers [kofer] in the vineyards of [karme] En-gedi:<sup>17</sup> He to Whom everything belongs [she-ha-kol shelo] shall make atonement [mekapper] for me for the sin of the kid<sup>18</sup> which I stored up [karamti] for myself.<sup>19</sup> Where is it implied that this 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].<sup>20</sup>

R. Joshua b. Levi also said: What is meant by, His cheeks are as a bed of spices?<sup>21</sup> 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,<sup>22</sup> as it is said, His lips are as lilies [shoshannim], dropping myrrh that pass on:<sup>23</sup> read not shoshannim but sheshonim.<sup>24</sup>

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.<sup>25</sup> 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.<sup>26</sup>

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],<sup>27</sup> as it is said, The hosts of angels<sup>28</sup> march, they march [yiddodun yiddodun]:<sup>29</sup> 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.'<sup>30</sup> 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!<sup>31</sup> '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,<sup>32</sup> whereon R. Nahman<sup>33</sup> observed: This teaches that the Almighty [SHaddai] spread [Pirash] the lustre [Ziw] of His Shechinah<sup>34</sup> and cast it as a protection<sup>35</sup> 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.<sup>36</sup> 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:<sup>37</sup> 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.
- (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.

## **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 89a**

idol worship? Again what is written therein? Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy:<sup>1</sup> do ye then perform work, that ye need to rest? Again what is written therein? Thou shalt not take [tissa] [the name ... in vain]:<sup>2</sup> is there any business [massa] dealings among you?<sup>3</sup> Again what is written therein, Honour thy father and thy mother;<sup>4</sup> have ye fathers and mothers? Again what is written therein? Thou shalt not murder. Thou shalt not commit adultery. Thou shalt not steal;<sup>5</sup> 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.<sup>6</sup> whereas 'Who has set thy glory upon the heavens is not written.<sup>7</sup> 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:<sup>8</sup> as a recompense for their calling thee man [adam]<sup>9</sup> 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;<sup>10</sup> and it is said. and he stood between the dead and the living, etc.<sup>11</sup> 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.’<sup>12</sup> 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 rumour thereof with our ears.<sup>13</sup> 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?’<sup>14</sup> ‘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.<sup>15</sup> 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].<sup>16</sup> Said He to him, ‘Moses, is there no [greeting of] Peace in thy town?’<sup>17</sup> ‘Shall a servant extend [a greeting of] Peace to his Master!’ replied he: ‘Yet thou shouldst have assisted Me,’<sup>18</sup> said He. immediately<sup>19</sup> he cried out to Him, And now, I pray thee, let the power of the Lord be great, according as thou hast spoken.<sup>20</sup>

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]?<sup>21</sup> ‘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.<sup>22</sup> 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.,<sup>23</sup>

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.<sup>24</sup> And thus R. Jose son of R. Hanina said: It has five names: The Wilderness of Zin, [meaning] that Israel were given commandments there;<sup>25</sup> the Wilderness of Kadesh, where the Israelites were sanctified [kadosh], the Wilderness of Kedemoth, because a priority [kedumah] was conferred there;<sup>26</sup> 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 **ז** **נ** **ז** **ג** **ז** **ש** **ע** **ט** **ו**. 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 labours.

(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.]

## Talmud - Mas. 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.

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?<sup>1</sup> 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,<sup>2</sup> yet they shall be as white as snow.<sup>3</sup> Raba lectured: What is meant by, Go now, and let us reason together, shall say the Lord.<sup>4</sup> [Instead of] 'Go now', Come now, is required: [instead of] 'shall say the Lord', saith the Lord, is required?<sup>5</sup> 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.'<sup>6</sup> 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 ... ],<sup>7</sup> yet he did not entreat mercy for us? To Isaac, who blessed Esau, And it shall come to pass, when thou shalt have dominion,<sup>8</sup> and yet he did not entreat mercy for us? To Jacob, to whom Thou didst say, I will go down with thee into Egypt, and yet he did not entreat mercy for us? To whom then shall we go now? [Rather] let the Lord state [our wrongs]!<sup>9</sup> 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?<sup>10</sup> 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:<sup>11</sup> 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,<sup>12</sup> [and] there remain fifty. Subtract twenty-five which comprise the

nights,<sup>13</sup> [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,<sup>14</sup> 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.<sup>15</sup>

MISHNAH. IF ONE CARRIES OUT WOOD, [THE STANDARD FOR CULPABILITY IS] AS MUCH AS IS REQUIRED FOR BOILING A LIGHT EGG; [SEASONING] SPICES, AS MUCH AS IS REQUIRED FOR SEASONING A LIGHT EGG; AND THEY COMBINE WITH EACH OTHER.<sup>16</sup> 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.<sup>17</sup> LYE,<sup>18</sup> CIMOLIAN EARTH,<sup>19</sup> AND ASHLEG,<sup>20</sup> 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.<sup>21</sup>

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?<sup>22</sup> — 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 designations<sup>23</sup> belonging to the same species or three [different] species are forbidden,<sup>24</sup> and they combine with each other.<sup>25</sup> 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. (11) Ibid. XLVI, 4.

(9) Do Thou rebuke us, not they, for they did not show themselves merciful.

(10) Isa. LXIII, 16.

(11) Ex. IV. 22.

(12) 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.

(13) When one sleeps and does not sin.

(14) Lit., 'caused it for him' — that he went down as Joseph's honoured guest.

(15) Hos. XI, 4.

(16) To make up the standard.

(17) V. Sanh., Sonc. ed., p. 330, n. 5.

(18) A sort of soap.

- (19) A clay used for cleansing.  
 (20) A kind of alkali or mineral used as soap.  
 (21) Caused by a menstruous woman, v. Sanh. 49b.  
 (22) And obviously the same applies to wood.  
 (23) Rashi: e.g., black pepper, white pepper, etc. Tosaf.: spices forbidden under various headings, e.g., 'orlah, kil'ayim, etc.  
 (24) If used for seasoning food, the food is interdicted.  
 (25) If there is not sufficient in one to impart a flavour but only in combination with each other.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 90a

They learnt this of sweetening condiments,<sup>1</sup> 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,<sup>2</sup> [the standard is] as much as is required for dyeing a sample colour for wool?<sup>3</sup> — 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 colour for wool.

URINE. A Tanna taught: Urine, until forty days.<sup>4</sup>

NATRON. it was taught: Alexandrian natron, but not natron of Antipatris.<sup>5</sup>

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 halbezin<sup>6</sup> and le'enn<sup>7</sup> and borith and ahol.<sup>8</sup> 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 has no root is not subject to shebi'ith? But what is borith? Ahala.<sup>9</sup> But it was taught: And borith and ahala?<sup>10</sup> — There are two kinds of ahala.

CIMOLIAN EARTH. Rab Judah said: That is 'pull out stick in.'<sup>11</sup>

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,<sup>12</sup> 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.<sup>13</sup> 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.<sup>14</sup>

GEMARA. Of what use is any [small] quantity of long pepper? For [dispelling] the [evil] odour 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],<sup>15</sup> however little; and a closed rose,<sup>16</sup> [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 vow<sup>17</sup> iron,'<sup>18</sup> — others rule:<sup>19</sup> 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.<sup>20</sup> 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['s worth]. it was taught, R. Eleazar said: He must not give less than a small brass hook. What is it fit for?<sup>21</sup> — 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.<sup>22</sup> 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.<sup>23</sup>

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.

(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.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 90b

[FOR] CUCUMBER SEED, [THE STANDARD IS] TWO; SEED OF GOURDS, TWO; SEED OF EGYPTIAN BEANS, TWO. IF ONE CARRIES OUT A LIVE CLEAN<sup>1</sup> LOCUST, WHATEVER ITS SIZE; DEAD, [ITS STANDARD IS] THE SIZE OF A DRIED FIG. THE BIRD OF THE VINEYARDS,<sup>2</sup> WHETHER LIVE OR DEAD, WHATEVER ITS SIZE, BECAUSE IT IS STORED AWAY FOR A MEDICINE.<sup>3</sup> R. JUDAH SAID: ALSO HE WHO CARRIES OUT A LIVE UNCLEAN 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?<sup>4</sup> — 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,<sup>5</sup> 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,<sup>6</sup> two; of palm fillets,<sup>7</sup> 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.<sup>8</sup> 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.<sup>9</sup> 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.<sup>10</sup>

R. JUDAH SAID: ALSO HE WHO CARRIES OUT, etc. But the first Tanna holds, Not so.<sup>11</sup> 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 shoshiba<sup>12</sup> 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.'<sup>13</sup> 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.<sup>14</sup>

## 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.<sup>15</sup> BUT ALL OTHERS ARE NOT CULPABLE THEREFOR SAVE IN ACCORDANCE WITH ITS STANDARD.<sup>16</sup> IF HE CARRIES IT BACK AGAIN,<sup>17</sup> HE IS LIABLE ONLY IN ACCORDANCE WITH ITS STANDARD.<sup>18</sup>

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?<sup>19</sup> — 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.

## **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 91a**

you might say, His intention has been cancelled;<sup>1</sup> 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,<sup>2</sup> 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,<sup>3</sup> 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 view<sup>4</sup> [and] there is the standard, and consider it from that point of view, [and] there is the standard? — You might say, [Both] removal and depositing<sup>5</sup> 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 swells<sup>6</sup> and he decides [to use it] for food? Can you argue, only there<sup>7</sup> 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],<sup>8</sup> 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

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?<sup>9</sup> Here it is certain that if he remained silent he would not be culpable on account of his original intention; or perhaps we regard<sup>10</sup> 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?<sup>11</sup> The question stands over.

Raba asked R. Nahman: What if one throws terumah<sup>12</sup> of the size of an olive into an unclean house? In respect of what [is the question]? If in respect of the Sabbath,<sup>13</sup> we require the size of a dried fig? If in respect of defilement,<sup>14</sup> 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 quantity<sup>15</sup> and this makes it up to an egg in quantity.<sup>16</sup> 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,<sup>17</sup> and the shewbread,<sup>18</sup> their standard is the size of a dried fig.<sup>19</sup> 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.

## **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 91b**

its going out,<sup>1</sup> [the standard is] the size of an olive, in respect of the Sabbath too it is the size of an olive?<sup>2</sup> 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.<sup>3</sup>

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.<sup>4</sup> You, might argue, since Its place is recognizable,

it stands in its original condition;<sup>5</sup> he [the Tanna] therefore teaches us that by throwing it on to a store he indeed nullifies it<sup>6</sup>

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 PRODUCE IS WITHOUT,<sup>7</sup> 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,<sup>8</sup> 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,<sup>9</sup> 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.<sup>10</sup>

A BASKET WHICH IS FULL OF PRODUCE. Hezekiah said: They learnt this only of a basket full of cucumbers and gourds;<sup>11</sup> but if it is full of mustard, he is culpable.<sup>12</sup> This proves that the tie of the vessel is not regarded as a tie.<sup>13</sup> 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?<sup>14</sup> -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 pedlar'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],<sup>15</sup> which is a difficulty according to Hezekiah? Hezekiah answers you: The reference here is to prickly shrubs.<sup>16</sup>

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.<sup>17</sup> But if you think that the tie of a vessel is regarded as a tie,<sup>18</sup> the interdict of theft precedes that of the Sabbath?<sup>19</sup> — If he carries it out by way of its opening,<sup>20</sup> that indeed is so. Here we discuss the case where he carries it out by way of its bottom.<sup>21</sup> 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.

(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) Gr. \*\*, 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.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 92a

which he can rip open<sup>1</sup> if he desires and extract [the coins]? — The reference is to a bar of metal.<sup>2</sup> But since it has straps,<sup>3</sup> he [the thief] can take it out up to its opening, untie [the straps] and take out the bar,<sup>4</sup> whilst the straps [still] unite it to within?<sup>5</sup> — It refers to one that has no straps. Alternatively, it has straps, but they are wound round about it [the purse].<sup>6</sup> 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;<sup>7</sup> if in a vessel, he is not culpable.<sup>8</sup> But Raba ruled: If in his hand, he is not culpable;<sup>9</sup> if in a vessel, he is culpable?<sup>10</sup> -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],<sup>11</sup> but here it is below three.<sup>12</sup>

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.<sup>13</sup> IN A BACKHANDED MANNER,<sup>14</sup> [E.G.,] WITH HIS FOOT, IN HIS MOUTH, WITH HIS ELBOW, IN HIS EAR, IN HIS HAIR, IN HIS BELT WITH ITS OPENING DOWNWARDS,<sup>15</sup> 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,<sup>16</sup> 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:<sup>17</sup> 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,<sup>18</sup> and it is [also] said, and he spread the tent over the Tabernacle,<sup>19</sup> whereon Rab commented: Moses our Teacher spread it. Hence you may learn that the Levites were ten cubits tall.<sup>20</sup> 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.<sup>21</sup> 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.<sup>22</sup> 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.<sup>23</sup>

Rab said on R. Hiyya's authority: If one carries out a burden on his head<sup>24</sup> on the Sabbath, he is liable to a sin-offering. because the people of Huzal<sup>25</sup> do thus. Are then the people of Huzal the world's majority!<sup>26</sup> 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 practice<sup>27</sup> be null by comparison with that of all men?<sup>28</sup> 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 effect 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 labour 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

## **Talmud - Mas. 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 ROUND<sup>1</sup> 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] BEFORE OR BEHIND HER,<sup>2</sup> IS CULPABLE, BECAUSE IT IS NATURAL<sup>3</sup> FOR IT TO REVERSE ITSELF.<sup>4</sup> R. JUDAH SAID: ALSO THOSE WHO RECEIVE NOTES.<sup>5</sup>

**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:<sup>6</sup> 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;<sup>7</sup> 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.<sup>8</sup> But then what is R. Eleazar's difficulty? The implications of the Mishnah are a difficulty:<sup>9</sup> 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?<sup>10</sup> — 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:<sup>11</sup> 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,<sup>12</sup> -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?<sup>13</sup> 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?<sup>14</sup> 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.<sup>15</sup>

R. JUDAH SAID: ALSO THOSE WHO RECEIVE NOTES. A Tanna taught: Because clerks of the State do thus.<sup>16</sup> 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].<sup>17</sup>

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,<sup>18</sup> -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.<sup>19</sup> 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.]:<sup>20</sup> [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];<sup>21</sup> [or] the shuttle, and press;<sup>22</sup> or a quill. and write; or a cane, and carry it out into the street,<sup>23</sup> -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. תברא).

(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. lv, 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.

## Talmud - Mas. 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.<sup>1</sup> 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] 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.<sup>2</sup> But R. Simeon is consistent with his view, for he maintains: An individual who acts on the ruling of Beth din is liable.<sup>3</sup> 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:<sup>4</sup> 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?<sup>5</sup> Said R. Hamnuna 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,<sup>6</sup> they are unclean, because it cannot stand on three;<sup>7</sup> but R. Simeon declares it clean.<sup>8</sup> 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:<sup>9</sup> 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].<sup>10</sup> But since it alternatively removes one foot and then another, let it be as a zab who turns about.<sup>11</sup> Did we not learn, If a zab is lying on five benches or five hollow belts:<sup>12</sup> if along their length, they are unclean;<sup>13</sup> 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],<sup>14</sup> they are unclean? Hence<sup>15</sup> 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.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 93b

R. Jose said: A horse defiles through its forefeet, an ass through its hindfeet, because a horse rests its weight<sup>1</sup> on its forefeet, while an ass rests its upon its hindfeet.<sup>2</sup> 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.<sup>3</sup> Yet why so, seeing that they [the feet] help each other? Hence it must surely be because we say, helping is no concrete [act].

Rabina said, We too learnt this: If he [the priest] catches [the blood] with his right hand, while his left helps him,<sup>4</sup> 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?<sup>5</sup> 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.<sup>6</sup> But why so: let the standard of gonorrhoea be necessary for each?<sup>7</sup> 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,<sup>8</sup> he is culpable; if two lock it, they are exempt.<sup>9</sup> 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?<sup>10</sup> 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.<sup>11</sup> 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?<sup>12</sup> -If so, he [the Tanna] should inform us about a cane in general?<sup>13</sup> why particularly a weaver's?<sup>14</sup> Yet perhaps it is large enough for each to weave a cloth therewith?<sup>15</sup> Hence nothing can be inferred from this.

A tanna<sup>16</sup> 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!<sup>17</sup> — 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;<sup>18</sup> 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.<sup>19</sup> BUT R. SIMEON DECLARES HIM EXEMPT.<sup>20</sup>

**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.<sup>21</sup> Then this proves that if one eats two olive-sized pieces of heleb in one state of unawareness, he is liable to two [sacrifices]?<sup>22</sup> 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 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 labour; 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 labour 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 labour 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.

## **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 94a**

where he sinned unwittingly in respect of the food, but deliberately in respect of the utensil.<sup>1</sup> R. Ashi demurred: But it is stated, 'in respect of the utensil too'?<sup>2</sup> 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.<sup>3</sup>

[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,<sup>4</sup> 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,<sup>5</sup> but as for a living person, who carries himself,<sup>6</sup> 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.<sup>7</sup> 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<sup>8</sup>. And R. Johanan observed, Ben Bathyra and R. Nathan said the same thing.<sup>9</sup> 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].<sup>10</sup> R. Johanan said: Yet R. Nathan agrees in the case of a tied [living being].<sup>11</sup> R. Adda b. Mattenah said to Abaye: But these Persians are like bound [men],<sup>12</sup> yet R. Johanan said, Ben Bathyra and R. Nathan said the same thing?<sup>13</sup> There they suffer from haughtiness,<sup>14</sup> for a certain officer with whom the king was angry ran three parasangs on foot.

A CORPSE IN A BED, HE IS CULPABLE.<sup>15</sup> 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 wilful desecration of the Sabbath.
- (2) Which implies the same liability.
- (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 ploughing, and thereby lose the Sabbath rest to which they are entitled (v. Ex. XX, (10). Horses, however, were not used for ploughing in Mishnaic times, but merely for riding.
- (8) Riding being only Rabbinically prohibited.
- (9) Sc. that it is not a labour 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 labour not essential in itself cf. supra p. 448, n. 8.]

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 94b

even him who carries out a corpse for burial.<sup>1</sup> 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.<sup>2</sup> That is obvious, for if this too should be regarded as a labour unrequired per se, how would a labour 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] plate<sup>3</sup> 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,<sup>4</sup> 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:<sup>5</sup> 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.<sup>6</sup>

We learnt elsewhere: If one plucks out the symptoms of uncleanness<sup>7</sup> or burns out the raw flesh,<sup>8</sup> he transgresses a negative injunction.<sup>9</sup> It was stated: [If he plucks out] one of two [hairs]. he is culpable;<sup>10</sup> 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.<sup>11</sup> But R. Nahman maintains: In both these cases he is culpable;<sup>12</sup> 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.<sup>13</sup>

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],<sup>14</sup> — R. ELIEZER DECLARES [THEM] CULPABLE, WHILE THE RABBIS FORBID [THESE ACTIONS] AS A SHEBUTH.<sup>15</sup>

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 extent<sup>16</sup> of R. Eliezer[’s ruling]:<sup>17</sup> [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 neighbour, 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 neighbour, while as to what is stated — HIS NAILS, that is to teach you the extent of the Rabbis[’ ruling]:<sup>18</sup> [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?<sup>19</sup> -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;<sup>20</sup> and this is interdicted even on weekdays, for it is said, neither shall a man put on a woman’s garment.<sup>21</sup>

It was taught: R. Simeon b. Eleazar said: As for a nail the greater part of which is severed,<sup>22</sup> 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?<sup>23</sup> -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.<sup>24</sup> 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.<sup>25</sup> 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 labour 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).
- (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 Baraitha.
- (20) For its removal makes him look younger; hence it is regarded as a labour.
- (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. פוקמת.

## Talmud - Mas. 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]:<sup>1</sup> 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],<sup>2</sup> 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 forty<sup>3</sup> [lashes]: this is R. Eliezer's view. But the Sages say: In both cases it is [forbidden] only as a shebuth.<sup>4</sup> 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.<sup>5</sup> He who sets milk is liable on account of selecting.<sup>6</sup> He who makes cheese is liable on account of building.<sup>7</sup>

‘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:<sup>8</sup> now, what is the connection between a forest and honey?<sup>9</sup> 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.<sup>10</sup> He argued: What is the reason 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.<sup>11</sup> Rabbah Tosfa'ah<sup>12</sup> 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,<sup>13</sup> he replied. It was taught: A wise woman can sprinkle her house on the Sabbath.<sup>14</sup> But now that we hold as R. Simeon,<sup>15</sup> it is permitted even at the very outset.<sup>16</sup>

**MISHNAH. IF ONE DETACHES [AUGHT] FROM A PERFORATED POT, HE IS CULPABLE;<sup>17</sup> 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. חֲבִי: 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.

is in respect of making [its] plants fit [to become unclean]?<sup>1</sup> — 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 carcase fall] upon any sowing seed which is to be sown, [it is clean].<sup>2</sup>

A certain old man asked R. Zera: If the root is over against the hole, what is R. Simeon's ruling then?<sup>3</sup> 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].<sup>4</sup> 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?<sup>5</sup> 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].<sup>6</sup>

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,<sup>7</sup> yet it is still a utensil in respect of sanctifying the water of lustration therein.<sup>8</sup> [ii] If it has a perforation sufficient for a liquid to run in,<sup>9</sup> it is 'clean' in respect of sanctifying the water of lustration therein,<sup>10</sup> yet it is still a utensil to render its plants fit [to become unclean].<sup>11</sup> [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.<sup>12</sup> [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.<sup>13</sup> [v] If it has a perforation large enough to allow pomegranates to fall through, it is clean in respect of all things.<sup>14</sup> But if it is closed with an airtight lid — [it ranks as a utensil] unless the greater portion thereof is broken.<sup>15</sup>

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.<sup>16</sup> Said Raba to him: Perhaps you heard [this] Only of [a vessel] closed with a tight-fitting lid!<sup>17</sup> 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 rebi'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 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.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 96a

the one refers to large ones, the other to small ones.<sup>1</sup>

R. Assi said, They [the Tannaim] learnt. As for an earthen vessel, its standard is [a hole] 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.<sup>2</sup> What is the reason? — Said Mar Zutra son of R. Nahman: Because people do not say, 'Let us bring one fragment for another.'<sup>3</sup> '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.<sup>4</sup> And your sign is, 'whether one increases or whether one diminishes.'<sup>5</sup>

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;<sup>6</sup> 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,<sup>7</sup> which do not contract uncleanness either by Biblical or by Rabbinical law;<sup>8</sup> but in respect to [the law of] a tight. fitting lid [it ranks as a vessel] unless the greater portion thereof is broken through.

## 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?<sup>9</sup> 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,<sup>10</sup> HE WHO REACHES OVER IS CULPABLE, WHILE HE WHO THROWS IS NOT, FOR THUS WAS THE SERVICE OF THE LEVITES:<sup>11</sup> 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. (6) v. p. 458, n. 3.
- (9) This explains the view of the Rabbis.
- (10) I.e. on the same side of the street, which interposes lengthwise.
- (11) In connection with the Tabernacle in the Wilderness.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 96b

GEMARA. Consider: throwing is a derivative of carrying out:<sup>1</sup> 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.]:<sup>2</sup> now, where was Moses stationed? in the camp of the Levites, which was public ground,<sup>3</sup> 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 happened<sup>4</sup> 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.<sup>5</sup> — The meaning of 'passing through' is learnt from [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]:<sup>6</sup> just as there the reference is to the day of the interdict, so here too the day of the interdict [is meant].<sup>7</sup> 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 [labour], [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 [labour]?-The practical difference is that if one performs two principal or two derivative [labours] together he is liable to two [sacrifices], whereas if he performs a principal [labour] and its derivative he is liable only to one. But according to R. Eliezer, who imposes liability for a derivative [when performed] conjointly with<sup>8</sup> 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.<sup>9</sup> 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;<sup>10</sup> if below ten, it is as though he throws it on to the ground;<sup>11</sup> and he who throws [an article] four cubits along the ground is culpable',<sup>12</sup> - 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.<sup>13</sup> 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.<sup>14</sup> 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.<sup>15</sup> But it passed through a place of non-liability?<sup>16</sup> — Rather [say:] Because the curtain weavers threw the clue to those who would borrow it from them.<sup>17</sup> Yet perhaps they sat near each other? Then they would touch each other on making the border. Yet perhaps they sat in irregular lines?<sup>18</sup> Moreover, did they borrow from each other? Surely Luda<sup>19</sup> taught: every man from his work which they wrought:<sup>20</sup> he wrought of his own work [stuff], but not of his neighbour's.<sup>21</sup> 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]<sup>22</sup> was that he carried [them] four cubits over public ground. In a Baraita it was taught: He cut [them] off.<sup>23</sup> R. Aha b. Jacob said: He tied [them] together.<sup>24</sup> 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 labours, but one is liable only [for] one. One and no more? Surely we learnt, The principal labours 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.<sup>25</sup> Now, Rab Judah is certain that he who carries [in the street] is culpable; the Baraita 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.<sup>26</sup>

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.];<sup>27</sup> whilst elsewhere it is said, our father died in the wilderness;<sup>28</sup> 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,<sup>29</sup> the Torah shielded<sup>30</sup> him, while you reveal him; and if not, you cast a stigma upon a righteous man.'

---

(1) On principal and derivative labours v. p. 3. n. 2. Throwing is certainly a derivative only, since it is not enumerated in the principal labours supra 73a: also it must be a derivative of carrying out, for it is not similar to any of the other principal labours,

(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'.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 97a

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

Similarly you read, and the anger of the Lord was kindled against them; and he departed.<sup>5</sup> 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'?<sup>6</sup> 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:<sup>7</sup> [and] it was taught: [That means] that he became free [panah] from his leprosy.<sup>8</sup>

Resh Lakish said: He who entertains a suspicion against innocent<sup>9</sup> men is bodily afflicted, for it is written, [And Moses . . . said,] But, behold, they will not believe me;<sup>10</sup> but it was known<sup>11</sup> 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;<sup>12</sup> the descendants of believers: and he [Abraham] believed in the Lord.<sup>13</sup> Thou wilt ultimately disbelieve, as it is said, [And the Lord said unto Moses and Aaron,] Because ye believed not in me.<sup>14</sup> 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.<sup>15</sup>

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;<sup>16</sup> 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:<sup>17</sup> from his very bosom,<sup>18</sup> it had turned again as his other flesh.

But Aaron's rod swallowed up their rods:<sup>19</sup> R. Eleazar observed, It was a double miracle.<sup>20</sup> 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?<sup>21</sup> 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,<sup>22</sup> that is to teach you the extent<sup>23</sup> of the Rabbis' ['ruling].<sup>24</sup> 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;<sup>25</sup>

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,<sup>26</sup> 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!<sup>27</sup> — 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]<sup>28</sup> 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?<sup>29</sup> Said he to him, Because it is impossible for the street to be trimmed with a plane and shears.<sup>30</sup> If so, the same should apply to three also? Moreover, when we learnt: If one lets down walls from above to below,<sup>31</sup> if they are three handbreadths high above the ground, it [the sukkah] is unfit,<sup>32</sup> Hence if [they are] less than three it is fit:<sup>33</sup> what can be said?<sup>34</sup> -There the reason is that it is a partition through which goats can enter.<sup>35</sup> That is well [for] below; what can be said [for] above?<sup>36</sup> — 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 throws<sup>37</sup> 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,<sup>38</sup> R. Hana<sup>39</sup> 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,<sup>40</sup> Now R. Hana sat [studying] and this presented a difficulty to him:<sup>41</sup>

---

(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 neighbour'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 levelled, 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,

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 97b

shall we say that Rabbi holds one liable for a derivative [when performed] conjointly with its principal?<sup>1</sup> But surely it was taught. Rabbi said: Words [debarim], the words [ha-debarim], these [eleh] are the words: this indicates the thirty-nine labours stated to Moses at Sinai.<sup>2</sup> Said R. Joseph to him: You learn it<sup>3</sup> in reference to this, and so find Rabbi self-contradictory; We learn it in reference to R. Judah[’s ruling]. and find no difficulty.<sup>4</sup> 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 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;<sup>5</sup> 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.<sup>6</sup> 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 labours; 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 labours [on his view, for then] what does he add? he adds principals; but if you say that they are derivatives, what does he add?<sup>7</sup> 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?<sup>8</sup> -Said he to him, It means that he declared, ‘Wherever it pleases, let it come to rest.’<sup>9</sup>

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.<sup>10</sup> [But] what if one intends throwing [an object] four [cubits] but throws [it] eight: do we say, Surely he has carried it out<sup>11</sup> 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’!<sup>12</sup> 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;<sup>13</sup> but here, without [intentionally] throwing [it] four, cannot one throw it eight?<sup>14</sup>

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.<sup>15</sup>

---

(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 labours 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 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 SHem 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 SHem he has performed a labour, whereas when one throws an article, his action is incomplete until it comes to rest.)

(15) I.e., over the two public grounds combined.

## **Talmud - Mas. 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,<sup>1</sup> and we do not say, An object caught up [in the air] is as at rest.<sup>2</sup>

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.<sup>3</sup> But that is not so? for the waggons surely were covered,<sup>4</sup> and yet Rab said in R. Hiyya's name: As for the waggons, beneath them, between them, and at their sides it was public ground?<sup>5</sup> - Rab referred to the interspaces<sup>6</sup> — Consider: what was the length of the waggons? 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!<sup>7</sup> -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!<sup>8</sup> Now, on the view that the boards were one cubit thick at the bottom, but tapered to a fingerbreadth, it is well:<sup>9</sup> 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.<sup>10</sup> Now, where were they placed: on the top of the waggon. But the waggon itself was covered?<sup>11</sup>

---

(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 waggons 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 waggons 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 waggon 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 waggon was completely closed, like the floor, e.g., of a cement-carrying lorry. How then did Rab state that the space underneath the waggon 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.]

## **Talmud - Mas. 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 thereof<sup>1</sup> whilst elsewhere it is said, [the waters . . .] ended [tammu] and were cut off;<sup>2</sup> 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,<sup>3</sup> and not divided.<sup>4</sup> And the other too, surely is written 'in like manner'?-That [teaches] that they were not to erect them irregularly.<sup>5</sup> 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:<sup>6</sup> thus the breadth of these comes and fills in the thickness of those.<sup>7</sup> 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?<sup>8</sup> They were planed mountain-fashion.<sup>9</sup> And the middle bar in the midst of the boards [shall pass through from end to end].<sup>10</sup> A Tanna taught: It lay<sup>11</sup> there by a miracle.<sup>12</sup>

Moreover thou shalt make the tabernacle with ten curtains. The length of each curtain shall be eight and twenty cubits.<sup>13</sup> 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].<sup>14</sup> Cast their breadth over the length of the Tabernacle: how much was it? forty cubits.<sup>15</sup> Subtract thirty for the roof,<sup>16</sup> 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 be thirty cubits. [and the breadth of each curtain four cubits].<sup>17</sup> 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]:<sup>18</sup> 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.<sup>19</sup> 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,<sup>20</sup> leaves twelve. Now, according to R. Judah, it is well; thus it is written, the half curtain that remaineth shall hang;<sup>21</sup> but according to R. Nehemiah, what is meant by [the half curtain . . .] shall hang?<sup>22</sup> -It shall hang over its companions.<sup>23</sup> The School of R. Ishmael taught: What did the Tabernacle resemble? A woman who goes in the street and her skirts trail after her.<sup>24</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: The boards were cut out and the sockets were grooved;<sup>25</sup>

---

(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.

(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.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 99a

also, the clasps in the loops<sup>1</sup> 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,<sup>2</sup> 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;<sup>3</sup> in reference to the upper ones it is written, And all the women whose heart stirred them up in wisdom spun the goats;<sup>4</sup> and it was taught in R. Nehemiah's name: It was washed [direct] on the goats and spun on the goats.<sup>5</sup>

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

Raba said: The sides of the waggon<sup>8</sup> equalled the fit [internal] breadth of the waggon, and how much was the [internal] breadth of the waggon? Two cubits and a half.<sup>9</sup> Why was this necessary: a cubit and a half would have sufficed?<sup>10</sup> — In order that the boards should not jump about.<sup>11</sup> 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,<sup>12</sup> surely [the public ground] of the Tabernacle was [only] fifteen?<sup>13</sup> -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,<sup>14</sup> AND A ROCK, WHICH ARE TEN [HANDBREADTHS] HIGH AND FOUR IN BREADTH,<sup>15</sup> IF ONE REMOVES [AUGHT] FROM THEM OR PLACES [AUGHT] UPON THEM, HIS IS CULPABLE;<sup>16</sup> 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'?<sup>17</sup> [Hence] this supports R. Johanan, who said: A cistern together with the bank thereof combine to [give a height of] ten [handbreadths].<sup>18</sup> 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,<sup>19</sup>

---

(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 waggon 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 waggons 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.

### Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 99b

unless a wall ten handbreadths high is made around it;<sup>1</sup> and one may not drink from it on the Sabbath unless he brings his head and the greater part of his body into it,<sup>2</sup> 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;<sup>3</sup> or perhaps since it comes from a place of non-liability<sup>4</sup> 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,'<sup>5</sup> 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.<sup>6</sup> 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,<sup>7</sup> or it [the needle] may lie in a cleft.<sup>8</sup> R. Misha said, R. Johanan propounded: What of a wall in a street, ten high but not four broad, surrounding a karmelith<sup>9</sup> and converting it [thereby] into private ground,<sup>10</sup> 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?<sup>11</sup> Said 'Ulla, [This may be solved] a fortiori: if it [the wall] serves as a partition for something else,<sup>12</sup> how much more so for itself!<sup>13</sup> 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 segment from it and makes it up to ten;<sup>14</sup> [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.<sup>15</sup> Yet why so? Surely it diminishes the four cubits?<sup>16</sup> — There he does not render it as nought;<sup>17</sup> here he does render it as nought.<sup>18</sup>

Raba propounded: What if one throws a board and it alights upon poles?<sup>19</sup> 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];<sup>20</sup> or perhaps, since it is impossible for it [the article] not to be slightly raised and then alight,<sup>21</sup> it is like the making of a partition and the [subsequent] depositing of an article?<sup>22</sup> 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.

## **Talmud - Mas. 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.<sup>1</sup>

Abaye said: If a pit in the street [is] ten deep and eight broad, and<sup>2</sup> one throws a mat into it, he is culpable; but if he divides it with the mat,<sup>3</sup> he is not culpable.<sup>4</sup> Now according to Abaye. who is certain that the mat annuls the partition,<sup>5</sup> a segment certainly annuls the partition;<sup>6</sup> but according to

R. Johanan to whom a segment is a problem, a mat certainly does not annul the partition.<sup>7</sup>

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,<sup>8</sup> [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,<sup>9</sup> R. Simeon said: If there is in the place where he throws [it a separate cavity] ten deep and four broad, he is liable.<sup>10</sup>

**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 GROUND<sup>11</sup> IS CULPABLE.**

**GEMARA.** But it does not stay there?-Said R. Johanan: We learnt of a juicy cake of figs.<sup>12</sup> 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.<sup>13</sup> 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,<sup>14</sup> and one throws [an object] and it alights on top of it, he is culpable. It was taught likewise: If an alley<sup>15</sup> is level with within but becomes a slope towards the [main] street,<sup>16</sup> or is level with the [main] street, but becomes a slope within,<sup>17</sup> that alley requires neither a lath nor a beam.<sup>18</sup> 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.<sup>19</sup>**

**GEMARA.** But it did not rest [beyond four cubits]?<sup>20</sup> -Said R. Johanan: Providing it rests [beyond four cubits] on something, whatever its size.<sup>21</sup> 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,<sup>22</sup> 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.<sup>23</sup> 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.

- (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.

## **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 100b**

Is this not [to be deduced from] our Mishnah, whereon R. Johanan commented. Providing it rests on something, whatever its size?<sup>1</sup> You speak of [a] rolling [object]. replied he; [a] rolling [object] is not destined to rest; but this, since it is destined to rest,<sup>2</sup> [I might argue that] though it did not come to rest, it is as though it had rested:<sup>3</sup> 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<sup>3</sup>. IF THERE IS A POOL OF WATER AND A PUBLIC ROAD TRAVERSES IT, AND ONE THROWS [AN OBJECT] FOUR CUBITS THEREIN,<sup>4</sup> 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;<sup>5</sup> [ii] use with difficulty is not designated use.<sup>6</sup> 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 mudstained they do not object;<sup>7</sup> 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.<sup>8</sup> R. Ashi said; They are necessary: I might argue, That is only where it [the pool] is four [across];<sup>9</sup> but where it is not four, one steps over it.<sup>10</sup> 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.<sup>11</sup> he is culpable, since many pass across it.<sup>12</sup>

**MISHNAH. IF ONE THROWS [AN OBJECT] FROM THE SEA TO DRY LAND,<sup>13</sup> OR FROM DRY LAND TO THE SEA, FROM THE SEA TO A SHIP<sup>14</sup> 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 enclosure<sup>15</sup> four [handbreadths square] and draws [water].<sup>16</sup> [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'.<sup>17</sup> Hence logically not even a projection is required.<sup>18</sup> but [it is placed there] to serve as a distinguishing mark.<sup>19</sup> 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.<sup>20</sup> [Hence] if a place of four [square] is not set up. one transports [the water] from a karmelith to private ground.<sup>21</sup>

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,<sup>22</sup> 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].<sup>23</sup> But it has a projecting point?<sup>24</sup> — Said R. Safra: Sounders precede it.<sup>25</sup>

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?<sup>26</sup> And should you answer that he throws it [likewise] through that same enclosure, — it is [surely] repulsive to him!<sup>27</sup> — He throws it against the sides of the ship.<sup>28</sup> But there is his force [behind it]?<sup>29</sup> 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 ארבעה 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 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.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 101a

R. Judah said: If it is ten [handbreadths] deep [internally] but not ten high,<sup>1</sup> one may transport from it into the sea, but not from the sea into it. Why not from the sea into it: because we [thus] transport from a karmelith into private ground? Then from it into the sea, one also transports from private ground to a karmelith? Hence it must surely mean on its edge.<sup>2</sup> which proves that they do not forbid one's force in connection with a karmelith: this proves it.

R. Huna said: As for the canal boats of Mesene,<sup>3</sup> we may carry in them only within [a distance of] four cubits.<sup>4</sup> But we say this only if they lack [a breadth of] four [handbreadths] at less than three [from the bottom edge]; but if they have [a breadth of] four at less than three, we have no objection; or if they are filled with canes and bullrushes,<sup>5</sup> we have no objection.<sup>6</sup> R. Nahman demurred to this: But let us say, Stretch and bring the partitions down.<sup>7</sup> Was it not taught, R. Jose son of R. Judah said: If one plants a rod in the street, at the top of which is a basket, and throws [an article] and it comes to rest upon it, he is liable: this proves that we say, Stretch and bring the partitions down,<sup>8</sup> so here too let us say, Stretch and bring the partition down? R. Joseph demurred to this, Yet did they not hear what was said by Rab Judah in Rab's name, which some trace to R. Hiyya: And it was taught thereon, But the Sages exempt [him]?<sup>9</sup> Said Abaye to him: And do you not hold thus? But it was taught: If a pillar in the street [is] ten [handbreadths] high and four broad, but its base is not four, and this narrow portion is three [in height],<sup>10</sup> and one throws [an article] and it alights upon it, he is liable: this proves that we say, Stretch and bring the partitions down;<sup>11</sup> so here too, stretch and bring the partition down. Hence [Abaye continues].<sup>12</sup> this is surely [not] an argument; there<sup>13</sup> it is partition through which goats can pass;<sup>14</sup> but here<sup>15</sup> they are partitions through which goats cannot pass.<sup>16</sup> R. Aha son of R. Aha said to R. Ashi: But in the case of a ship too, there is the passing through of fish? The passing through of fish is not designated passing through, he replied. And whence do you say this? For R. Tabla asked Rab: Can a suspended partition make a ruin permissible [for carrying therein]?<sup>17</sup> And he answered him: A suspended partition makes [something] permissible only

---

(1) From the edge of the water.

(2) In the latter case the water is not poured directly into the sea but on to the ship's edge. whence it descends into the sea.

(3) V. p, 174. n. 8.

- (4) So MS.M. These boats are very narrow and taper to a knife edge in the water. Being thus less than four handbreadths wide at the bottom they do not count as private ground (v. supra 6a), and therefore one may not carry in them.
- (5) Up to the height where they have a breadth of four.
- (6) Providing in both cases that they are ten high above the level which gives the breadth of four.
- (7) I.e., adopt the legal fiction that the sides of the boat drop vertically down to the water, which gives the necessary breadth to make it rank as private ground.
- (8) For only if we assume imaginary partitions descending from the sides of the basket, which is not ten handbreadths deep itself have we the necessary conditions for culpability.
- (9) Which proves that the majority reject this legal fiction.
- (10) So that the principle of being accounted as joined to the ground from the level which gives a breadth of four does not operate.
- (11) Otherwise the base would be disregarded, and the sides above would count as partitions suspended in the air, which cannot form a private domain.
- (12) R. Joseph's question.
- (13) In the case of the basket set on top of a rod.
- (14) I.e., even if one adopts that fiction, such imaginary partitions cannot keep goats out! and that is the legal test of a barrier; therefore the Rabbis exempt him.
- (15) In the case of the boat.
- (16) Being in the water.
- (17) E.g. the ruins of a hut which has part of a wall hanging from the roof: does this wall make it as though enclosed, so that it ranks as a private domain?

## **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 101b**

in water, this being a leniency which the Rabbis permitted in connection with water. But why so: surely there is the passing through of fish? Hence infer from this that the passing through of fish is not designated passing through.

IF SHIPS ARE TIED TOGETHER, etc. This is obvious?—Said Raba. This is necessary only to permit [carrying via] a small boat [lying] between them.<sup>1</sup> Said R. Safra to him, By Moses!<sup>2</sup> do you say right? We learnt, ONE MAY CARRY FROM ONE TO ANOTHER!<sup>3</sup>—Rather said R. Safra. It is necessary only to [teach that one may] combine them<sup>4</sup> and carry from one to another, and as it was taught: If ships are tied to each other, one may combine them and carry from one to another. If they are separated, they become prohibited. If they are rejoined, whether in ignorance<sup>5</sup> or wilfully, accidentally or erroneously,<sup>6</sup> they revert to their original permitted condition. Likewise, if mats are spread [i.e.. hung up].<sup>7</sup> one may combine them and carry from one to another. If they are rolled up, they become prohibited. If they are respread,<sup>8</sup> whether in ignorance or wilfully, accidentally or erroneously, they revert to their original permitted condition. For every partition that is made on the Sabbath, whether ignorantly or wilfully, is designated a partition, But that is not so? For did not R. Nahman say: They learnt this only in respect of throwing,<sup>9</sup> yet it is forbidden to carry [therein]?<sup>10</sup> — R. Nahman's [dictum] was stated in reference to wilful [erection].<sup>11</sup>

Samuel said: Even if they are tied by a cloak ribbon. How is that: if it can hold them together, it is obvious? If it cannot hold them together, why [does it suffice]? — In truth, it is one that can hold them together, but Samuel comes to discount his own [dictum]. For we learnt: If one ties it [a ship]<sup>12</sup> with something that holds it still, it brings defilement to it; with something that does not hold it still, it does not bring defilement to it. Whereon Samuel observed: Providing that it is fastened with iron chains.<sup>13</sup> Now, it is only with respect to defilement where it is written, one that it slain with a sword,<sup>14</sup> [teaching.] the sword is like the slain,<sup>15</sup> that that [Samuel's dictum] is so. But with respect to the Sabbath, since it can hold it still, even [if it be] with the ribbon of a cloak, [it is sufficient].

---

(1) The larger ships being fastened to the opposite sides of the boat,

- (2) Or, Scholar, great as Moses!
- (3) Not via a third.
- (4) By means of an 'erub (q.v. Glos.), if they belong to different owners.
- (5) Either of the fact that it is the Sabbath, or that this is interdicted on the Sabbath.
- (6) While engaged in fastening something else one tied the boats instead.
- (7) Forming tents, all belonging to separate owners.
- (8) On the Sabbath.
- (9) The space enclosed by partitions erected on the Sabbath is private ground only in so far that throwing an object therein from public ground is a culpable offence.
- (10) By Rabbinical law.
- (11) In which case the Rabbis have imposed the interdict as penalty.
- (12) If it is a ship that can be defiled (v. supra 83b).
- (13) Rashi: If a ship is moored by a chain to a wharf where a corpse is lying and touching the chain. Tosaf. explains the passage quite differently but with emendation of the text.
- (14) Num. XIX, 16.
- (15) I.e.. metal that touches a corpse has the same degree of uncleanness as the corpse itself (v. Pes. 14b). and therefore the chain defiles the ship.

### **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 102a**

MISHNAH. IF ONE THROWS [AN ARTICLE] AND RECALLS [THAT IT IS THE SABBATH] AFTER IT LEAVES HIS HAND, AND ANOTHER CATCHES IT,<sup>1</sup> OR A DOG CATCHES IT. OR IT IS BURNT, HE IS NOT LIABLE.<sup>2</sup> IF ONE THROWS [AN ARTICLE] IN ORDER TO INFLICT A WOUND. WHETHER IN MAN OR IN BEAST, AND HE RECALLS [THAT IT IS THE SABBATH] BEFORE THE WOUND IS INFLICTED. HE IS NOT LIABLE THIS IS THE GENERAL PRINCIPLE: ALL WHO ARE LIABLE TO SIN-OFFERINGS ARE LIABLE ONLY IF THE BEGINNING AND THE END [OF THE FORBIDDEN ACTION] ARE UNWITTING. IF THEIR BEGINNING IS UNWITTING WHILE THEIR END IS WILFUL, IF THEIR BEGINNING IS WILFUL WHILE THEIR END IS UNWITTING. THEY ARE NOT LIABLE, UNLESS THEIR BEGINNING AND END ARE UNWITTING.

GEMARA. Hence if it alighted. he is liable:<sup>3</sup> But surely he did not remind himself, and we learnt, ALL WHO ARE LIABLE TO SIN-OFFERINGS ARE LIABLE ONLY IF THE BEGINNING AND THE END [OF THE FORBIDDEN ACTION] ARE UNWITTING? Said R. Kahana: The last clause is applicable to a bolt and a cord.<sup>4</sup> [You say.] 'A bolt and a cord'! But is not its tie in his hand?<sup>5</sup> -It means, e.g., that he intended to inflict a wound. But this too we learnt:<sup>6</sup> IF ONE THROWS [AN ARTICLE] IN ORDER TO INFLICT A WOUND, WHETHER IN MAN OR IN BEAST, AND HE RECALLS [THAT IT IS THE SABBATH] BEFORE THE WOUND IS INFLICTED, HE IS NOT LIABLE?-Rather said Raba: It refers to one who carries.<sup>7</sup> But the statement, THIS IS THE GENERAL PRINCIPLE, is stated with reference to throwing? Rather said Raba: Two [contingencies] are taught. [Thus:] IF ONE THROWS [AN ARTICLE] AND RECALLS [that it is the Sabbath] after it leaves his hand, or even if he does not recall [it], but ANOTHER CATCHES IT, OR A DOG CATCHES IT, OR IT IS BURNT, HE IS NOT LIABLE'- R. Ashi said: It [the Mishnah] is defective, and teaches this: 'IF ONE THROWS [AN ARTICLE] AND RECALLS [THAT IT IS THE SABBATH] AFTER IT LEAVES HIS HAND, AND ANOTHER CATCHES IT, OR A DOG CATCHES IT, OR IT IS BURNT, HE IS NOT LIABLE.'<sup>8</sup> But if it alights, he is liable. That, however, is said only if he forgot again;<sup>9</sup> but if he did not forget again, he is not liable, because ALL WHO ARE LIABLE TO SIN-OFFERINGS ARE LIABLE ONLY IF THE BEGINNING AND THE END [OF THE FORBIDDEN ACTION] ARE UNWITTING'.

THIS IS THE GENERAL PRINCIPLE: ALL WHO ARE LIABLE TO SIN-OFFERINGS. etc. It was stated: [If the object travels] two cubits unwittingly, two cubits deliberately, and two cubits

unwittingly.<sup>10</sup> — Rabbah ruled, He [the thrower] is not liable; Raba said: He is liable. ‘Rabbah ruled, He is not liable’: even according to R. Gamaliel, who maintained, Knowledge in respect of half the standard is of no consequence,<sup>11</sup> that is [only] there, because when he completes the standard, he completes it unwittingly, but here that [he completes it] wilfully, it is not so. But to what [does this refer]? If to one who throws, [surely] he is an unwitting offender?<sup>12</sup> -Rather it must refer to one who carries. ‘Raba said, He is liable’: even according to the Rabbis, who maintained, Knowledge in respect of half the standard is of consequence: that is [only] there, because it is in his power,<sup>13</sup> but here that it is not in his power, it is not so. But to what [does this refer]? If to one who carries, surely it is in his power? Rather it must refer to one who throws.<sup>14</sup>

Raba said: If one throws [an article] and it falls into the mouth of a dog or a furnace, he is culpable. But we learnt, AND ANOTHER CATCHES IT, OR A DOG CATCHES IT, OR IT IS BURNT, HE IS NOT LIABLE? — There that is not his intention; here this is his intention. R. Bibi b. Abaye said, We too have learnt [thus]: A person may eat once, and be liable to four sin-offerings and one guilt-offering on account thereof, [viz.:] All unclean person who eats heleb, which is nothar<sup>15</sup> of sacred food [sacrifices] on the Day of Atonement.<sup>16</sup> R. Meir said: If in addition it is the Sabbath, and he carries it out in his mouth, he is liable.<sup>17</sup> Said they to him, That does not fall under this designation.<sup>18</sup> Yet why so? Surely this is not the normal way of carrying out?<sup>19</sup> But [what you must say is.] since he intends it this, his design renders it [his mouth) the [right] place,<sup>20</sup> so here too, since he intends [it this].<sup>21</sup> his design renders it [the mouth of the dog or of the furnace] a place [for depositing] [

---

(1) Before it falls to the ground.

(2) The exact meaning is discussed infra.

(3) This assumes that the Mishnah means, AND RECALLS, and, ANOTHER CATCHES, etc.

(4) Tied together. I.e., the second clause can refer only to one who throws a bolt whilst retaining the cord in his hand. If he recollects before it reaches the ground, he can pull it back; hence if he does not pull it back the end (sc. its alighting) is deliberate. But if the article has left his hand entirely and he cannot prevent its falling, the end too is regarded as unwitting, whether he recollects or not.

(5) That is not throwing at all.

(6) Rashi reads: But we learnt this explicitly why then intimate it in the general principle?

(7) Sc. the last clause: if he recollects, he can stop before he has traversed four cubits.

(8) This is all one, not as Raba interprets it.

(9) Before it alighted.

(10) The thrower or carrier (v. infra to which this actually refers) was unaware of the Sabbath (or that throwing is prohibited) during the first two cubits of its passage, recollected for the next two, and forgot again for the last two. — Of course, this is a most unlikely hypothesis almost impossible in fact. Many similar unlikely contingencies are discussed in the Talmud, and their purpose is to establish the principles by which they are governed and which may then be applied to normal possibilities.

(11) Cf. p. 341. n. 8. Here too’ two cubits is half the standard.

(12) Even if he recollects, since it has left his hand and he cannot bring it back.

(13) Not to complete the action.

(14) Thus there is no controversy, each referring to a different case.

(15) For heleb and nothar v. Glos.

(16) He is liable to separate sin-offering because he has violated the interdicts of heleb, nothar, eating on the Day of Atonement, and the prohibition against an unclean person’s consumption of sacred food. Again, since the heleb of a sacrifice belongs to the altar, he is liable to a guilt-offering for trespass.

(17) On account of carrying.

(18) Sc. eating, for this liability is on account of carrying, not of eating; v. Ker. 13b.

(19) One is not liable for performing an action in an abnormal manner.

(20) For holding the food in to carry it out. R. Han.: his design renders his mouth the equivalent of a place four handbreadths square, whence and whither removal and depositing can take place.

(21) Sc. that the dog should catch it, etc.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 102b

### CHAPTER XII

MISHNAH. IF ONE BUILDS HOW MUCH MUST HE BUILD TO BE CULPABLE? he WHO BUILDS HOWEVER LITTLE, AND HE WHO CHISELS, AND HE WHO STRIKES WITH A HAMMER OR WITH AN ADZE, AND HE WHO BORES [A HOLE], HOWEVER LITTLE,<sup>1</sup> IS CULPABLE. THIS IS THE GENERAL PRINCIPLE: WHOEVER DOES WORK ON THE SABBATH AND HIS WORK ENDURES,<sup>2</sup> IS CULPABLE. R. SIMEON B. GAMALIEL SAID: HE TOO IS CULPABLE WHO BEATS WITH THE SLEDGE HAMMER ON THE ANVIL AT THE TIME OF HIS WORK, BECAUSE HE IS AS ONE WHO IMPROVES HIS WORK.<sup>3</sup>

GEMARA. 'HOWEVER LITTLE'-what is that fit for?-Said R. Jeremiah: Because a poor man digs a hole to hide his perutoth therein.<sup>4</sup> Similarly in connection with the Tabernacle such a labour was performed because those who sewed the curtain dug holes to put away their needles therein. Said Abaye. Since they would rust, they would not do so! Rather [say]: because a poor man makes the feet of a small stove to place a pot upon it. Similarly in connection with the Tabernacle, [such a labor was performed] because those who boiled the dyes for dyeing the curtains, when their materials [the finished dyes] were insufficient, they made the feet of a small stove to place a small kettle upon it. Said R. Aha b. Jacob: There is no poverty in the place of wealth.<sup>5</sup> Rather [say] because a householder who finds a hole in his dwelling closes it up. Similarly in connection with the Tabernacle, [such a labour was performed] because when a board was attacked by wood-worms, one dropped molten lead into it and closed it.<sup>6</sup>

Samuel said: He who arranges a building stone<sup>7</sup> is culpable.<sup>8</sup> An objection is raised: If one places the stone and another the mortar, he who places the mortar is culpable?<sup>9</sup> — But according to your view, consider the second clause: R. Jose said:<sup>10</sup> Even if one lifts up [the stone] and sets [it] on the row of stones, he is liable? Rather [the fact is that] there are three modes of building, [viz., in connection with] the lower, the middle, and the upper [rows]. The lower requires arranging in place and [filling] earth [around it];<sup>11</sup> the middle<sup>12</sup> requires mortar too; whilst the top merely [requires] placing.<sup>13</sup>

AND HE WHO CHISELS. On what score is a chiseller culpable? — Rab said: On the score of building: while Samuel said: On the score of beating with a hammer.<sup>14</sup> If one makes a hole in a hencoop,<sup>15</sup> — Rab said: [He is culpable] on account of building; while Samuel said: On account of beating with a hammer. If one inserts a pin through the eyelet of a spade,<sup>16</sup> -Rab said: [He is liable] on account of building; while Samuel said: On account of beating with a hammer. Now, these are [all] necessary. For if we were informed of the first, [I would argue]: in that case Rab rules [so], because such is a mode of building;<sup>17</sup> but if one makes a hole in a hen-coop, seeing that this is not a mode of building, I would maintain that he agrees with Samuel. And if we were informed of this [latter one only],-here does Rab rule [thus], because it is similar to a building, since it is made for ventilation; but [as for inserting] a pin through the eyelet of a spade, which is not a mode of building, I would say that he agrees with Samuel. And if we were told of this [latter one], only here does Samuel rule [thus], but in the former two I would maintain that he agrees with Samuel:<sup>18</sup> [hence] they are necessary.

R. Nathan b. Oshaia asked R. Johanan: On what grounds is a chiseller culpable? He intimated to him with his hand, On account of beating with a hammer. But we learnt, HE WHO CHISELS AND HE WHO BEATS WITH A HAMMER?- Say, ' HE WHO CHISELS, WHO BEATS WITH A HAMMER'<sup>19</sup> Come and hear:

- 
- (1) 'However little' applies to all the foregoing labours.
  - (2) I.e., it is not necessary to add thereto, which on occasion may be complete in itself
  - (3) This is explained in the Gemara.
  - (4) Perutah. pl. perutoth, a very small coin. Thus we find an instance of very little building, and therefore this sets the standard. Money was hidden in the earth. Cf. B.M. 42a: 'Money can only be guarded by placing it in the earth'; Josephus. Wars, V. 7. 2: 'which the owners have treasured up underground against the uncertain fortunes of war'. (5) The labors performed there being the basis for the principal Sabbath labours, v. supra 73a.
  - (5) This would never be necessary there, for everything was prepared in large quantities.
  - (6) All these are instances of building.
  - (7) Shifting the stone about on the ground until it is in the right spot.
  - (8) For building, even if no mortar is used.
  - (9) But not the former, which contradicts Samuel.
  - (10) Tosaf. omits 'R. Jose said', and Wilna Gaon makes a somewhat similar emendation.
  - (11) But no mortar, and Samuel refers to this.
  - (12) This means all the rows between the bottom and the top rows.
  - (13) Without the meticulous care needed for the bottom row, since nothing was to go upon it.
  - (14) This being the completion of the work, v. supra 75b.
  - (15) For ventilation, etc.
  - (16) Rashi: the pin passed through the handle and made it fast to the blade.
  - (17) Chiselling a stone to smooth it is an essential part of building.
  - (18) By reversing the former argument.
  - (19) The latter being explanatory of the former.

### **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 103a**

HE WHO BORES A HOLE, HOWEVER LITTLE, IS CULPABLE. As for Rab, it is well: it looks like boring a hole for a building. But according to Samuel,<sup>1</sup> [surely] this is not a completion of work?<sup>2</sup> — The meaning here is that he pierces it with an iron pick and leaves it therein, so that that is the completion of its work. THIS IS THE GENERAL PRINCIPLE. What does THIS IS THE GENERAL PRINCIPLE add?<sup>3</sup> -It adds the case of hollowing out a kapiza in a kab measure.<sup>4</sup>

R. SIMEON B. GAMALIEL SAID: HE TOO IS CULPABLE WHO BEATS WITH THE SLEDGE-HAMMER ON THE ANVIL, etc. What does he do?<sup>5</sup> -Rabbah and R. Joseph both say: Because he trains his hand. The sons of Rahabah found this difficult: if so, if one sees a labour [being performed] on the Sabbath he really culpable?<sup>6</sup> — But Abaye and Raba both say: Because those who beat out the [metal] plates of the Tabernacle<sup>7</sup> did thus.<sup>8</sup> It was taught likewise: R. Simeon b. Gamaliel said: Also he who beats with the sledge-hammer on the anvil at the time of his work is culpable, because those who beat out the [metal] plates of the Tabernacle did thus.

MISHNAH. HE WHO PLOUGHS, HOWEVER LITTLE, HE WHO WEEDS AND HE WHO TRIMS [TREES],<sup>9</sup> AND HE WHO CUTS OFF YOUNG SHOOTS, HOWEVER LITTLE, IS CULPABLE. HE WHO GATHERS TIMBER: IF IN ORDER TO EFFECT AN IMPROVEMENT,<sup>10</sup> [THE STANDARD OF CULPABILITY IS] HOWEVER LITTLE; IF FOR FUEL, AS MUCH AS IS REQUIRED FOR BOILING A LIGHT EGG. IF ONE COLLECTS GRASS, IF TO EFFECT AN IMPROVEMENT, [THE STANDARD OF CULPABILITY IS] HOWEVER LITTLE; IF FOR AN ANIMAL[‘S FODDER], A KID'S MOUTHFUL.

GEMARA. What is it fit for?<sup>11</sup> -It is fit for [planting] the seeds of a pumpkin.<sup>12</sup> Similarly in respect to the Tabernacle, [such a labour was performed] because it is fit for one stalk of [vegetable] dyes.

HE WHO WEEDS AND HE WHO TRIMS [TREES] AND HE WHO CUTS OFF YOUNG SHOOTS. Our Rabbis taught: He who plucks endives and he who cuts greens [shoots],<sup>13</sup> if for [human] consumption, [the standard of culpability is] the size of a dried fig; is for animal [food], a kid's mouthful; if for fuel, as much as is required for boiling a light egg; if in order to improve the soil,<sup>14</sup> however little. Are not all in order to improve the soil?<sup>15</sup> Rabbah and R. Joseph both say: They [the Sages] learnt this of an uncleared field.<sup>16</sup> Abaye said: You may even say [that they spoke] of a field that is not uncleared, but in a case where he has no intention.<sup>17</sup> But surely Abaye and Raba both said, R. Simeon admits in a case of, 'cut off his head but let him not die'?<sup>18</sup> This holds good only when he works in his neighbour's field.<sup>19</sup>

MISHNAH. HE WHO WRITES TWO LETTERS, WHETHER WITH HIS RIGHT OR WITH HIS LEFT HAND, OF THE SAME DESIGNATION OR OF TWO DESIGNATIONS<sup>20</sup> OR IN TWO PIGMENTS,<sup>21</sup> IN ANY LANGUAGE, IS CULPABLE. SAID R. JOSE: THEY DECLARED ONE CULPABLE [FOR WRITING] TWO LETTERS ONLY BECAUSE [HE MAKES] A MARK, BECAUSE THUS DID THEY WRITE ON EACH BOARD OF THE TABERNACLE, TO KNOW WHICH WAS ITS COMPANION.<sup>22</sup> R. JUDAH SAID: WE FIND A SHORT NAME [FORMING PART] OF A LONG NAME: SHEM AS PART OF SHime'on OR SHemuel, Noah AS PART OF Nahor, Dan AS PART OF Daniel, Gad AS PART OF Gaddi'el.<sup>23</sup>

GEMARA. As for his being culpable on account of his right hand, that is well, since that is the [usual] way of writing; but why on account of his left hand, seeing that it is not the [usual] way of writing?—Said R. Jeremiah, They learnt this of a left-handed person. Then let his left hand be as the right hand of all [other] people, and so let him be liable on account of his left, but not his right hand? — Rather said Abaye: [They learned this] of one who can use both hands. R. Jacob the son of Jacob's daughter<sup>24</sup> said: The author of this is R. Jose, who said: THEY DECLARED ONE CULPABLE [FOR WRITING] TWO LETTERS ONLY BECAUSE [HE MAKES] A MARK.<sup>25</sup> But since the second clause is R. Jose['s], the first clause is not R. Jose? — The whole is R. Jose.

R. JUDAH SAID: WE FIND, [etc.] Then according to R. Judah, one is culpable only on account of two letters of two designations,<sup>26</sup> but not two letters of the same designation? But surely it was taught: [If a soul shall sin unwittingly against any of the commandments of the Lord concerning things which ought not to be done,] and shall do of one [of them]:<sup>27</sup> I might think that one must write the whole noun or weave a whole garment or make a whole sieve [before he is guilty]; hence 'of one' is stated. If 'of one', I might think that even if one writes only one letter or weaves a single thread or makes only one mesh of a sieve, [he is culpable];

---

(1) Who holds that boring a hole is not building.

(2) For the hole must be filled up subsequently.

(3) It is a rule that this phrase always adds something not explicitly mentioned.

(4) The kapiza was a small measure, less than a kab. If one hollows out a kapiza in a block of wood that is large enough for a kab, one might think that this labour is incomplete for he will probably enlarge it subsequently to a kab. Therefore the general principle is stated to teach that this is a complete labour. On the size of a kapiza v. J.E. XII, 488 I; and 489 Table.

(5) How does this constitute a labour? (8) Merely by watching.

(6) Surely not.

(7) For covering the altar.

(8) They beat the anvil occasionally, that it might present a smooth surface for the metal plates.

(9) By lopping off dead branches, etc.

(10) E.g., he cuts off branches or twigs to allow of a more vigorous growth.

(11) Sc. ploughing very little.

(12) 'Ar. and MS.M.: as a cavity for a pumpkin.

(13) When very young these are fit for human consumption; a little later they are only fit for animals, and still later,

when more hardened, they are used as fuel.

(14) To leave room for expansion for the other plants.

(15) That is their effect, whatever the intention.

(16) Where the improvement is unnecessary.

(17) Of improving the soil.

(18) v. 75a. This too is inevitable.

(19) Since he has no interest in his neighbour's field, the inevitable improvement is disregarded.

(20) I.e., the same letter twice or two different letters.

(21) E.g., one letter in black and one in red.

(22) So that when the Tabernacle was dismantled and subsequently re-erected. the boards should remain in the same order as before. Therefore if one makes any two marks, not particularly letters, he is guilty in R. Jose's view.

(23) If one commences writing long names, but writes only part thereof, which forms a complete name in itself, he is liable. The actual transliteration is employed here and in the Gemara below, to show the exact letters referred to.

(24) Rashi in 'Er. 8 states that the father was an unworthy person, and so he is not mentioned.

(25) Even a right-handed person can do that quite easily with his left.

(26) I.e., two different letters, since he does not give an example of two identical letters, e.g., SHesh as part of SHishak.

(27) Lev. IV, 2; lit. translation. In a way, 'of' and 'one' are contradictory. since 'of' denotes a portion of an act, whereas 'one' implies a complete act. This is discussed here, the various views put forward really being attempts to harmonize the two.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 103b

therefore 'one' is stated. How is this [to be reconciled]? One is liable only if he writes a short noun [as part] of a long noun: SHem as part of SHime'on or SHemu'el, Noah as part of Nahor, Dan as part of Dani'el, Gad as part of Gaddi'el.<sup>1</sup> R. Judah said: Even if one writes two letters of the same designation, he is liable: e.g., SHesh, Teth, Rar, Gag, Hah.<sup>2</sup> Said R. Jose: Is he then guilty on account of writing? Surely he is guilty only on account of [making] a mark, because marks were made on [each of] the boards of the Tabernacle to know which was its companion Therefore if one draws one line across two boards, or two lines on one board, he is culpable. R. Simeon said: 'And shall do one': I might think that one must write the whole noun or weave a complete garment or make a whole sieve [before he is liable]; therefore it is written, 'of one'. If of one, I might think that even if one writes one letter only, or weaves one thread only, or makes one mesh only in a sieve, [he is guilty]: therefore 'one' is stated. How is this [to be reconciled]? One is liable only when he performs an action the like of which stands [on its own].<sup>3</sup> R. Jose said: 'And shall do one, and shall to them': sometimes one sacrifice is incurred for all of them, at others one is liable for each separately.<sup>4</sup> Now it is incidentally taught, R. Judah said: Even if one only writes two letters of the same designation, he is liable?-There is no difficulty: one is his own [view], the other is his teacher's. For it was taught: R. Judah said in R. Gamaliel's name: Even if one only writes two letters of the same designation, he is liable, e.g., SHesh, Teth, Rar, Gag, Hah.

Now R. Simeon, is he not identical with the first Tanna? And should you answer, they differ in respect of the a'a of a'azzereka:<sup>5</sup> the first Tanna holding, [for writing] the a'a of a'azzereka one is not liable:<sup>6</sup> while R. Simeon holds, Since it is contained in charms in general,<sup>7</sup> he is culpable, — shall we then say that R. Simeon is more stringent? Surely it was taught: He who bores, however little,<sup>8</sup> he who scrapes,<sup>9</sup> however little, he who tans, however little, he who draws a figure on a vessel, however little, [is culpable]. R. Simeon said: [He is not culpable] unless he bores right through or scrapes the whole of it [the skin] or tans the whole of it or draws the whole of it!<sup>10</sup> Rather R. Simeon comes to teach us this: [one is not guilty] unless he writes the whole word. But can you say so? Surely it was taught, R. Simeon said: 'And shall do one': you might think that one must write the whole word; therefore 'of one' is stated?-Answer and say thus: You might think that one must write a complete sentence, therefore 'of one' is stated.

R. Jose said: 'And shall do one, and shall do them': sometimes one sacrifice is incurred for all of them, at others one is liable for each separately. Said R. Jose son of R. Hanina, What is R. Jose's reason? 'One', 'of one', 'them', 'of them': [this implies] one may be the equivalent of many, and many may equal one. 'one', [i.e.,] SHime'on; 'of one', [i.e.,] SHem [as part] of SHime'on; 'them' [i.e.,] the principal labours; 'of them':, the derivative labours. 'One is the equivalent of many' — awareness of the Sabbath coupled with unawareness of [the forbidden nature of his] labours. 'Many may equal one' unawareness of the Sabbath coupled with awareness [of the forbidden nature of his] labours.<sup>11</sup>

R. JUDAH SAID: WE FIND A SHORT NAME [FORMING PART] OF A LONG NAME. Are they then similar: the mem of SHem is closed, whereas that of SHime'on is open?<sup>12</sup> -Said R. Hisda: This proves that if a closed [mem] is written open,<sup>13</sup> it is valid.<sup>14</sup> An objection is raised: U-kethabtam:<sup>15</sup> it must be kethibah tammah [perfect writing];<sup>16</sup> thus one must not write the alef as an 'ayyin, the 'ayyin as an alef, the beth as a kaf, or the kaf as a beth, the gimmel as a zadde or the zadde as a gimmel,<sup>17</sup> the daleth as a resh or the resh as a daleth, the heh as a heth or the heth as a heh, the waw as a yod or the yod as a waw, the zayyin as a nun or the nun as a zayyin, the teth as a pe or the pe as a teth, bent letters straight or straight letters bent,<sup>18</sup> the mem as a samek or the samek as a mem, closed [letters] open or open letters closed.<sup>19</sup> An open section [parashah] may not be written closed, nor a closed section open.<sup>20</sup> If one writes it as the 'Song', or if one writes the 'Song' as the general text,<sup>21</sup> or if one writes it without ink, or if one writes the 'Names'<sup>22</sup> in gold, they [the Scrolls thus written] must be 'hidden'.<sup>23</sup> -He [R. Hisda] holds with the following Tanna. For it was taught, R. Judah b. Bathyra said: In reference to the second [day] 'We-niskehem [and their drink-offerings]' is stated; in reference to the sixth, 'u-nesakehah [and the drink-offerings thereof]'; in reference to the seventh, 'ke-mishpatam [after the ordinance]':<sup>24</sup> this gives mem, yod, mem<sup>25</sup> [i.e.,] mayim [water], whence we have a Biblical intimation of the water libation.<sup>26</sup> Now since if an open letter is written closed, it is valid,<sup>27</sup> a closed [letter] is the same, [viz.,] if a closed letter is written open, it is fit. But how compare! If an open [letter] is written closed,

(1) Though examples of proper nouns are given, there is no reason for not assuming that the same does not apply to common nouns too, both here and in the Mishnah.

(2) These are complete words in themselves, and also the beginnings of longer words. SHesh == linen; Teth == giving; Rar == flowing; Gag == roof; Hah == hook.

(3) V. p. 490, n.2 on Mishnah supra 102b.

(4) This is explained below.

(5) Isa. XLV, 5, E.V.: I will gird thee. The word commences with a double alef (ךך), and a double alef does not form an independent word.

(6) Since it is not a word.

(7) Rashi. Tosaf., and R. Han. Jast.: since it has merely the value of a vowel letter.

(8) Even if the wood is not pierced right through.

(9) E.g., hair off skin.

(10) I.e., the entire figure which he intended to draw. This proves that he is more lenient.

(11) V. supra 70a and b for notes.

(12) Mem at the end of a word is written מ (closed); in the middle it is written מ (open).

(13) In a Scroll of the law, or in a mezuzah or phylacteries.

(14) Hence when one writes מ with a closed mem it is still possible to add thereto as it stands.

(15) Deut. VI, 9: E.V.: and thou shalt write them.

(16) This is a play on u-kethabtam by dividing it into two words.

(17) The original reads, the gamma, this being the ancient name of the letter. In the translation the modern name is used.

(18) The medial forms of kaf, pe, zadde and nun are bent, thus: כ פ צ נ the final forms are straight, thus: כף פף צף נף.

(19) This refers to the open and closed mem.-Thus this contradicts R. Hisda.

(20) The parashiot (chapters or sections) are either open or closed, the nature of each parashah being fixed by tradition. Maimonides and Asheri differ on the definition of 'open' and 'closed', but the present practice is this: Both an open and

a closed parashah end in the middle of the line, but in an open one the next parashah commences on the following line, whereas in a closed parashah the next one commences on the same line after a short blank space. V.J.E. art. Scroll of the Law, XI, 192'f.

(21) The 'Song' refers to the two songs of Moses, Ex. XV, 1-18 and Deut. XXXII, 1-43. The first is written in the form of half bricks set over whole bricks, \_\_\_\_\_ thus: \_\_\_\_\_ The second is written in seventy double half-columns, thus: \_\_\_\_\_

(22) Lit., 'the mentions' (of the Divine Name).

(23) This is the technical term to indicate that a Scroll is unfit for public use and must be 'hidden', i.e., buried; v. Meg. 26b.

(24) V. Num. XXIX, 19, 31, 33. The reference is to the Feast of Tabernacles.

(25) Taking one letter out of each of these three words.

(26) Which took place on that Feast, v. Ta'an. 2b. For a description of the ceremony v. Suk. 48a and b. The sanctity of this ceremony was disputed by the Sadducees, as stated in the Mishnah a.l.; cf. also Josephus, Ant. XIII, 13, 5 and Halevy, Doroth, 1, 3, 480 seq. This may be the reason why R. Judah b. Bathyra sought a hint for it in the Bible.

(27) The mem of we-niskehem, coming as it does at the end, is closed; but it is taken as the first letter of mayim, i.e., open; hence it follows that if an open letter is written closed the Scroll is fit.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 104a

it['s sanctity] is enhanced, for R. Hisda said: The mem and the samek which were in the Tables stood [there] by a miracle.<sup>1</sup> But as for a closed letter which is written open, it['s sanctity] is diminished, for R. Jeremiah-others state, R. Hiyya b. Abba-said [The double form of] manzapak<sup>2</sup> was declared by the Watchmen [prophets].<sup>3</sup> (But, is that reasonable: surely is is written, These are the commandments,<sup>4</sup> [teaching] that a prophet may henceforth [i.e., after Moses] make no innovations! — Rather they were in existence, but it was not known which were [to be used] medially and which finally, and the Watchmen came and fixed [the mode of their employment]). But still, 'these are the commandments' [teaches] that a prophet may henceforth make no innovations?<sup>5</sup> — Rather they had forgotten them, and they [the Watchmen] reinstated them.<sup>6</sup>

It was stated above, R. Hisda said: The mem and the samek which were in the Tables stood [there] by a miracle. R. Hisda also said: The writing of the Tables could be read from within and without,<sup>7</sup> e.g., nehub [hollow] would be read buban;-behar [in the mountain] [as] rahab; saru [they departed] [as] waras.<sup>8</sup> The Rabbis told R. Joshua b. Levi: Children have come to the Beth Hamidrash and said things the like of which was not said even in the days of Joshua the son of Nun. [Thus:] alef Beth [means] 'learn wisdom [alef Binah];<sup>9</sup> Gimmel Daleth, show kindness to the Poor [Gemol Dallim]. Why is the foot of the Gimmel stretched toward the Daleth? Because it is fitting for<sup>10</sup> the benevolent to run after [seek out] the poor. And why is the roof<sup>11</sup> of the Daleth stretched out toward the Gimmel? Because he [the poor] must make himself available to him.<sup>12</sup> And why is the face of the Daleth turned away from the Gimmel? Because he must give him [help] in secret,<sup>13</sup> lest he be ashamed of him. He, Waw, that is the Name of the Holy One, blessed be He;<sup>14</sup> Zayyin, Heth, Teth, Yod, Kaf, Lamed: [this sequence teaches,] and if thou doest thus, the Holy One, blessed be He, will sustain [Zan] thee, be gracious [Hen] unto thee, show goodness [metib] to thee, give thee a heritage [Yerushah], and bind a crown [Kether] on thee in the world to come. The open Mem and the closed Mem [denote] open teaching [Ma'amar] and closed [esoteric] teaching.<sup>15</sup> The bent Nun and the straight Nun: the faithful [Ne'eman] if bent [humble], [will ultimately be] the faithful, straightened.<sup>16</sup> Samek, 'ayyin: support [Semak] the poor ['aniyyim]. Another interpretation: devise ['aseh] mnemonics [Simanin] in the Torah and [thus] acquire [memorize] it.<sup>17</sup> The bent pe and the straight pe [intimate] an open mouth [peh], a closed mouth.<sup>18</sup> A bent zadde and a straight zadde: the righteous [zaddik] is bent [in this world]; the righteous is straightened [in the next world].<sup>19</sup> But that is identical with the faithful bent [and] the faithful straightened?-The Writ added humility<sup>20</sup> to his humility;<sup>21</sup> hence [we learn that] the Torah was given under great submissiveness.<sup>22</sup> Kuf [stands for] Kadosh [holy]; Resh [for] Rasha' [wicked]: why is the face of the Kuf averted from, the Resh? The

Holy One, blessed be He, said: I cannot look at the wicked. And why is the crown of the Kuf<sup>23</sup> turned toward the Resh? The Holy One, blessed be He, saith: If he repents, I will bind a crown on him like Mine. And why is the foot of the Kuf suspended?<sup>24</sup> [To show] that if he repents, he can enter and be brought in [to God's favour] through this [opening]. This supports Resh Lakish, for Resh Lakish said: What is meant by, Surely he scorneth the scorers, But he giveth grace unto the lowly?<sup>25</sup> If one comes to defile himself, he is given an opening;<sup>26</sup> if one comes to cleanse himself, he is helped. SHin [stands for] SHeker [falsehood]; Taw [for] emeth [truth]: why are the letters of Sheker close together, whilst those of 'emeth are far apart?<sup>27</sup> Falsehood is frequent, truth is rare.<sup>28</sup> And why does falsehood [stand] on one foot, whilst truth has a brick-like foundation?<sup>29</sup> Truth can stand, falsehood cannot stand. AT Bash.<sup>30</sup> he that rejects Me [othi Ti'ew], shall I desire [eth'aweh] him? Bash: he that delighteth not in Me [Bi lo hashak], shall My Name [SHemi] rest upon him? Gar: he has defiled his body [Gufo] — shall I have mercy [arahem] upon him? Dak he has closed My doors [Dalthothay] shall I not cut off his horns [Karnaw]?<sup>31</sup> Thus far is the exegesis for the wicked, but the interpretation for the righteous is: AT Bash: If thou are ashamed [to sin] [attah Bosh], then Gar Dak [i.e.,] dwell [Gur] in heaven [Dok]. Haz Waf there will be a barrier [Hazazah] between thee and wrath [af] — Za' Has Tan nor wilt thou tremble [mizda'aze'a] before Satan [Satan]. Yam Kol: the prince of Gehenna said to the Holy One, blessed be He, Sovereign of the Universe! To the sea [Yam] let all [Kol] be consigned.<sup>32</sup> But the Holy One, blessed be He, replieth, AHas, Beta, Gif.<sup>33</sup> I [ani] spare [Has] them, because they have spurned [Ba'atu] sensual pleasures [Gif]. Dakaz: they are contrite [Dakkim]; they are true [Kenim]; they are righteous [Zaddikim]. Halak: thou hast [Lak] no portion [Helek] in them. UMarzan SHeth: the Gehenna cried out before Him, Sovereign of the Universe! My Lord [Mari]! Satiat me [Zenini] with the seed of SHeth.<sup>34</sup> [But] He retorted, al Bam [thou hast nought in them]; Gan Das: Whither shall I lead them? to the Garden [Gan] of myrtles [hadas].<sup>35</sup> Ha! Waf: the Gehenna cried out before the Holy One, blessed be He, Sovereign of the Universe! I am faint ['ayef] [with hunger]. [To which He relied.] Zaz Hak: these are the seed [Zar'o] of Isaac [Yizhak]. Tar Yesh Kat: Wait [Tar]! I have [Yesh] whole companies [Kitoth] of heathens whom I will give thee.

---

(1) The engraving of the Tables went right through from side to side. Consequently the completely closed letters, viz., the mem and the samek, should have fallen out, and the fact that they did not was a miracle. This assumes that only the closed mem was then in use, for it is now assumed that the employment of distinct medial forms was a later innovation. Hence if one writes a closed mem instead of an open one, he enhances its sanctity, since that is the older form. This is historically correct: the present medial forms were probably introduced in order to make it possible to join them to the next letter, and since this was unnecessary in the case of final letters, they were left in their original state. V. J.E., art. Alphabet, Vol. 1,443

(2) I.e., mem, nun, zadde, pe, and kaf (מ נ ז פ כ). V. Meg., Sonc. ed., p. 8, n. 5.

(3) Hence the open letters, dating from a later period, are less sacred.

(4) Lev. XXVII, 34.

(5) Even such definitive fixing, where none existed before, is held to be an innovation. Weiss, Dor, II, p. 8 maintains that this exegesis was directed against Paul's claim to abrogate the Torah.

(6) Hence both forms are of equal sanctity.

(7) I.e., from both sides.

(8) These words do not actually occur in the Ten Commandments written on the Tables, but are given as examples of what words might be legible backwards. For the writing would naturally appear backwards as seen from without and the letters of the words given as examples are fairly easy to read thus. Maharsha assumes that R. Hisda found some meaning in these reversed readings.

(9) Here follows an homiletic interpretation of the names of the Hebrew letters in alphabetical order.

(10) Lit., 'the way of'.

(11) Lit., 'foot'.

(12) And not trouble his benefactor too much, to find him.

(13) As though with averted face.

(14) These letters form part of the Tetragrammaton.

- (15) Such which men are forbidden to seek.
- (16) I.e., upright in the world to come. (Rashi): Jast. (s.v. **כפף** faithful when bent, faithful when straightened.
- (17) Cf. 'Er. 54b.
- (18) The medial (bent) pe is almost closed ( **פ** ). — 'A time to keep silence, and a time to speak' (Eccl. III, 7).
- (19) Or, righteous when bent, righteous when straight: cf. n. 8.
- (20) Lit., 'bending'.
- (21) I.e., particularly emphasized the virtue of humility.
- (22) Lit., 'with bent head'
- (23) The upward turn of the 'tittle' or 'dagger' on the upper line of the Kuf.
- (24) Not joined to the rest of the letter.
- (25) Prov. III, 34.
- (26) I.e., he is permitted, but not actively helped.
- (27) The three letters of Sheker, **שקר** occur together; whereas the three of emeth, **אמת** are far apart, **א** being the first, **מ** the middle, and **ת** the last letters of the alphabet.
- (28) I.e., Instances of truth are found only at distant intervals.
- (29) I.e., each of the letters of **שקר** is insecurely poised on one leg (**ש** was anciently written with a narrow pointed bottom) whereas those of **אמת** are firmly set, each resting on two ends, the **מ** too resting on a horizontal bar.
- (30) Here follows an interpretation of the letters coupled, the first with the last, the second with the last but one, and so on.
- (31) Or the passages may be understood affirmatively: though he has rejected Me, yet shall I desire him; etc.
- (32) Rashi: 'all'-i.e., including Israel; the sea, i.e., Gehenna.
- (33) A combination of letters wherein the first, eighth. and fifteenth are grouped together; similarly the second, ninth and sixteenth, and so on.
- (34) I.e., with all, both Jews and non-Jews.
- (35) I.e., of Eden, probably so called here on account of its fragrance: cf. B.B. 75a.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 104b

MISHNAH. IF ONE WRITES TWO LETTERS IN ONE STATE OF UNAWARENESS,<sup>1</sup> HE IS CULPABLE. IF ONE WRITES WITH INK, CHEMICALS, SIKRA,<sup>2</sup> KUMOS,<sup>3</sup> KANKANTUM,<sup>4</sup> OR WITH ANYTHING THAT LEAVES A MARK ON THE ANGLE OF TWO WALLS OR ON THE TWO LEAVES [TABLES] OF A LEDGER, AND THEY [THE TWO LETTERS] ARE READ<sup>5</sup> TOGETHER, HE IS CULPABLE. IF ONE WRITES ON HIS FLESH, HE IS CULPABLE: HE WHO SCRATCHES A MARK ON HIS FLESH, R. ELIEZER DECLARES HIM LIABLE TO A SIN-OFFERING; BUT THE SAGES EXEMPT HIM. IF ONE WRITES WITH A FLUID, WITH FRUIT JUICE, WITH ROAD DUST,<sup>6</sup> OR WITH WRITER'S POWDER,<sup>7</sup> OR WITH<sup>8</sup> ANYTHING THAT CANNOT ENDURE, HE IS NOT CULPABLE. [IF ONE WRITES] WITH THE BACK OF HIS HAND, WITH HIS FOOT, WITH HIS MOUTH, OR WITH HIS ELBOW; IF ONE WRITES ONE LETTER NEAR [OTHER] WRITING,<sup>9</sup> OR IF ONE WRITES UPON WRITING;<sup>10</sup> IF ONE INTENDS WRITING A HETH BUT WRITES TWO ZAYYININ; ONE [LETTER] ON THE GROUND AND ANOTHER ON A BEAM; IF ONE WRITES ON TWO WALLS OF THE HOUSE, OR ON TWO LEAVES OF A LEDGER WHICH ARE NOT TO BE READ<sup>11</sup> TOGETHER, HE IS NOT CULPABLE. IF ONE WRITES ONE LETTER AS AN ABBREVIATION,<sup>12</sup> R. JOSHUA B. BATHYRA HOLDS HIM LIABLE, WHILST THE SAGES EXEMPT HIM.

GEMARA. DY<sup>o</sup> [ink] is deyutha,- Sam [chemical] is samma [orpiment]; SIKRA: Rabbah b. Bar Hanah said, Its name is sekarta. Kumos is Kumma. Kankantum: Rabbah b. Bar Hanah said in Samuel's name, The blacking used by shoemakers.<sup>13</sup>

OR WITH ANYTHING THAT LEAVES A MARK. What does this add?<sup>14</sup> -It adds what was taught by R. Hanina: If he writes it [a divorce] with the fluid of taria,<sup>15</sup> or gall-nut [juice], it is

valid.<sup>16</sup> R. Hiyya taught: If he writes it with dust,<sup>17</sup> with a black pigment, or with coal, it is valid. HE WHO SCRATCHES A MARK ON HIS FLESH, [etc.] It was taught. R. Eliezer said to the Sages: But did not Ben Stada bring forth witchcraft from Egypt by means of scratches<sup>18</sup> [in the form of charms] upon his flesh?<sup>19</sup> He was a fool, answered they. and proof cannot be adduced from fools.<sup>20</sup>

IF ONE WRITES ONE LETTER NEAR [OTHER] WRITING. Who teaches this? — Said Rabbah son of R. Huna, It does not agree with R. Eliezer. For if [it agreed with] R. Eliezer, — surely he maintained, [for] one [thread] added to woven stuff, he is culpable.<sup>21</sup>

IF ONE WRITES UPON WRITING. Who teaches this? Said R. Hisda, It does not agree with R. Judah. For it was taught: If one had to write the [Divine] Name,<sup>22</sup> but [erroneously] intended to write Judah [YHWDH]<sup>23</sup> but omitted the daleth,<sup>24</sup> he can trace his reed [writing pen] over it and sanctify it: this is R. Judah's view;<sup>25</sup> but the Sages maintain: The [Divine] Name [thus written] is not of the most preferable.

It was taught: If one writes one letter and completes a book<sup>26</sup> therewith, [or] weaves one thread and completes a garment therewith, he is culpable. Who is the authority? — Said Rabbah son of R. Huna, It is R. Eliezer, who maintained: [For] one [thread] added to woven stuff, he is culpable. R. Ashi said, You may even say that it is the Rabbis: completing is different.

R. Ammi said: If one writes one letter in Tiberias and another in Sepphoris,<sup>27</sup> he is culpable: it is one [act of] writing but that it lacks being brought together. But we learnt: IF ONE WRITES ON TWO WALLS OF A HOUSE, OR ON TWO LEAVES OF A LEDGER WHICH CANNOT BE READ TOGETHER, HE IS NOT CULPABLE? — There the act of being brought together is lacking,<sup>28</sup> but here the act of bringing together is not lacking.<sup>29</sup>

A Tanna taught: If one corrects one letter, he is culpable. Now, seeing that if one writes one letter he is not culpable. if he [merely] corrects one letter he is culpable?<sup>30</sup> -Said R. Shesheth: The circumstances here are e.g., that he removes the roof [i.e. the upper bar] of a heth and makes two zayyin thereof. Raba said: E.g. he removes the projection of a daleth and makes a resh thereof.<sup>31</sup>

A Tanna taught: If one intended writing one letter,

---

(1) V. supra 67b.

(2) A kind of red paint.

(3) Ink prepared with gum.

(4) Vitriol used as an ingredient of ink.

(5) Lit., — lead'.

(6) Mixed with water to produce a weak ink. — Others: in the dust of the roads, i.e., one traces writing therein with his finger.

(7) The refuse of writing material, or the coloured sand strewn over the writing (Rashi and Jast.). Others: in writer's powder.

(8) Or 'in'.

(9) I.e., near a letter already written, so as to complete the word.

(10) To make it clearer.

(11) Lit., 'lead'.

(12) I.e., a letter followed by a short stroke or point to indicate that it is an abbreviation, e.g. ר for רבי.

(13) In the above the Hebrew of the Mishnah is translated into the more familiar Aramaic used by the amoraim. V. Git., Sonc. ed., p. 71, n. 2.

(14) V. p. 492. n. 5.

(15) A sort of ink. Rashi: either fruit juice or rain water. V. Low. Graph. Requisiten, pp. 158, 161. v. Meg.. Sonc. ed., p. 103.

- (16) Hence it must be regarded as durable and therefore involves culpability in connection with the Sabbath.
- (17) So cur. edd. Rashi reads: with lead.
- (18) Incisions.
- (19) Which proves that scratches are important. and so one should be liable therefore. In the uncensored text this passage follows: Was he then the son of Stada: surely he was the son of Pandira?-Said R. Hisda: The husband was Stada, the paramour was Pandira. But the husband was Pappos b. Judah? — His mother was Stada. But his mother was Miriam the hairdresser? — It is as we say in Pumbeditha: This one has been unfaithful to (lit., ‘turned away from’ — satath da) her husband. — On the identity of Ben Stada v. Sanh., Sonc. ed., p. 456, n. 5.
- (20) His action was too unusual to furnish a criterion.
- (21) V. infra 105a. The same principle applies here too.
- (22) The Tetragrammaton; the reference is to a Scroll of the Law, in which the Tetragrammaton must be written with sacred intention.
- (23) In this word the waw (W) is a vowel.
- (24) Thus writing YHWH-the Tetragrammaton-after all, but without sacred intention.
- (25) Thus he counts retracing as writing.
- (26) Rashi: of one of the Hebrew Scriptures.
- (27) Two towns of Galilee.
- (28) Before the two letters can be read as one the paper must be cut away. so that they can be put together.
- (29) E.g.. if the letters are written on the edges of two boards.
- (30) Surely not.
- (31) In a Scroll of one of the Biblical books. This constitutes a complete labour, because one may not permit a Scroll of Scripture to remain with an error.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 105a

but chanced to write two, he is culpable. But we learnt: HE IS NOT CULPABLE?<sup>1</sup> -There is no difficulty: in the one case it requires crownlets; in the other, it does not require crownlets.<sup>2</sup>

IF ONE WRITES ONE LETTER AS AN ABBREVIATION, R. JOSHUA B. BATHYRA HOLDS HIM LIABLE, WHILST THE SAGES EXEMPT HIM. R. Johanan said in R. Jose b. Zimra's name; How do we know [that] abbreviated forms [are recognized] by the Torah? Because it is written, for' AB [the father of] Hamwn [a multitude of]<sup>3</sup> nations have I made thee:<sup>4</sup> a father [Ab] of nations have I made thee; a chosen one [Bahur] among nations have I made thee. Hamwn beloved [Habib]<sup>5</sup> have I made thee among nations; a king [Melek] have I appointed thee for the nations; distinguished [Wathik] have I made thee among the nations; faithful [Ne'eman] have I made thee to the nations.<sup>6</sup> R. Johanan on his own authority quoted. anoky [I — am the Lord thy God, etc.].<sup>7</sup> I [ana] Myself [Nafshi] have written the Script [Kethibah Yehabith]. The Rabbis interpreted: Sweet speech [amirah Ne'imah], a writing, a gift [Kethibah Yehibah]. Others state, anoky [interpreted] reversed is: Scripture was given [to man] [Yahibah Kethibah]. faithful are its words [Ne'emanin amarehah]. The School of R. Nathan quoted, Because thy way is perverse [Yarat] before me:<sup>8</sup> She [the ass] feared [Yare'ah], saw [Ra'athah], [and] turned aside [natethah]. The School of R. Ishmael taught: Karmel [fresh ears]:<sup>9</sup> rounded [Kar] and full [Male]. R. Aha b. Jacob quoted, and he cursed me with a curse that is grievous [Nimrezeth].<sup>10</sup> This is an abbreviation: he is an adulterer [No'ef], a Moabite, a murderer [Rozeah], an adversary [Zorer], an abomination [To'ebah]. R. Nahman b. Isaac quoted, What shall we speak<sup>7</sup> or how shall we clear ourselves [Nitzadak]:<sup>11</sup> We are honest [Nekonim], we are righteous [Zaddikim], we are pure [Tehorim], we are submissive [Dakkim], we are holy [Kedoshim].

MISHNAH. IF ONE WRITES TWO LETTERS IN TWO STATES OF UNAWARENESS, ONE IN THE MORNING AND ONE IN THE EVENING, R. GAMALIEL HOLDS HIM LIABLE, WHILST THE SAGES EXEMPT HIM.

GEMARA. Wherein do they differ?-R. Gamaliel holds: Awareness in respect of half the standard is of no account; whilst the Rabbis hold: Awareness in respect of half the standard is of account.<sup>12</sup>

### CHAPTER XIII

MISHNAH. R. ELIEZER SAID: HE WHO WEAVES THREE THREADS AT THE BEGINNING<sup>13</sup> OR ONE [THREAD] ADDED TO<sup>14</sup> WOVEN STUFF, IS CULPABLE; BUT THE SAGES MAINTAIN: WHETHER AT THE BEGINNING OR AT THE END, THE STANDARD [FOR CULPABLE] IS TWO THREADS. HE WHO MAKES TWO MESHES, ATTACHING THEM EITHER TO THE CROSS-PIECES [NIRIM] OR TO THE SLIPS [KEROS], OR IN A WINNOW, SIEVE, OR BASKET, IS CULPABLE. AND HE WHO SEWS TWO STITCHES, AND HE WHO TEARS IN ORDER TO SEW TWO STITCHES [IS LIKEWISE CULPABLE].

GEMARA. When R. Isaac came,<sup>15</sup> he recited: Two. But we learnt THREE?- There is no difficulty: the one refers to thick [threads], the other to thin [ones]. Some explain it in one way, others explain it the reverse. Some explain it in one way: [of] thick threads, three will not break, but two will break;<sup>16</sup> [of] thin threads, even two will not break. Others explain it the reverse: [of] thin [threads], three are noticeable<sup>17</sup> whereas two are not:<sup>18</sup> [of] thick threads, even two are noticeable.

It was taught: He who weaves three threads at the beginning or one thread added to woven stuff, is culpable; but the Sages maintain: Whether at the beginning or at the end, the standard is two threads, and at the selvedge, two threads over the breadth of three meshes. To what is this like? To weaving a small belt two threads over the breadth of three meshes [in size].<sup>19</sup> [Now,] ‘He who weaves three threads at the beginning or one thread added to woven stuff, is culpable’: this anonymous [teaching] is in agreement with R. Eliezer. Another [Baraita] taught: He who weaves two threads added to<sup>20</sup> the border of the web<sup>21</sup> or to the hem,<sup>22</sup> is culpable. R. Eliezer said: Even one. And at the selvedge, two threads over the breadth of three meshes. To what is this like? To weaving a small belt two or three threads over the breadth of three meshes [in size]. ‘He who weaves two threads added to the border of the web or to the hem, is culpable’: this anonymous [teaching is] in agreement with the Rabbis. HE WHO MAKES TWO MESHES, ATTACHING THEM EITHER TO THE CROSS-PIECES [NIRIM]. What does, ‘To THE NIRIM mean? — Said Abaye: Two in a mesh and one in the cross-piece. OR TO THE SLIPS [KEROS]. What is KEROS?-Said Rab:The slips.<sup>23</sup>

AND HE WHO SEWS TWO STITCHES. But we have [already] learnt it in [the list of] principal labours: ‘and he who sews two stitches?’<sup>24</sup> - Because he wishes to teach the second clause: AND HE WHO TEARS IN ORDER TO SEW TWO STITCHES, he also teaches, AND HE WHO SEWS, [etc.]. But we learnt about tearing too in [the list of] principal labours? Rather because he wishes to teach in a subsequent clause, ‘He who tears in his anger or for his dead’,<sup>25</sup> he therefore teaches [here], HE WHO SEWS TWO STITCHES. AND HE WHO TEARS IN ORDER TO SEW TWO STITCHES. How is that possible?

---

(1) If he intends writing a heth and writes two zayyinin.

(2) The references to a Scroll of the Law, where certain letters, including the **ד**, are embellished with ‘tittles’, ‘daggers’. If one writes **דד** instead of a **ד** (in a Scroll of the law **ד** is written as a double **דד**, thus: **דד** ) but without the daggers, he is not culpable; with the daggers, he is culpable.

(3) Here too the waw is used vocally, but is interpreted consonantly.

(4) Gen. XVII, 5.

(5) Heh and Het interchange.

(6) Thus AB Hamwn is interpreted as an abbreviation.

(7) Ex. XX, 1.

(8) Num. XXII, 32.

(9) Lev. XXIII, 14.

- (10) 1 Kings II 8.  
 (11) Gen. XLIV, 16.  
 (12) V. supra 71b; 102a.  
 (13) Of a garment or a piece of cloth. V. Halevy, Doroth, I, 3, pp. 261 seq.  
 (14) Lit., 'upon'.  
 (15) From Palestine to Babylon; cf. p. 12, n. 9.  
 (16) Under their own weight. Or, the thickness of the thread prevents them from being closely woven; hence if there are only two they may split.  
 (17) Lit., 'known'.  
 (18) One cannot see that anything substantial has been made; therefore he is not culpable.  
 (19) Therefore weaving this amount on the selvedge is a culpable offence.  
 (20) Lit., upon'.  
 (21) Or, thickly woven material.  
 (22) Rashi: made at the beginning of the cloth.  
 (23) Jast.: the thrums or slips to which the threads of the warp are attached.  
 (24) Supra 73a.  
 (25) Infra b.

### **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 105b**

— If he made it [the garment] like a pocket.<sup>1</sup>

MISHNAH. HE WHO TEARS IN HIS ANGER OR [IN MOURNING] FOR HIS DEAD,<sup>2</sup> AND ALL WHO EFFECT DAMAGE ARE EXEMPT; BUT HE WHO DAMAGES IN ORDER TO REPAIR,<sup>3</sup> HIS STANDARD [FOR CULPABILITY] IS AS FOR REPAIRING. THE STANDARD OF BLEACHING [WOOL], HATCHELLING, DYEING OR SPINNING IT, IS A FULL DOUBLE SIT.<sup>4</sup> AND HE WHO WEAVES TWO THREADS TOGETHER, HIS STANDARD IS A FULL SIT.

GEMARA. But the following contradicts this: He who rends [his garment] in his anger, in his mourning or for his dead, is guilty, and though he desecrates the Sabbath, he has fulfilled his duty of rending?<sup>5</sup> — There is no difficulty: the one refers to his dead,<sup>6</sup> the other to the dead in general.<sup>7</sup> But he [our Tanna] states, HIS DEAD? — After all, it does refer to his dead,<sup>8</sup> but those for whom there is no duty of mourning?<sup>9</sup> Now, if he [the dead] was a Sage, he is indeed bound [to rend his garments]? For it was taught: If a Sage dies, all are his kinsmen. All are his kinsmen! can you think so? Rather say, all are as his kinsmen, [i.e.,] all must rend [their garments] for him; all must bare [their shoulders] for him,<sup>10</sup> and all partake of the [mourner's] meal for him in a public square!<sup>11</sup> -This holds good only if he was not a Sage. But [even] if he was [merely] a worthy man, one is indeed bound [to rend his garments]? For it was taught: Why do a man's sons and daughters die in childhood? So that he may weep and mourn for a worthy man? 'So that he may weep' — is a pledge taken!<sup>12</sup> But because he did not weep and mourn for a worthy man, for whoever weeps for a worthy man is forgiven all his iniquities on account of the honour which he showed him! — This holds good only if he was not a worthy man. But if he stood [there] at the parting of the soul<sup>13</sup> he is indeed bound? For it was taught, R. Simeon b. Eleazar said: He who stands by the dead at the parting of the soul is bound to rend [his garments]: [for] what does this resemble? A scroll of the Law that is burnt!<sup>14</sup> -This holds good only if he was not standing there at the moment of death. Now, that is well in respect to his dead. But [the two statements concerning tearing] in one's anger are contradictory? — These too cause no difficulty: one agrees with R. Judah, the other with R. Simeon. One agrees with R. Judah, who maintained: One is liable in respect of a labour which is not required per se, the other with R. Simeon, who maintained: One is exempt in respect of a labour which is not required per se.<sup>15</sup> But you know R. Judah [to rule thus] in the case of one who repairs? do you know him [to rule thus] in the case of one who causes damage?—Said R. Abin: This man too effects an improvement, because

he appeases his wrath. But is it permitted [to effect this] in such a manner? Surely it was taught, R. Simeon b. Eleazar said in the name of Halfa b. Agra in R. Johanan b. Nuri's name: He who rends his garments in his anger, he who breaks his vessels in his anger, and he who scatters his money in his anger, regard him as an idolater, because such are the wiles of the Tempter: To-day he says to him, 'Do this'; to-morrow he tells him, 'Do that,' until he bids him, 'Go and serve idols,' and he goes and serves [them].<sup>16</sup> R. Abin observed: What verse [intimates this]? There shall be no strange god in thee; neither shalt thou worship any strange god;<sup>17</sup> who is the strange god that resides in man himself? Say, that is the Tempter!<sup>18</sup> -This holds good only where he does it in order to instil fear in his household, even as Rab Judah pulled the thrums [of his garment;]<sup>19</sup> R. Aha b. Jacob broke broken vessels; R. Shesheth threw brine on his maidservant's head; R. Abba broke a lid.

R. Simeon b. Pazzi said in the name of R. Joshua b. Levi in Bar Kappara's name: If one sheds tears for a worthy man, the Holy One, blessed be He, counts them and lays them up in His treasure house, for it is said, Thou countest my grievings: Put thou my tear into thy bottle; Are they not in thy book?<sup>20</sup> Rab Judah said in Rab's name: He who is slothful to lament a Sage deserves to be buried alive, because it is said, And they buried him in the border of his inheritance in Timnath-serah, which is in the hill country of Ephraim; on the north of the mountain of Gaash:<sup>21</sup> this teaches that the mountain raged against them to slay them.<sup>22</sup> R. Hiyya b. Abba said in R. Johanan's name: He who is slothful to lament a Sage will not prolong his days, [this being] measure for measure, as it is said, In measure, when thou sendest her away, thou dost contend with her.<sup>23</sup> R. Hiyya b. Abba objected to R. Johanan: And Israel served the Lord all the days of Joshua and all the days of the elders who prolonged their days after Joshua?<sup>24</sup> — O Babylonian! answered he, they prolonged 'their days',<sup>25</sup> but not years. If so, that your days may be multiplied, and the days of your children.<sup>26</sup> [does that mean] days but not years! — A blessing is different.<sup>27</sup>

R. Hiyya b. Abba also said in R. Johanan's name]: When one of brothers dies,

- 
- (1) Rashi: bulging and creasing, so that part has to be torn open in order for it to be resewn.
  - (2) At the death of one's parents, brothers, sisters, children, wife or husband the garments are rent.
  - (3) As in the example mentioned immediately preceding the Mishnah.
  - (4) Rashi: the distance between the tips of the index finger and middle finger when held wide apart, v. Gemara.
  - (5) Sc. for the dead.
  - (6) Sc. those enumerated in p. 508. n. 9. Since rending is a duty there, it is an act of positive value, and he is liable.
  - (7) Though he rends his garment in grief, it is not actually necessary.
  - (8) I.e., one whom through certain circumstances it is his duty to bury.
  - (9) I.e., other than those enumerated in p. 508, n. 9.
  - (10) This was a mourning rite in former times, but is no longer practised.
  - (11) The first meal after the funeral is called the meal of comfort (se'udath habra'ah), and is supplied by friends of the mourner. In the case of a Sage all must partake of such a meal.
  - (12) For the future surely not!
  - (13) I.e., at the moment of death.
  - (14) If one sees this he must rend his garments, and even the most ignorant and the most worthless Jew has some knowledge thereof and has fulfilled some of its precepts.
  - (15) V. supra 30a.
  - (16) Since then this is forbidden, he cannot be held to effect an improvement.
  - (17) Ps. LXXXI, 10.
  - (18) This shows that no real separate identity was ascribed to the source of evil, of which the Tempter is merely a personification; cf. Joseph, M., 'Judaism as Creed and Life', pp. 65-68.
  - (19) To show his anger.
  - (20) Ps. LVI, 9.
  - (21) Josh. XXIV, 30. 'Gaash' is derived from a root meaning to tremble or rage.
  - (22) Because they did not fittingly lament him.

(23) Isa. XXVII, 8.

(24) Josh. *ibid.* 31. Thus they lived long in spite of their failure to mourn for Joshua.

(25) (Maharsha: Their days seemed prolonged on account of the difficult times they experienced, v. however Rashi.)

(26) Deut. XI, 21.

(27) [The length of days in the case of a blessing can be only another expression for length of years, cf. n. 6.]

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 106a

all the other brothers should fear. When one of a company dies, the whole company should fear. Some say that this means where the eldest [or chief] dies; others say, where the youngest<sup>1</sup> dies.

AND ALL WHO EFFECT DAMAGE ARE EXEMPT. R. Abbahu recited before R. Johanan: All who cause damage are exempt, except he who wounds and he who sets fire [to a stack of corn]. Said he to him, Go and recite it outside:<sup>2</sup> wounding and setting fire is not a Mishnah;<sup>3</sup> and should you say that it is a Mishnah, wounding refers to one who needs [the blood] for his dog, and setting fire, to one who needs the ashes.<sup>4</sup> But we learnt, ALL WHO EFFECT DAMAGE ARE EXEMPT?<sup>5</sup> -Our Mishnah is [in accordance with] R. Judah, while the Baraitha<sup>6</sup> [agrees with] R. Simeon. What is R. Simeon's reason? — Since a verse is required to permit circumcision [on the Sabbath],<sup>7</sup> it follows that for wounding elsewhere one is liable. And since the Divine Law forbade burning in respect of a priest's [adulterous] daughter,<sup>8</sup> it follows that for kindling a fire in general one is liable. And R. Judah?<sup>9</sup> -There he effects an improvement, even as R. Ashi [said]. For R. Ashi said: What is the difference whether one repairs [the foreskin by] circumcision or one repairs a utensil: what is the difference whether one boils [melts] the lead bar<sup>10</sup> or one boils dyes?

THE STANDARD OF BLEACHING, etc. R. Joseph indicated the double [measure]; R. Hiyya b. Ammi showed the single [measure].<sup>11</sup>

MISHNAH. R. JUDAH SAID: HE WHO HUNTS A BIRD [AND DRIVES IT] INTO A TURRET, OR A DEER INTO A HOUSE, IS GUILTY; BUT THE SAGES MAINTAIN: [HE WHO HUNTS] A BIRD INTO A TURRET,

---

(1) Or, least important.

(2) It is not an authenticated teaching to be admitted to the school.

(3) I.e., no Mishnah states that these are exceptions.

(4) For medical purposes. Then the wounding and setting fire is beneficial, not a damage-effecting labour.

(5) Which refutes n. Abbahu.

(6) Cited by R. Abbahu.

(7) V. *infra* 132a.

(8) Who may not be thus executed on the Sabbath, Sanh. 35b.

(9) How does he refute these arguments?

(10) Death by fire was carried out by pouring molten lead down the condemned person's throat, Sanh. 52a.

(11) [Rashi: The distance between the tips of the index and middle fingers held widely apart, which is the measure of a single sit, is half the distance between the tips of the outstretched thumb and index finger. Thus, whereas R. Joseph using the smaller unit indicated by gesture a double measure to explain the meaning of DOUBLE SIT', R. Hiyya b. Ammi, using the larger unit, indicated a single measure. For other interpretations v. Jast. s.v. **סִיט**.]

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 106b

AND A DEER INTO A GARDEN,<sup>1</sup> COURTYARD OR VIVARIUM, IS LIABLE. R. SIMEON B. GAMALIEL SAID: NOT ALL VIVARIA ARE ALIKE. THIS IS THE GENERAL PRINCIPLE: IF IT [STILL] NEEDS TO BE CAUGHT, HE IS EXEMPT IF IT DOES NOT STILL NEED TO BE CAUGHT,<sup>2</sup> HE IS LIABLE.

GEMARA. We learnt elsewhere: Fish may not be caught out of aquaria on a Festival, nor may food be placed before them; but beasts and birds may be caught out of vivaria, and food may be placed before them. But the following contradicts it: As for vivaria of beasts, birds and fish, one may not catch [the animals, etc.] out of them on a Festival, and we may not place food before them: [thus the rulings on] beasts are contradictory, and [the rulings on] birds are contradictory. As for [the rulings on] beasts, it is well: there is no difficulty, one agreeing with R. Judah,<sup>3</sup> the other with the Rabbis.<sup>4</sup> But [the rulings on] birds are contradictory? And should you say, [The rulings on] birds too are not contradictory: one refers to a covered vivarium,<sup>5</sup> whereas the other refers to an uncovered vivarium — [It might be asked]: But a house is covered, yet both R. Judah and the Rabbis hold, Only [if one hunts a bird] into a turret [is he culpable], but not [if he hunts it] into a house?—Said Rabbah b. R. Huna: Here we treat of a free bird,<sup>6</sup> [the reason being] because it does not submit to domestication.<sup>7</sup> For the School of R. Ishmael taught: Why is it called a free bird? Because it dwells in a house [free] just as in the field. Now that you have arrived at this [answer], [the rulings on] beasts too are not contradictory: one refers to a large vivarium, the other to a small vivarium. What is a large vivarium and what is a small vivarium? Said R. Ashi: Where one can run after and catch it with a single lunge, that is a small vivarium; any other is a large vivarium. Alternatively, if the shadows of the walls fall upon each other, it is a small vivarium; otherwise it is a large vivarium. Alternatively, if there are not many recesses,<sup>8</sup> it is a small vivarium; otherwise it is a large vivarium.<sup>9</sup>

R. SIMEON B. GAMALIEL SAID, etc. R. Joseph said in Rab Judah's name in Samuel's name: The halachah is as R. Simeon b. Gamaliel. Said Abaye to him, [You say,] The halachah [etc.]: hence it follows that they [the Rabbis] disagree?<sup>10</sup> And what difference does that make? he replied.<sup>11</sup> Shall one learn a tradition as it were [merely] a song? he retorted.<sup>12</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: If one catches a deer that is blind or asleep, he is culpable; a deer that is lame, aged or sick, he is exempt. Abaye asked R. Joseph: What is the difference between them?—The former try to escape;<sup>13</sup> the latter do not try to escape. But it was taught: [If one catches] a sick [deer] he is culpable?—Said R. Shesheth, There is no difficulty: one refers to [an animal] sick with fever,<sup>14</sup> the other to [an animal] sick through exhaustion.

Our Rabbis taught: He who catches locusts, gazin,<sup>15</sup> hornets, or gnats on the Sabbath is culpable: that is the view of R. Meir. But the Sages rule: If that species is hunted, one is liable; if that species is not hunted, one is not liable.<sup>16</sup> Another [Baraita] taught: He who catches locusts at the time of dew is not liable;<sup>17</sup> at the time of dry heat [midday], is liable. Eleazar b. Mahabai said: If they advance in thick swarms, he is not culpable.<sup>18</sup> The scholars asked: Does Eleazar b. Mahabai refer to the first clause or to the last?—Come and hear: He who catches locusts at the time of dew is not liable; at the time of dry heat, is liable. Eleazar b. Mahabai said: Even at the time of dry heat, if they advance in thick swarms he is not culpable.

MISHNAH. IF A DEER ENTERS A HOUSE AND ONE PERSON SHUTS [THE DOOR] BEFORE IT, HE IS CULPABLE; IF TWO SHUT IT, THEY ARE EXEMPT. IF ONE COULD NOT SHUT IT, AND BOTH SHUT IT, THEY ARE CULPABLE. R. SIMEON DECLARES [THEM] EXEMPT.<sup>19</sup>

GEMARA. R. Jeremiah b. Abba said in Samuel's name: If one catches a lion on the Sabbath he is not culpable unless he entices it into its cage.

MISHNAH. IF ONE SITS DOWN IN THE DOORWAY BUT DOES NOT FILL IT, AND A SECOND SITS DOWN AND FILLS IT,<sup>20</sup> THE SECOND IS CULPABLE. IF THE FIRST SITS DOWN IN THE DOORWAY AND FILLS IT, AND A SECOND COMES AND SITS DOWN AT HIS SIDE, EVEN IF THE FIRST [THEN] RISES AND DEPARTS, THE FIRST IS CULPABLE

WHILE THE SECOND IS EXEMPT. WHAT DOES THIS RESEMBLE? ONE WHO SHUTS HIS HOUSE TO GUARD IT,<sup>21</sup> AND A DEER IS [THEREBY] FOUND TO BE GUARDED THEREIN.<sup>22</sup>

- 
- (1) Bah reads: into a house, garden, etc. V. Halevy, Doroth, I, 3, pp. 233-234 and n. 38 a.l.
  - (2) The animal having been driven into a place where it is easy to seize it.
  - (3) In our Mishnah, Since he holds that only when an animal is in a house is it regarded as trapped, it follows that it is not trapped in a vivarium, and therefore if one catches a beast out of a vivarium he is guilty, in accordance with the general principle of the Mishnah.
  - (4) That it is trapped even in a vivarium.
  - (5) In which a bird is regarded as already trapped, and so one may catch a bird out of it on a Festival.
  - (6) Swallow(?). It lives in a house just as in the open and it is difficult to catch it there. But other birds are trapped when driven into a house.
  - (7) Lit., 'authority'.
  - (8) Into which the animals may run when chased.
  - (9) On the whole passage v. Bez. 23b.
  - (10) But it has just been stated that they too differentiate between large and small vivaria.
  - (11) If the Rabbis do not disagree, the halachah is certainly so.
  - (12) I.e., why use words superfluously?
  - (13) Their senses are on the alert and they feel the attempt to take them. Hence they need hunting and catching.
  - (14) That animal tries to escape.
  - (15) Rashi: hagazin; a species of wild bees, or locusts, Jast.
  - (16) Nobody hunts gnats or hornets, as they are of no use.
  - (17) Rashi: they are blind then and need no catching.
  - (18) They are easily taken and need no catching.
  - (19) In accordance with his view supra 92b.
  - (20) Thereby effectively trapping an animal that has entered the house.
  - (21) But not to trap an animal.
  - (22) I.e., a deer which had previously been caught; so here too the first, by filling up the doorway, traps the deer, and the second only guards all animal already caught.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 107a

GEMARA. R. Abba said in R. Hiyya b. Ashi's name in Rab's name: If a bird creeps under the skirts [of one's garments], he may sit and guard it<sup>1</sup> until evening. R. Nahman b. Isaac objected: IF THE FIRST SITS DOWN IN THE DOORWAY AND FILLS IT, AND A SECOND COMES AND SITS DOWN AT HIS SIDE, EVEN IF THE FIRST [THEN] RISES AND DEPARTS, THE FIRST IS CULPABLE WHILE THE SECOND IS EXEMPT. Surely that means, he IS EXEMPT, yet it is forbidden?— No: he is exempt, bind it is permitted. Reason too supports this: since the second clause teaches, WHAT DOES THIS RESEMBLE? ONE WHO SHUTS HIS HOUSE TO GUARD IT, AND A DEER IS [THEREBY] FOUND TO BE GUARDED THEREIN, it follows that it means, he is EXEMPT, and it is permitted.<sup>2</sup> Others state, R. Nahman b. Isaac said: We too learnt thus: EVEN IF THE FIRST [THEN] RISES AND DEPARTS, THE FIRST IS CULPABLE, WHILE THE SECOND IS EXEMPT: surely that means, he IS EXEMPT, and it is permitted? No: he is EXEMPT, yet it is forbidden. But since the second clause states, WHAT DOES THIS RESEMBLE? ONE WHO SHUTS HIS HOUSE TO GUARD IT, AND A DEER IS [THEREBY] FOUND TO BE GUARDED THEREIN, it follows that he is EXEMPT, and it is permitted. This proves it.

Samuel said: Everything [taught as] involving no liability on the Sabbath involves [indeed] no liability, yet is forbidden, save these three, which involve no liability and are permitted. This [sc. the capture of a deer] is one. And how do you know that he is exempt and it is permitted? Because the second clause teaches: WHAT DOES THIS RESEMBLE? ONE WHO SHUTS HIS HOUSE TO GUARD IT, AND A DEER IS THEREBY FOUND TO BE GUARDED THEREIN. A second [is this]: If one manipulates an abscess on the Sabbath, if in order to make an opening for it, he is liable;<sup>3</sup> if in order to draw the matter out of it, he is exempt. And how do you know that he is exempt and it is permitted? Because we learnt: A small needle<sup>4</sup> [may be moved on the Sabbath] for the purpose of extracting a thorn.<sup>5</sup> And the third: If one catches a snake on the Sabbath: if he is engaged therewith [sc. in catching it] so that it should not bite him,<sup>6</sup> he is exempt; if for a remedy,<sup>7</sup> he is liable. And how do you know that he is exempt and it is permitted? — Because we learnt: A dish may be inverted over a lamp, that the beams should not catch [fire], or over an infant's excrements, or over a scorpion, that it should not bite.<sup>8</sup>

### CHAPTER XIV

MISHNAH. AS FOR THE EIGHT REPTILES [SHERAZIM] WHICH ARE MENTIONED IN THE TORAH,<sup>9</sup> HE WHO CATCHES OR WOUNDS THEM [ON THE SABBATH] IS CULPABLE;<sup>10</sup> BUT [AS FOR] OTHER ABOMINATIONS AND CREEPING THINGS,<sup>11</sup> HE WHO WOUNDS THEM IS EXEMPT; HE WHO CATCHES THEM, BECAUSE HE NEEDS THEM, HE IS LIABLE; IF HE DOES NOT NEED THEM, HE IS EXEMPT, AS FOR A BEAST OR BIRD IN ONE'S PRIVATE DOMAIN, HE WHO CATCHES IT IS EXEMPT; HE WHO WOUNDS IT IS CULPABLE.

GEMARA. Since he [the Tanna] teaches, HE WHO WOUNDS THEM IS CULPABLE, it follows that they have skin.<sup>12</sup> Which Tanna [maintains this]? — Said Samuel, It is R. Johanan b. Nuri. For we learnt, R. Johanan b. Nuri said: The eight reptiles have skins.<sup>13</sup> Rabbah son of R. Huna said in Rab's name, You may even say [that this agrees with] the Rabbis: the Rabbis disagree with R. Johanan b. Nuri only in respect of defilement, because it is written, And these are they which are unclean unto you,<sup>14</sup> extending [the law to teach] that their skins are as their flesh; but in respect to the Sabbath even the Rabbis agree. But do they not differ in respect of the Sabbath? Surely it was taught: He who catches one of the eight reptiles mentioned in the Torah, [or] he who wounds them, is culpable: this is R. Johanan b. Nuri's view. But the Sages maintain: Only those which the Sages enumerated<sup>15</sup> have skin.

- (1) To prevent it from flying away.
- (2) For obviously one may lock his house in order to guard it.
- (3) Rashi: either on account of building an opening, or because of mending, for there is no difference between mending a utensil and mending (i.e., healing) a wound.
- (4) Lit., 'hand.needle'.
- (5) Because it pains him, and matter which causes pain is similar.
- (6) 'Mith'assek' may be understood in the sense of performing indirect labour, i.e., he catches it only incidentally, as he does not need the snake but merely desires to prevent it from doing harm.
- (7) The snake's poison can be used medicinally.
- (8) Though it is thereby caught.
- (9) As unclean, i.e., non-edible; Lev. XI, 29f.
- (10) These have a skin distinct from the flesh (v. infra), and a wound does not completely heal but leaves a scar; this is regarded as a minor degree of killing, i.e., part of the animal's life is taken away.
- (11) E.g., worms, insects, snakes, etc.
- (12) V. n. 2.
- (13) V. Hul. 122a. The Rabbis rule that the skins of four of these defile by the same standard as their flesh, viz., the size of a lentil. Thus they hold that their skin is not distinct from their flesh, and R. Johanan b. Nuri disputes it.
- (14) Ibid.
- (15) As those whose skins are the same as their flesh.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 107b

[Whereon it was asked]: On the contrary, Those which the Sages enumerated have no skin?<sup>1</sup> And 'Abaye said, This is what he [the Tanna] states: Only those not enumerated by the Sages have a skin distinct from the flesh.<sup>2</sup> Said Raba to him: But he states, which the Sages enumerated? Rather said Raba, This is the meaning: the skin of those [reptiles] only which the Sages enumerated defiles like the flesh.<sup>3</sup> Hence it follows that R. Johanan b. Nuri holds that even those which the Sages did not enumerate defile [in this way]? But it is stated, R. Johanan b. Nuri said: The eight reptiles have skins and do not defile?—Rather Said R. Adda b. Mattenah, Reconcile it thus: But the Sages maintain: In respect of defilement those which the Sages enumerated have skin.

Still, however, do they not differ in respect of the Sabbath? But it was taught: He who catches one of the eight reptiles mentioned in the Torah, [or] he who wounds them, is culpable, [viz.,] in the case of the reptiles which have skins.<sup>4</sup> And what is a wound that does not heal?<sup>5</sup> If the blood becomes clotted, even if it does not issue. R. Johanan b. Nuri said: The eight reptiles have skins!<sup>6</sup> — Said R. Ashi, Who is the first Tanna? R. Judah, who maintains that touch is the criterion.<sup>7</sup> For we learnt, R. Judah said: The halta'ah<sup>8</sup> is like the weasel. But the Rabbis who disagree with R. Johanan b. Nuri in respect of defilement agree with him in respect of the Sabbath.<sup>9</sup> If so, instead of 'this is the view of R. Johanan b. Nuri,' 'this is the view of R. Johanan b. Nuri and his opponents' is required?<sup>10</sup> — Learn: 'this is the view of R. Johanan b. Nuri and his opponents.'<sup>11</sup>

Levi asked Rabbi: How do we know that a wound<sup>12</sup> is such as is permanent?<sup>13</sup> — Because it is written, Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots [habarbarothaw]?<sup>14</sup> What does 'habarbarothaw' mean: shall we say, that it is covered with spots? Then instead of 'and a leopard habarbarothaw,' it should read, 'a leopard gawwanaw [its colours]?' Rather it is parallel to Ethiopian, — just as the skin of an Ethiopian cannot turn, so is a [real] wound one that does not turn [i.e., heal].<sup>15</sup>

BUT OTHER ABOMINATIONS, etc. But if one kills them, he is culpable: which Tanna [holds thus]? Said R. Jeremiah, It is R. Eliezer. For it was taught, R. Eliezer said: He who kills vermin on the Sabbath is as though he killed a camel on the Sabbath. R. Joseph demurred to this: The Rabbis disagree with R. Eliezer only in respect to vermin, which does not multiply and increase, but as for

other abominations and creeping things, which multiply and increase, they do not differ [therein]. And both learn it from none but the rams.<sup>16</sup> R. Eliezer holds, It is as the rams: just as there was the taking of life in the case of the rams, so whatever constitutes the taking of life [is a culpable offence]. While the Rabbis argue, It is as the rams: just as rams multiply and increase, so are all which multiply and increase [of account].<sup>17</sup> Said Abaye to him, Do not vermin multiply and increase? But a Master said: 'The Holy One, blessed be He, sits and sustains [all creatures], from the horns of wild oxen to the eggs of vermin'?<sup>18</sup> — It is a species called 'eggs of vermin'. But it was taught: Tippuyi<sup>19</sup> and the eggs of vermin? — The species is called 'eggs of vermin'. But there is the flea, which multiplies and increases, yet it was taught, If one catches a flea on the Sabbath: R. Eliezer declares him liable, while R. Joshua exempts [him]?-Said R. Ashi: You oppose catching to killing! R. Eliezer and R. Joshua disagree only in that one Master holds: If the species is not hunted, one is liable; whilst the other Master holds: He is exempt. But in respect to killing even R. Joshua agrees.

HE WHO CATCHES THEM BECAUSE HE NEEDS THEM, HE IS LIABLE, etc. Which Tanna [rules thus]?-Said Rab Judah in Rab's name: It is R. Simeon, who maintains, One is not culpable on account of a labour unrequired per se.<sup>20</sup> Others learn it in reference to this: If one manipulates an abscess on the Sabbath, — if in order to make an opening for it, he is liable; if in order to draw the matter out of it, he is exempt. Which Tanna [rules thus]? Said Rab Judah in Rab's name: It is R. Simeon, who maintains: One is not culpable on account of a labour unrequired per se. Others again learn it in reference to this: If one catches a snake on the Sabbath: if he is engaged therewith [in catching it] so that it should not bite him, he is exempt; if for a remedy, he is liable.<sup>21</sup> Which Tanna [rules thus]? Said Rab Judah in Rab's name, It is R. Simeon, who maintains: One is not culpable on account of a labour unrequired per se. Samuel said: If one removes a fish from the sea,<sup>22</sup> as soon as the size of a sela' thereof becomes dry, he is liable.<sup>23</sup> R. Jose b. Abin observed: provided it is between the fins.<sup>24</sup> R. Ashi said: Do not think literally dry, but even if it forms slimy threads.<sup>25</sup>

Mar Bar Hamduri said in Samuel's name: If one inserts his hand in an animal's bowels and detaches an embryo that is inside her, he is culpable. What is the reason? Said Raba: Bar Hamduri explained it to me: Did not R. Shesheth say: If one plucks cuscuta from shrubs and thorns, he is culpable on account of uprooting something from the place of its growth;<sup>26</sup> so here too he is culpable on account of uprooting something [sc. the embryo] from the place of its growth. Abaye said: He who plucks

---

(1) Since their skin is the same as their flesh.

(2) But those enumerated by them have no skin distinct from the flesh, and consequently wounding them involves no liability. On this interpretation the Rabbis differ even in respect of the Sabbath, which contradicts Rab. But on the following explanations there is no difficulty.

(3) V. p. 518, n. 5.

(4) I.e., the four not enumerated by the Sages. This shows that they differ even in respect of the Sabbath.

(5) I.e., which leaves a permanent discolouring only such entails liability.

(6) All involve culpability on the Sabbath.

(7) Lit., 'who goes after touch'.

(8) A species of lizard.

(9) R. Judah holds that the question whether the skin of reptiles is like their flesh or not in the matter of defilement is not settled by deduction from the verse, 'and these are they which are unclean, etc.' (quoted supra a), but is dependent on touch. I.e., if the skin, is thick and perceptibly distinct from the flesh, it is not the same as the flesh; otherwise it is. By this criterion the halta'ah is like the weasel, since both have thick skins; though if the matter were decided by Scriptural exegesis these two would be dissimilar, as is shown in Hul. 142a. Hence he holds that in respect of the Sabbath, too, three of these eight have no skin, i.e., if one wounds them he is not guilty, for the skin is thin and not distinct from the flesh. But the Rabbis in Hul. count the halta'ah as one of the reptiles whose skin is the same as their flesh, in spite of its thickness. This shows that they settle the matter solely by reference to the verse, and therefore their view, which disagrees with R. Johanan b. Nuri's, applies only to defilement, since the verse is written in that connection, but not to

the Sabbath.

(10) Since the Rabbis agree with him.

(11) This is probably not an emendation, but merely implies that it is to be understood thus.

(12) For it to involve culpability on the Sabbath.

(13) Lit., 'return'.

(14) Jer. XIII, 23.

(15) On this interpretation namer (E.V. leopard) is derived from mur, to change, and the verse is translated: Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or turn (i.e., heal) his wounds? habarbarothaw (E.V. spots) being derived from haburah, a wound.

(16) Which were killed for the sake of their skins, which were dyed red and used in the Tabernacle. Thus killing was a labour of importance in the Tabernacle, and hence ranks as a principal labour; v. supra 49b.

(17) In that killing them renders one liable.

(18) 'Eggs of vermin is assumed to mean its progeny.

(19) Name of certain small insects.

(20) V. supra 105b.

(21) V. end of last chapter for notes.

(22) Rashi and Tosaf. both explain that this refers to a fish that was already caught before the Sabbath, In that case 'from the sea' is un-intelligible. Maim. in Hilchoth Shabbath beginning of ch. XI reads 'from a bowl', which is preferable. V. Marginal Gloss, [Rashi, however, did not seem to read 'from the sea'].

(23) For taking life, as it cannot live after that. — There is no culpability for catching, since it was caught before the Sabbath.

(24) But a dryness in any other part does not mean that the fish can no longer live.

(25) I.e., it becomes partially dry only, so that the moisture adheres to one's finger in slimy threads.

(26) But not for detaching from the soil, as cuscuta was not held to be attached to the soil; v. 'Er. 28b,

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 108a

fungus from the handle of a pitcher is liable on account of uprooting something from the place of its growth. R. Oshaia objected: If one detaches [aught] from a perforated pot, he is culpable; if it is unperforated, he is exempt?—There, that is not its [normal place for] growing; but here this is its [normal place for] growing.<sup>1</sup> AN ANIMAL OR A BIRD, etc. R. Huna said: Tefillin may be written upon the skin of a clean bird. R. Joseph demurred: What does he inform us? That it has a skin!<sup>2</sup> [But] we have [already] learnt it: HE WHO WOUNDS IT IS CULPABLE?<sup>3</sup> Said Abaye to him, He informs us much. For if we [deduced] from our Mishnah, I might object, Since it is perforated all over,<sup>4</sup> it may not [be thus used]; hence he informs us as they say in the West [Palestine]: Any hole over which the ink can pass is not a hole.

R. Zera objected: [And he shall rend it] by the wings thereof:<sup>5</sup> this is to teach that the skin is fit.<sup>6</sup> Now if you think that it is [a separate] skin, how can Scripture include it?<sup>7</sup> —Said Abaye to him, it is [indeed a separate] skin, but the Divine Law includes it.<sup>8</sup> Others state, R. Zera said: We too learnt thus: 'By the wings thereof';— this is to include the skin. Now, if you say that it is [a separate] skin, it is well: hence a verse is required for including it. But if you say that it is not skin, why is a verse required for including it? Said Abaye to him, in truth I may tell you that it is not [a separate] skin, yet it is necessary. I might argue, Since it is covered with splits [holes], it is repulsive. [Hence] we are informed [otherwise].

Mar son of Rabina asked R. Nahman b. Isaac: May tefillin be written upon the skin of a clean fish? If Elijah will come and declare, he replied. What does 'if Elijah will come and declare' mean. Shall we say, whether it has a [separate] skin or not, — but we see that it has a skin? Moreover we learnt: The bones of a fish and its skin afford protection in the tent wherein is a corpse!<sup>9</sup> Rather [he meant]: If Elijah comes and tells [us] whether its foul smell<sup>10</sup> evaporates or not.

Samuel and Karna were sitting by the bank of the Nehar Malka,<sup>11</sup> and saw the water rising and becoming discoloured. Said Samuel to Karna, A great man is arriving from the West who suffers from stomach trouble, and the water is rising to give him a welcome, Go and smell his bottle!<sup>12</sup> So he went and met Rab. He asked him, How do we know that tefillin maybe written only on the skin of a clean [edible] animal? Because it is written, that the Law of the Lord may be in thy mouth,<sup>13</sup> [meaning] of that which is permitted in thy mouth, he replied. How do we know that blood is red? he asked.<sup>14</sup> — Because it is said, and the Moabites saw the water over against them as red as blood.<sup>15</sup> How do we know that circumcision [must be performed] in that [particular] place? — ‘His ‘orlah’<sup>16</sup> is stated here, and ‘its ‘orlah’<sup>17</sup> is stated elsewhere: just as there something that produces fruit [is meant], so here too something [the limb] that produces fruit [is meant]. Perhaps it means the heart, for it is written, Circumcise therefore the foreskin of your heart?<sup>18</sup> Perhaps it means the ear, for it is written, behold, their ear is uncircumcised?<sup>19</sup> — We learn the complete [word] ‘orlatho from the complete [word] ‘orlatho, but we do not learn the complete ‘orlatho from ‘orlath, which is incomplete.<sup>20</sup> ‘What is your name?’ he asked. Karna. ‘May it be [His] will that a horn [karna] shall sprout out from between his eyes!’ he retorted.<sup>21</sup> Subsequently Samuel took him into his house, gave him barley bread and a fish pie to eat, and strong liquor to drink,<sup>22</sup> but did not show him the privy, that he might be eased.<sup>23</sup> Rab cursed, saying, He who causes me pain, may no sons arise from him — And thus it was.

This is a controversy of Tannaim. How do we know that circumcision [must be performed] in that place? ‘Orlatho is stated here, and ‘orlatho is stated elsewhere: just as there something that produces fruit [is meant], so here too something that produces fruit [is meant]: that is R. Josiah's view. R. Nathan said: It is unnecessary: surely it is said, And the uncircumcised male who is not circumcised in the flesh of his foreskin:- [that indicates] the place where the male sex is differentiated from the female sex.

Our Rabbis taught: Tefillin can be written upon the skin of clean animals and upon the skin of clean beasts, and<sup>24</sup> upon the skin of their nebeloth or terefoth,<sup>25</sup> and they are tied round with their hair,<sup>26</sup> and sewn with their tendons. And it is a halachah from Moses at Sinai<sup>27</sup> that tefillin are tied round with their hair and sewn with their tendons. But we may not write [them] upon the skin of unclean animals or upon the skin of unclean beasts, and the skin of their nebeloth and terefoth need not be stated,<sup>28</sup> nor may they be tied round with their hair or sewn with their tendons. And this question a certain Boethusian<sup>29</sup> asked R. Joshua the grits dealer: How do we know that tefillin may not be written upon the skin of an unclean animal? Because it is written, ‘that the law of thy Lord may be in thy mouth’ [implying] of that which is permitted in thy mouth. If so, they should not be written on the skin of nebeloth and terefoth.? Said he to him, I will give you a comparison. What does this resemble? Two men who were condemned to death by the State, one being executed by the king and the other by the executioner. Who stands higher? Surely he who was slain by the king!<sup>30</sup> If so, let them be eaten? The Torah saith, Ye shall not eat any nebelah,<sup>31</sup> he retorted, yet you say, let them be eaten! Well spoken!<sup>32</sup> admitted he. MISHNAH. ONE MAY NOT PREPARE [PICKLING] BRINE ON THE SABBATH,<sup>33</sup>

---

(1) The reference being to a moss or fungus which sprouts up in such places.

(2) Distinct from its flesh.

(3) Which shows that it has a distinct skin, v. p. 518, n. 2.

(4) Lit., ‘it has holes (and) holes’- where the feathers are set.

(5) Lev. I, 17. The reference is to a fowl burnt-offering, whose wings were burnt upon the altar.

(6) To be burnt on the altar, it being unnecessary to skin the bird first.

(7) It should be the same as the skin of all animal, which must be first removed, v. 6.

(8) This verse shows that the skin of a bird is not the same as that of an animal.

(9) If food is in a vessel which is covered by the bones or the skin of a fish, or if the whole vessel, which is closed, is made from these materials, the food is protected from contamination; v. Num. XIX, 15. — Thus the skin is mentioned as

a separate entity.

(10) Lit., 'filth'.

(11) The Royal Canal. The Canal connecting the Euphrates and the Tigris at Nehardea and Mahoza respectively; Obermeyer, 244f.

(12) Examine his knowledge—a humorous allusion to Karna's ability to judge whether wine was good or not merely by smelling the bottle, Keth. 105a. V. Obermeyer. op. cit., p. 247 and notes.

(13) Ex. XIII, 9.

(14) Only blood that is red or of colours akin to redness defiles a woman as a menstruant (Nid. 19a), and this was the point of his question.

(15) II Kings III, 22.

(16) Gen. XVII, 14, in connection with circumcision (E.V. foreskin).

(17) Lev. XIX, 23, in reference to the fruit of a tree within the first three years of its planting, which may not be eaten (E.V. uncircumcision).

(18) Deut. X, 16. This question of course was not mentioned seriously, but was put merely to point out that 'circumcision' is mentioned in connection with other organs too.

(19) Jer. VI, 10.

(20) 'Orlatho' is written in both verses quoted by Rab, whereas 'orlah and 'orlath are written in the verses proposed by Karna.

(21) He was probably annoyed at Karna's temerity in thus examining him.

(22) All this he gave him to act as a laxative.

(23) This, too, was part of the treatment. Samuel was a doctor.

(24) Behemah denotes a domestic animal; hayyah, a wild animal.

(25) V. Glos.

(26) The slips of parchment are rolled up and tied round with hair of these animals.

(27) V. p. 123, n. 7.

(28) As unfit.

(29) The Boethusians were a sect similar to the Sadducees, and disagreed with the Pharisees on certain religious beliefs, such as immortality and its concomitant, reward and punishment in the hereafter, and resurrection, which they rejected; and in certain practices, viz., the date of Pentecost and the method of preparing incense on the Day of Atonement (Men. X, 3; Tosaf. Yoma I, 8—the parallel passage in Yoma 39a has 'Sadducees'). The opinion most generally held is that the Boethusians were a variety of the Sadducees.

(30) Similarly, nebeloth and terefoth may be regarded as slain by God.

(31) Deut, XIV, 21. (E.V.: 'of anything that dieth of itself').

(32) The same law applies to both — either both are forbidden or both are permitted.

(33) Before the salt is put into it.

## **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 108b**

**BUT ONE MAY PREPARE SALT WATER AND DIP HIS BREAD INTO IT OR PUT IT INTO A STEW. SAID R. JOSE, BUT THAT IS BRINE, WHETHER [ONE PREPARES] MUCH OR LITTLE?<sup>1</sup> RATHER THIS IS THE SALT WATER THAT IS PERMITTED: OIL IS FIRST PUT INTO THE WATER<sup>2</sup> OR INTO THE SALT.<sup>3</sup>**

GEMARA. What does he [the first Tanna] mean?<sup>4</sup> Said Rab Judah in Samuel's name, He means this: One may not prepare a large quantity of salt water, but one may prepare a small quantity of salt water.

SAID R. JOSE, BUT THAT IS BRINE, WHETHER [ONE PREPARES] MUCH OR LITTLE? The scholars asked: Does R. Jose [mean] to forbid [both] or to permit [both]?- Said Rab Judah: He [means] to permit [both], since it is not stated, R. Jose forbids. Said Rabbah to him: But since the final clause states, RATHER THIS IS THE SALT WATER THAT IS PERMITTED, it follows that R. Jose [means] to forbid [in the first clause]! Rather said Rabbah: He [means] to forbid; and thus did

R. Johanan say: He [means] to forbid. It was taught likewise: One may not prepare a large quantity of salt water for putting into preserved vegetables in a mutilated vessel;<sup>5</sup> but one may prepare a little salt water and eat his bread therewith or put it into a stew. Said R. Jose: Is it just because this is in large quantity and this is in small, that the one is forbidden and the other is permitted? then it will be said, Much work is forbidden but a little work is permitted! Rather both are forbidden, and this is the salt water that is permitted: one puts oil and salt [mixed into water] or oil and water [over salt], but provided that water and salt are not mixed at the outset. [Mnemonic: Strong radish and citron.]<sup>6</sup> R. Judah b. Habiba recited: We may not prepare strong salt water. What is strong salt water? — Rabbah and R. Joseph b. Abba both say: Such that an egg floats in it. And how much is that?—Said Abaye: Two parts of salt and one part of water. For what is it made? Said R. Abbahu: For muries.<sup>7</sup>

R. Judah b. Habiba recited: One may not salt a radish or an egg on the Sabbath.<sup>8</sup> R. Hezekiah said in Abaye's name: Radish is forbidden, but an egg is permitted. R. Nahman said: Originally I used to salt radish, arguing, I do indeed spoil it, for Samuel said, Sharp radish is [more] beneficial. But when I heard what 'Ulla said when he came,<sup>9</sup> viz., In the West [Palestine] they salt them slice by slice,<sup>10</sup> I no longer salt them,<sup>11</sup> but I certainly do drop them [in salt].<sup>12</sup>

R. Judah b. Habiba recited: A citron, radish, and egg, but for their outer shell,<sup>13</sup> would never leave the stomach.<sup>14</sup>

When R. Dimi came,<sup>15</sup> he said: No man ever sank in the Lake of Sodom.<sup>16</sup> R. Joseph observed: Sodom was overturned and the statement about it is topsy-turvy:<sup>17</sup> No man sank [in it], but a plank did?<sup>18</sup> Said Abaye to him, He states the more surprising thing.<sup>19</sup> It is unnecessary [to mention] a plank, seeing that it does not sink in any water; but not even a man, who sinks in all [other] waters of the world, [ever] sank in the Lake of Sodom. What difference does that make? — Even as it once happened that Rabin was walking behind R. Jeremiah by the bank of the Lake of Sodom, [and] he asked him, May one wash with this water on the Sabbath?<sup>20</sup> — It is well, he replied.<sup>21</sup> Is it permissible to shut and open [one's eyes]?<sup>22</sup> I have not heard this, he answered, [but] I have heard something similar; for R. Zera said, at times in R. Mattenah's name, at others in Mar 'Ukba's name, and both [R. Mattenah and Mar 'Ukba] said it in the names of Samuel's father and Levi: one said: [To put] wine into one's eye<sup>23</sup> is forbidden; [to put it] on the eye, is permitted.<sup>24</sup> Whilst the other said: [To put] tasteless saliva,<sup>25</sup> even on the eye, is forbidden. It may be proved that it was Samuel's father who ruled, '[To put] wine into one's eye is forbidden; on the eye, is permitted': for Samuel said: One may soak bread in wine and place it on his eye on the Sabbath. Now, from whom, did he hear this, surely he heard it from his father? — But then on your reasoning, when Samuel said: [To apply] tasteless saliva even on the eye is forbidden; from whom did he hear it? Shall we say that he heard it from his father, — then Levi did not state any one [of these laws]! Hence he [must have] heard one from his father and one from Levi, but we do not know which from his father and which from Levi.

Mar 'Ukba said in Samuel's name: One may steep collyrium [an eye salve] on the eve of the Sabbath and place it upon his eyes on the Sabbath without fear.<sup>26</sup> Bar Lewai was standing before Mar 'Ukba, and saw him opening and shutting [his eyes].<sup>27</sup> To this extent Mar Samuel certainly did not give permission, he observed to him.<sup>28</sup> R. Jannai sent [word] to Mar 'Ukba, Send us some of Mar Samuel's eye-salves.<sup>29</sup> He sent back [word], I do indeed send [them] to you, lest you accuse me of meanness; but thus did Samuel say: A drop of cold water in the morning, and bathing the hands and feet in hot water in the evening, is better than all the eye-salves in the world. It was taught likewise: R. Muna said in R. Judah's name: A drop of cold water in the morning and bathing the hands and feet [in hot water]<sup>30</sup> in the evening is better than all the eye-salves in the world. He [R. Muna] used to say: If the hand [be put] to the eye, let it be cut off;<sup>31</sup> the hand to the nose, let it be cut off: the hand to the mouth, let it be cut off; the hand to the ear, let it be cut off; the hand to the vein [opened for blood letting], let it be cut off; the hand to the membrum, let it be cut off; the hand to the anus, let it

be cut off; the hand

- 
- (1) Gr. \*\*
  - (2) This is forbidden under 'salting', v. supra 73a.
  - (3) Before the salt is put into the water. The oil weakens the salt in both cases.
  - (4) Surely brine and salt water are identical.
  - (5) Which is specially set aside for pickling.
  - (6) A mnemonic is a string of words to aid the memory.
  - (7) A pickle containing fish hash and sometimes wine (Jast.).
  - (8) A number of slices at the same time (Rashi).
  - (9) Cf p. 12, n. 9,
  - (10) Eating the one before the next is salted.
  - (11) More than one slice. Two slices at once (Rashi).
  - (12) Each radish as I eat it.
  - (13) This refers to the white of the egg, not what is generally called the shell.
  - (14) They are very constipating.
  - (15) V. p. 12, n. 9.
  - (16) Owing to its high specific gravity due to its large proportion of salt.
  - (17) Lit., 'overturned'.
  - (18) Surely a plank is even lighter.
  - (19) Lit., 'he says, it is unnecessary (to state)'.
  - (20) Its saltiness conferred healing properties upon it; hence the question, since one may not heal on the Sabbath.
  - (21) For it is not evident that one washes himself for that reason. [Healing is forbidden only for fear lest one crushes the necessary ingredients, but it is not labour in itself: consequently the Rabbis did not impose this interdict unless one is obviously performing a cure.]
  - (22) Several times in succession, for the salt to enter and heal them. The purpose is more obvious here.
  - (23) By opening and shutting it. This is similar to Rabin's question, Thus the saltiness of the Lake of Sodom has a practical bearing in law.
  - (24) For it looks as though he is merely washing himself.
  - (25) I.e., saliva of a person who has tasted nothing a(er sleeping.
  - (26) Of transgression.
  - (27) For the salve to enter right in.
  - (28) Surely one was reported in his name!
  - (29) Samuel was a doctor.
  - (30) So the text is emended in 'Aruch.
  - (31) R causes it injury, and so the rest. In nearly all cases it means before washing in the morning.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 109a

to the vat,<sup>1</sup> let it be cut off: [because] the [unwashed] hand leads to blindness, the hand leads to deafness, the hand causes a polypus.<sup>2</sup>

It was taught, R. Nathan said: It<sup>3</sup> is a free agent, and insists [on remaining on the hands] until one washes his hands three times. R. Johanan said: Stibium removes [cures] the Princess,<sup>4</sup> stops the tears, and promotes the growth of the eye-lashes. It was taught likewise, R. Jose said: Stibium removes the Princess, stops the tears, and promotes the growth of the eye-lashes.

Mar 'Ukba also said in Samuel's name: Leaves<sup>5</sup> have no healing properties.<sup>6</sup> R. Joseph said: Coriander has no healing properties. R. Shesheth said: Cuscuta has no healing properties. R. Joseph observed: Coriander is injurious even to me.<sup>7</sup> R. Shesheth observed: Eruca is beneficial even to me.<sup>8</sup>

Mar 'Ukba said in Samuel's name: All kinds of cuscuta are permitted, except teruza.<sup>9</sup> R. Hisda

said: To glair roast meat<sup>10</sup> is permitted; to make hashed eggs<sup>11</sup> is forbidden.

Ze'iri's wife made [it] for Hiyya b. Ashi,<sup>12</sup> but he did not eat it. Said she, 'I have made this for your teacher [Ze'iri] and he ate, yet do you not eat'!-Ze'iri follows his view. For Ze'iri said: One may pour clear wine and clear water through a strainer on the Sabbath, and he need have no fear.<sup>13</sup> This proves that since it can be drunk as it is,<sup>14</sup> he does nothing;<sup>15</sup> so here too, since it can be eaten as it is,<sup>16</sup> he does nothing.

Mar 'Ukba also said: If one knocks his hand or foot, he may reduce the swelling with wine, and need have no fear. The scholars asked: What about vinegar? Said R. Hillel to R. Ashi, When I attended R. Kahana's academy they said, Not vinegar.<sup>17</sup> Raba observed: But the people of Mahoza,<sup>18</sup> since they are delicate, even wine heals them.<sup>19</sup>

Rabina visited R. Ashi: He saw that an ass had trodden on his foot, and he was sitting and reducing the swelling in vinegar.<sup>20</sup> Said he to him, Do you not accept R. Hillel's statement, Not vinegar? [A swelling on] the back of the hand or on the foot is different, he replied.<sup>21</sup> Others state, He saw him reducing the swelling in wine. Said he to him, Do you not agree with what Raba said, The people of Mahoza, since they are delicate, even wine heals them, and you too are delicate? [A swelling on] the hand or on the foot is different, he replied, for R. Adda b. Mattenah said in Rab's name, [A blow on] the hand or on the foot is like an internal wound, and the Sabbath may be desecrated on its account.

Our Rabbis taught: One may bathe in the water of Gerar,<sup>22</sup> in the water of Hammethan,<sup>23</sup> in the water of Essa,<sup>24</sup> and in the water of Tiberias,<sup>25</sup> but not in the Great Sea [the Mediterranean], or in the water of steeping,<sup>26</sup> or in the Lake of Sodom. But this contradicts it: One may bathe in the water of Tiberias and in the Great Sea, but not in the water of steeping or in the Lake of Sodom. Thus [the rulings on] the Great Sea are contradictory. — Said R. Johanan, There is no difficulty: one agrees with R. Meir, the other with R. Judah. For we learnt: All seas are like a mikweh,<sup>27</sup> for it is said, and the gathering of [mikweh] the waters called he Seas:<sup>28</sup> this is R. Meir's view. R. Judah said: The Great Sea [alone] is like a mikweh, 'seas' being stated only because it contains many kinds of waters.<sup>29</sup> R. Jose maintained: All seas [including the Great Sea] purify when running,<sup>30</sup> but they are unfit for zabim, lepers, and to be sanctified as the water of lustration.<sup>31</sup> R. Nahman b. Isaac demurred:

---

(1) Which is to be filled with wine.

(2) A morbid growth in the nose.

(3) The evil spirit that rests on the hands during the night. The belief in same is held to have been borrowed from the Persians, and many regulations were based thereon; v. Weiss, Dor, II, p. 13.

(4) The name of a demon afflicting the eye, also a certain disorder of the eye. Var. lec.: **בת חורין** the Nobleman's daughter, likewise with the same meaning.

(5) 'Alin. Rashi: the name of a certain herb.

(6) Therefore they may be applied to the eye on the Sabbath (Ri).

(7) Who am blind.

(8) Though I possess good eyesight already.

(9) A kind of cucumber or melon possessing medicinal properties. These are used for no other purpose; hence they are forbidden (cf. p. 527, n. 16).

(10) Rashi; R. Han.: to strain off the juice of melon, which is taken as a laxative. V. Tosaf. a.l.

(11) I.e., a hash of roasted eggs beaten up.

(12) Rashi: roast meat glared.

(13) Of transgression.

(14) Without straining.

(15) Though one may not filter muddy wine on the Sabbath.

- (16) Without the covering of eggs.
- (17) Its purpose is too obviously medicinal.
- (18) V. p. 150, n. 11.
- (19) Their skin is so delicate that even wine acts like vinegar upon it. Hence they would only use it medicinally, and therefore it is forbidden.
- (20) It was the Sabbath.
- (21) A bruise there is dangerous.
- (22) Gerar was the seat of a Philistine prince (Gen. X, 19; XX, 1 et seq; I Chron. IV, 39) whose site has not been identified with certainty. Some think it was southwest of Kadesh; others, that it was south of Gaza.
- (23) The word means 'hot Springs'. It was a town a mile away from Tiberias.
- (24) Supposed to be east of the lake of Tiberias, v. Neub. Geogr. p. 38; Jast. s.v.
- (25) Though all these are salty, it is permitted, as it does not look that one is bathing particularly for medicinal purposes (v. p. 527, n. 16).
- (26) In which flax was steeped.
- (27) v. Glos. They are like a mikweh in all respects, and not like a spring. The difference between these two are: (i) a zab can have his ritual bath in a spring, but not in a mikweh; (ii) the water of a spring, but not of a mikweh, is fit for sprinkling upon a leper (Lev. XIV, 5) and for mixing with the ashes of the red heifer (Num. XIX, 17); (iii) the water of a spring purifies when running, whereas a mikweh purifies only when its water is still (v. supra 65a bottom and b top and notes a.l.). — Since R. Meir maintains that all seas are alike, he draws no distinction in respect to bathing either, and permits it in the Great Sea too.
- (28) Gen. I, 10.
- (29) Many different rivers flow into the sea, hence the plural; but actually the verse refers to the Great Sea only. Thus he draws a distinction between the Great Sea and other seas, and so he also forbids bathing therein on the Sabbath.
- (30) Since that is the nature of seas.
- (31) I.e., to be mixed with the ashes of the red heifer.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 109b

Say that they differ in respect to uncleanness and purity; but do you know them [to differ] in respect of the Sabbath?<sup>1</sup> Rather said R. Nahman b. Isaac: There is no difficulty: in the one case he tarries [there];<sup>2</sup> in the other he does not tarry [there]. To what have you referred the second [Baraita]? Where he does not tarry! If he does not tarry, [it is permitted] even in the water of steeping too. For it was taught: One may bathe in the waters of Tiberias and in the water of steeping and in the Lake of Sodom, even if he has scabs on his head. When is that? If he does not tarry [there]; but if he tarries [there], it is forbidden! — Rather [reply thus]: [The rulings on] the Great Sea are not contradictory: one refers to its wholesome [water]; the other to its malodorous [water].<sup>3</sup> [The rulings on] the water of steeping too are not contradictory: in the one case he tarries; in the other he does not tarry.

MISHNAH. WE MAY NOT EAT GREEK HYSSOP ON THE SABBATH, BECAUSE IT IS NOT THE FOOD OF HEALTHY PEOPLE;<sup>4</sup> BUT WE MAY EAT YO'EZER<sup>5</sup> AND DRINK ABUB RO'EH.<sup>6</sup> A MAN MAY EAT ANY KIND OF FOOD AS A REMEDY, AND DRINK ANY LIQUID,<sup>7</sup> EXCEPT WATER OF PALM TREES<sup>8</sup> AND A POTION<sup>9</sup> OF ROOTS, BECAUSE THEY ARE [A REMEDY] FOR JAUNDICE; BUT ONE MAY DRINK WATER OF PALM TREES FOR HIS THIRST AND RUB HIMSELF WITH OIL. OF ROOTS WITHOUT MEDICAL PURPOSE.

GEMARA. R. Joseph said: Hyssop<sup>10</sup> is *abratha bar hemag*;<sup>11</sup> Greek hyssop is *abratha bar henag*.<sup>12</sup> 'Ulla said: [Hyssop is] white marwa [sage]. 'Ulla visited R. Samuel b. Judah [and] they set white marwa before him. Said he to them, That is the hyssop prescribed in Scripture. R. Pappi said, It is *shumshuk*. [marjoram]. R. Jeremiah of Difti<sup>13</sup> said: Reason Supports R. Pappi. For we learnt: 'The law of hyssop [requires] three stalks [each] containing three calyxes'; and *shumshuk*, is found to have that shape. For what is it eaten? — [As a remedy] for worms. With what is it eaten? With seven

black dates. By what is it [the disease of worms] caused? — Through [eating] barley-flour forty days old.

**BUT ONE MAY EAT YO'EZER.** What is YO'EZER?-Pennyroyal.<sup>14</sup> For what is it eaten? [As a remedy] for worms in the bowels<sup>15</sup> With what is it eaten? With seven white dates. Through what is it caused? Through [eating] raw meat<sup>16</sup> and [drinking] water on an empty stomach; through meat on an empty stomach or ox meat on an empty stomach; through nuts on an empty stomach; shoots of fenugreek on an empty stomach and drinking water after it.<sup>17</sup> But if not,<sup>18</sup> let him swallow white cress. If not, let him fast, then bring fat meat and cast it on the coals, suck out a thick piece and drink vinegar. But others say, not vinegar, because it affects the liver. If not, let him procure the scrapings of a thorn bush which was scraped from top to bottom but not from below and upward, lest [the worms] issue through his mouth, and boil them in strong liquor<sup>19</sup> at twilight.<sup>20</sup> On the morrow let him stop up his orifices<sup>21</sup> and drink it: And when he eases himself, he must do so on the stripped parts of a palm tree.

**AND DRINK ABUB RO'EH.** What is ABUB RO'EH? Humtarya [eupatorium]. What is humtarya?; The lonely staff.<sup>22</sup> What is it prepared for? [As a remedy for] one who drank uncovered water.<sup>23</sup> If not,<sup>24</sup> let him bring five roses and five glasses of strong liquor, boil them together until they amount to an anpak,<sup>25</sup> and drink it. The mother of R. Ahadbuy b. Ammi prepared [a potion of] one rose and one glass of strong liquor for a certain man. She boiled them up, made him drink it, lit the stove and swept it out, placed bricks in it,<sup>26</sup> and it [the poison of the snake] issued like a green palm-leaf. R. Awia said: A quarter [log] of milk from a white goat.<sup>27</sup> R. Huna b. Judah said: Let him obtain a sweet citron, scoop it out, fill it with honey, set it on burning embers [to boil], and then eat it. R. Hanina said: [One drinks] urine forty days old<sup>28</sup> [as a remedy]; a barzina<sup>29</sup> for [the sting of] a wasp; a quarter [log] for a scorpion [bite]; an eighth [of a log] for uncovered water; a quarter is efficacious even against witchcraft. R. Johanan said: Elaiogaron,<sup>30</sup> kangad,<sup>31</sup> and theriac are efficacious against both uncovered water and witchcraft. If one swallows a snake, he should be made to eat cuscuta with salt and run three mils. R. Shimi b. Ashi saw a man swallow a snake; thereupon he appeared to him in the guise of a horseman,<sup>32</sup> made him eat cuscuta with salt and run three mils before him, [and] it issued from him in strips.<sup>33</sup> Others say: R. Shimi b. Ashi swallowed a snake, thereupon Elijah came,<sup>34</sup> appeared to him in the guise of a horseman, made him eat cuscuta with salt and run three mils before him, [and] it issued from him in strips.

If one is bitten by a snake, he should procure an embryo of a white ass, tear it open, and be made to sit upon it; providing, however, that it was not Found to be terefah. A certain

---

(1) Which is totally different.

(2) Then it is obvious that his purpose is to effect a cure.

(3) The latter is forbidden, since no one would bathe therein for cleanliness.

(4) But obviously a medicine.

(5) A certain plant.

(6) Lit., 'shepherd's flute' — name of a plant (Eupatorium) used for medicinal purposes (Jast.).

(7) Provided that they are eaten and drunk without healing intentions too.

(8) Explained infra 110a.

(9) Lit., 'clip'.

(10) Prescribed in the Torah for purification, e.g.. Lev. Xlv, 4.

(11) So they called it.

(12) Abratha is probably *Artemisia abrotanum*, and with the designations bar hemag (of the bush) and bar hemag (of the shrub) the names of two sub-species of hyssop were meant.

(13) V p. 35, n. 5.

(14) *Mentha pelegium*; Jast.

(15) Fluke worms(?).

- (16) Umza is meat roasted directly on coals or pickled in a strong acid.
- (17) That probably applies to all the foregoing.
- (18) If pennyroyal is unobtainable or has failed to cure.
- (19) Mead, or beer.
- (20) Or the text may mean, 'in a neighbour's house', so that the sufferer himself should not smell it, lest the smell affect him.
- (21) Either his nostrils, so as not to smell it, lest the smell nostrils and ears, that the strength of the potion should not pass out of his body.
- (22) Name of a drink made of liver-wort (Jast.).
- (23) Water left uncovered over night might not be drunk, lest a snake had drunk of it — a necessary precaution in Eastern countries.
- (24) V. n. 6.
- (25) A quarter of a log. B.B. 58b.
- (26) For the sufferer to sit on.
- (27) Is a good remedy for this.
- (28) Or, of a babe forty days old.
- (29) A small measure, one thirty-second of log.
- (30) A sauce of oil and garum, to which wine is sometimes added (Jast.).
- (31) A kind of chervil.
- (32) Rashi: in order to frighten him, which would help to kill the snake.
- (33) The snake was broken up within him.
- (34) Elijah was thought to appear quite frequently to favoured persons: cf. B.M. 59b; Sanh. 113a; Keth. 61a, passim.

## **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 110a**

officer of Pumbeditha was bitten by a snake. Now there were thirteen white asses in Pumbeditha; they were all torn open and found to be terefah. There was another on the other side of Pumbeditha, [but] before they could go and bring it a lion devoured it. [Thereupon] Abaye observed to them. 'Perhaps he was bitten by a snake of the Rabbis,<sup>1</sup> for which there is no cure, as it is written, and whoso breaketh through a fence,<sup>2</sup> a serpent shall bite him?'<sup>3</sup> 'Indeed so, Rabbi,' answered they. For when Rab died, R. Isaac b. Bisna decreed that none should bring myrtles and palm-branches to a wedding feast to the sound of a tabla,<sup>4</sup> yet he went and brought myrtle and palm-branches at a wedding to the sound of the tabla; [so] a snake bit him and he died.

If a snake winds itself around a person, let him go down into water, put a basket over its head and force it [the snake] away from himself, and when it goes on to it [the basket], he should throw it into the water, ascend and make off.

If a man is scented by a snake,<sup>5</sup> if his companion is with him, he should make him ride four cubits.<sup>6</sup> If not, let him jump a ditch.<sup>7</sup> If not, let him cross a river; and at night place his bed on four barrels and sleep under the stars,<sup>8</sup> and bring four cats and tie them to the four legs of the bed. Then he should fetch rubbish<sup>9</sup> and throw it there, so that when they hear a sound they [the cats] will devour it.

If a man is chased by one [a snake], he should flee into sandy places.<sup>10</sup>

If a woman sees a snake and does not know whether it has turned its attention to her or not, let her remove her garments and throw them in front of it; if it winds itself around them, its mind is upon her; if not, its mind is not upon her. What can she do? She should cohabit [with her husband] in front of it. Others say, That will even strengthen its instincts. Rather she should take some of her hair and nails and throw them at it and say, 'I am menstruous'.

If a snake enters a woman, let her spread her legs and place them on two barrels; fat meat must be brought and cast on the burning coals; a basket of cress must be brought together with fragrant wine and placed there, and be well beaten together.<sup>11</sup> They should take a pair of tongs in their hand, for when it smells the fragrance it will come out, so that it can be seized and burnt in the fire, as otherwise it will re-enter.

EXCEPT WATER OF PALM TREES. It was taught: Except water that pierces. He who teaches, water that pierces, [calls it thus] because it pierces the gall.<sup>12</sup> And he who says WATER OF PALM TREES, that is because it comes forth from [between] two palm trees. What is water of palm trees?<sup>13</sup> — Rabbah b. Beruna said: There are two tali<sup>14</sup> in the west [Palestine] and a spring of water issues from between them. The first cup [thereof] loosens, the second causes motion, and the third passes out just as it enters. ‘Ulla said: I myself drank Babylonian beer and it is more efficacious than these [waters];<sup>15</sup> provided, however, that one had discontinued [drinking] it for forty days.<sup>16</sup>

R. Joseph said: Egyptian beer consists of one part barley, one part safflower, and one part salt. R. Papa said: One part wheat, one part safflower, and one part salt. And the token is sisane.<sup>17</sup> And it is drunk between Passover<sup>18</sup> and Pentecost; upon him who is constipated it acts as a laxative, while him who suffers with diarrhoea it binds.

AND A POTION OF ROOTS. What is a POTION OF ROOTS? Said R. Johanan: The weight of a zuz<sup>19</sup> of Alexandrian gum is brought, a zuz weight of liquid alum and a zuz weight of garden crocus, and they are powdered together. For a zabah, a third thereof [mixed] with wine [is efficacious] that she shall not become barren. For jaundice two thirds thereof [mixed] with beer [is drunk], and he [the sufferer] then becomes impotent.<sup>20</sup> ‘For a zabah, a third thereof [mixed] with win [is efficacious] that she shall not become barren’: but if not,<sup>21</sup> let them procure three

---

(1) I.e., as a punishment for disobeying the Rabbis.

(2) Rabbinical laws were often so called; cf. Aboth, I, 13.

(3) Eccl. X, 8.

(4) A bell or a collection of bells forming an instrument specially used at public processions, weddings, etc.

(5) Which pursues him.

(6) To break the track of the scent.

(7) The water breaks the scent.

(8) So that the snake cannot attack him either from below or above.

(9) Rashi: branches, twigs, etc., which rustle and make a noise when anything passes over them. ‘Ar: refuse of reeds.

(10) Where the snake cannot follow.

(11) To cause their fragrance to ascend.

(12) I.e., makes it function.

(13) Bah deletes this question.

(14) A species of palms.

(15) Sc. of the well just mentioned.

(16) Otherwise the system does not react to it.

(17) A basket made of twigs. Sisane contains two sameks; thus R. Joseph (יֹסֵף) mentioned barley (שְׁעוּרִים) — the samek and sin being interchangeable.

(18) Lit., ‘the sacrifice’.

(19) Three and five hundred eighty-five thousand grammes; v. J.E. Weights and Measures, XII, p. 486: Other Weights and Table on p. 489.

(20) Though cured of his illness.

(21) If it is unavailable or fails to cure.

kapiza<sup>1</sup> of Persian onions, boil them in wine, make her drink it, and say to her, 'Cease your discharge.' But if not, she should be made to sit at cross-roads, hold a cup of wine in her hand, and a man comes up from behind, frightens her and exclaims, 'Cease your discharge!' But if not, a handful of cummin, a handful of saffron, and a handful of fenugreek are brought and boiled in wine, she is made to drink it, and they say to her, 'Cease your discharge'. But if not, let sixty pieces of sealing clay of a [wine] vessel be brought, and let them smear her<sup>2</sup> [therewith] and say to her, 'Cease your discharge'. But if not, let one take a fern,<sup>3</sup> boil it in wine, smear her with it and say to her, 'Cease your discharge'. But if not, let one take a thistle growing among Roman thorns,<sup>4</sup> burn it, and gather it up in linen rags in summer and in cotton rags in winter. If not, let one dig seven holes and burn therein a young shoot of 'orlah,<sup>5</sup> put a cup of wine into her hand, then make her rise from one [hole] and seat her on the next, make her rise from that and seat her on the following [and so on], and at each one he should say to her, 'Cease your discharge'. But if not, let one take the flour, rub her from the lower half downwards and say to her, 'Cease your discharge'. If not; let him take an ostrich egg, burn it, and wrap it in linen rags in summer and in cotton rags in winter. If not, let him broach a barrel of wine specially for her sake. If not, let him fetch barley grain which is found in the dung of a white mule: if she holds it one day, it [her discharge] will cease (or two days; if she holds it two days, it will cease for three days; but if she holds it three days, it will cease for ever.

'For jaundice two thirds thereof with beer [is drunk], and he [the sufferer] then becomes impotent.' But if not, let him take the head of a salted shibuta,<sup>6</sup> boil it in beer and drink it. If not, let him take brine of locusts. If brine of locusts is not available, let him take brine of small birds,<sup>7</sup> carry it into the baths and rub himself [therewith]. If there are no baths, he should be placed between the stove and the wall.<sup>8</sup>

R. Johanan said: If one wishes to make him [the sufferer from jaundice] warm, he should wrap him well<sup>9</sup> in his sheet. R. Aha b. Jacob suffered therewith, so R. Kahana treated him thus and he recovered. But if not, let him take three kapiza of Persian dates, three kapiza of dripping wax,<sup>10</sup> and three kapiza of purple aloes, boil them in beer and drink it. If not, let him take a young ass; then he [the invalid] shaves half his head, draws blood from its forehead and applies it to his [own] head, but he must take care of his eyes, lest it [the blood] blind him. If not, let him take a buck's head which has lain in preserves [vinegar], boil it in beer and drink it. If not, let him take a speckled swine, tear it open and apply it to his heart: If not, let him take porret [leeks] from the wastes of the valley.<sup>11</sup> A certain Arab suffered with it. Said he to a gardener, Take my robe and give me some leeks from the wastes of the valley.<sup>12</sup> He gave them to him [and] he ate them. Then he requested, Lend me your robe and I will sleep in it. He singed it, wrapped himself therein and slept. As he became heated through and got up, it fell away from him bit by bit.<sup>13</sup>

'For jaundice two [thirds thereof] with beer, and he becomes impotent.' But is this permitted? Surely it was taught: How do we know that the castration of a man is forbidden? From the verse, neither shall ye do thus in your land:<sup>14</sup> [this means], ye shall not do [thus] to yourselves: the words of R. Hanina! — That is only if he intends [it so], but here it is automatic. For R. Johanan said: If one wishes to castrate a cock, let him cut off its crest, and it is automatically castrated.<sup>15</sup> But R. Ashi said: There it suffers from conceit?<sup>16</sup> Rather [the reference here is to] one who is [already] a castrate.<sup>17</sup> But R. Hiyya b. Abba said in R. Johanan's name:

---

(1) v. p. 492, n. 6.

(2) Rashi: after soaking it in water.

(3) Pastina. The word means a low, spreading plant.

(4) Jast.: probably *corduelis spinosa*.

(5) v. Glos.

(6) Name of a fish, probably mullet (Jast.).

(7) 'Aruch: clear fish brine.

- (8) To make him perspire.  
 (9) Or, rub him.  
 (10) That drips down from an overful honeycomb.  
 (11) Jast., who also suggests an alternative: of the after-crops of valleys. Rash: from the middle of the furrow, where the leeks are sharp.  
 (12) Or, as Rash. V. preceding note.  
 (13) From the feverish heat of the sleeper.  
 (14) Lev. XXII, 24 v. preceding part of the verse.  
 (15) Thus direct castration only is prohibited, but not indirect, and the same applies here.  
 (16) It grieves that its crest is removed and refuses to copulate, but actually it is not castrated.  
 (17) Who suffers from jaundice.

## **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 111a**

All agree that if one prepares it [a meal-offering] as leaven after another has prepared it as leaven,<sup>1</sup> he is culpable; because it is said, It shall not be baked leaven,<sup>2</sup> it shall not be made leaven,<sup>3</sup> If one castrates after another has castrated, he is culpable, for it is said, That which hath its stones bruised, or crushed, or broken, or cut away,<sup>4</sup> [ye shall not offer unto the Lord; neither shall ye do thus in your land]:<sup>5</sup> now, if one is guilty for cutting [them] away, how much more so for breaking them!<sup>6</sup> But it is to teach<sup>7</sup> that if one castrates after another, he is culpable!<sup>8</sup> -Rather it refers to an old man.<sup>9</sup> But R. Johanan said: It was those very [remedies]<sup>10</sup> which restored me to my youth?<sup>11</sup> — Rather the reference [here] is to a woman.<sup>12</sup> But according to R. Johanan b. Beroka, who said: Concerning both [man and woman] it is said, And God blessed them: and God said unto them, Be fruitful and multiply,<sup>13</sup> what can be said?- The reference [here] is to an old woman<sup>14</sup> or to a barren woman.

**MISHNAH.** IF ONE'S TEETH PAIN HIM, HE MUST NOT SIP VINEGAR THROUGH THEM,<sup>15</sup> BUT MAY DIP [HIS BREAD IN VINEGAR] IN THE USUAL MANNER,<sup>16</sup> AND IF HE IS CURED, HE IS CURED. IF ONE'S LOINS PAIN HIM, HE MUST NOT RUB THEM WITH WINE OR VINEGAR, BUT HE MAY ANOINT THEM WITH OIL,<sup>17</sup> YET NOT ROSE OIL.<sup>18</sup> ROYAL CHILDREN MAY ANOINT THEIR WOUNDS WITH ROSE OIL, SINCE IT IS THEIR PRACTICE TO ANOINT THEMSELVES THUS ON WEEKDAYS. R. SIMEON SAID: ALL ISRAEL ARE ROYAL CHILDREN.

**GEMARA.** R. Aha the Long, i.e., R. Ahab. Papa, pointed out a contradiction to R. Abbahu. We learnt: IF ONE HAS TOOTHACHE, HE MUST NOT SIP VINEGAR ON THEM. Shall we say that vinegar is beneficial to the teeth,-but it is written, As vinegar to the teeth, and as smoke to the eyes?<sup>19</sup> -There is no difficulty: the one refers to vinegar of fruit;<sup>20</sup> the other to acid. Alternatively, both refer to acid: one means where there is a wound; the other, where there is no wound.<sup>21</sup> If there is a wound it heals; if there is no wound it loosens [the teeth in the gums].

**HE MUST NOT SIP VINEGAR THROUGH THEM.** But it was taught, He must not sip and eject, yet he may sip and swallow? — Said Abaye, When we learnt our Mishnah we too learnt of sipping and ejecting. Raba said, You may even say [that it refers to] sipping and swallowing: the one holds good before the dipping, the other after the dipping.<sup>22</sup> But let us say, Since it is permitted before the dipping, it is permitted after the dipping too,<sup>23</sup> for we know that Raba accepts this argument.<sup>24</sup> For Raba said: There is nothing which is permitted on the Sabbath and forbidden on the Day of Atonement:<sup>25</sup> since it is permitted on the Sabbath, it is permitted on the Day of Atonement too? He retracted from the present statement.<sup>26</sup> How do you know that he retracted from, this statement: perhaps he retracted from the other?- You cannot think so, For it was taught: All who are obliged to perform tebillah may do so in the normal way, both on the ninth of Ab and on the Day of Atonement.<sup>27</sup>

IF ONES LOINS PAIN HIM, etc. R. Abba b. Zabda said in Rab's name: The halachah is as R. Simeon. Shall we say that Rab holds with R. Simeon?<sup>28</sup> Surely R. Simeon son of R. Hiyya said in Rab's name: The stopper of the brewing vat<sup>29</sup>

- (1) I.e., the first kneads the dough after it was leaven, a second shapes it, and a third bakes it.
- (2) Lev. VI, 10.
- (3) Ibid. II, 11. The repeated prohibition shows that every separate act of preparation entails guilt.
- (4) E. V. cut,' from the present discussion it appears, however, that the Talmud translates the word 'cut away'.
- (5) Ibid. XXII, 24.
- (6) Then why mention it?
- (7) Lit., 'bring'.
- (8) Hence even a castrate may not drink this potion.
- (9) Who is in any case unable to beget children.
- (10) The reference is to the remedies mentioned in Git. 70a.
- (11) And made me potent again.
- (12) Who is not commanded to procreate: hence she may sterilize herself.
- (13) Gen. I, 28. This is understood as a positive command.
- (14) 'Who certainly can not regain her youth in this respect.
- (15) This is healing which is forbidden on the Sabbath.
- (16) And eat the vinegar-soaked bread.
- (17) Since this is done even without intention of healing.
- (18) Which ordinary people use only as a remedy.
- (19) Prov. X, 26.
- (20) Rashi: Wine not fully matured in the grapes — that is injurious.
- (21) Or, swelling.
- (22) Bread dipped in vinegar was eaten before meals. Before one has done this he may sip vinegar for his tooth, as it merely looks like a substitute for soaked bread. But if he has already eaten, he is obviously sipping it now as a remedy only.
- (23) For a thing cannot be permitted during one portion of the Sabbath and forbidden during the other.
- (24) Lit., 'he accepts "Since"'.  
(25) In the matter of labour.
- (26) Sc. that which differentiates between before and after dipping.
- (27) It was in reference to this that Raba stated that what is permitted on the Sabbath is permitted on the Day of Atonement, and he is supported by a Baraitha.
- (28) I.e., with his lenient rulings relating to the Sabbath.
- (29) In which beer is kept during the process of brewing. The stopper was made of soft materials, such as rags, wound round the bung.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 111b

may not be forced into [the bung-hole] on a Festival!<sup>1</sup> — There even R. Simeon agrees, For Abaye and Raba both maintain: R. Simeon agrees in the case of 'cut off his head but let him not die'.<sup>2</sup> But R. Hiyya b. Ashi said in Rab's name: The halachah is as R. Judah,<sup>3</sup> while R. Hanan b. Ammi said in Samuel's name: The halachah is as R. Simeon. Further, R. Hiyya b. Abin recited it without [intermediary] scholars:<sup>4</sup> Rab said: The halachah is as R. Judah; while Samuel ruled: The halachah is as R. Simeon?—Rather said Raba, I and a lion of the company,<sup>5</sup> viz., R. Hiyya b. Abin, explained it: [Rab said:] The halachah is as R. Simeon, but not on account of his view. What is meant by 'The halachah is as R. Simeon, but not on account of his view?' Shall we say, 'The halachah is as R. Simeon', that it is permitted; 'but not through his reason for R. Simeon holds [that] it heals,<sup>6</sup> whereas Rab holds that it does not heal? Does then Rab hold that it does not heal? But surely, since he [the Tanna] states, ROYAL CHILDREN MAY ANOINT THEIR WOUNDS WITH ROSE OIL, it follows that [all agree] that it does heal? But 'the halachah is as R. Simeon', that it is permitted; 'but

not through his reason': for whereas R. Simeon holds that in spite of its being rare it is permitted, Rab holds: Only if it is common [is it permitted], but not if it is rare,<sup>7</sup> and in Rab's place rose oil was common.

## CHAPTER XV

MISHNAH. Now, THESE ARE THE KNOTS WHICH ENTAIL CULPABILITY<sup>8</sup>: CAMEL-DRIVERS' KNOTS AND SAILORS' KNOTS. AND JUST AS ONE IS GUILTY FOR TYING THEM, SO IS HE GUILTY FOR UNTYING THEM. R. MEIR SAID: ANY KNOT WHICH ONE CAN UNTIE WITH ONE HAND ENTAILS NO GUILT.

GEMARA. What are CAMEL-DRIVERS' KNOTS AND SAILORS' KNOTS? Shall we say, the knot which is tied through the nose ring<sup>9</sup> and the knot which is tied through the ship's ring,<sup>10</sup> but these are non-permanent knots?<sup>11</sup> Rather it means the knot of the nose ring itself and of the ship's ring itself.<sup>12</sup>

R. MEIR SAID: ANY KNOT, etc. R. Ahadbuy the brother of Mar Aha asked: What of a slip-knot<sup>13</sup> on R. Meir's view: is R. Meir's reason because it can be untied with one hand, and this too can be untied;<sup>14</sup> or perhaps R. Meir's reason is that it is not well-fastened,<sup>15</sup> whereas this is well-fastened? The question stands over.

MISHNAH. YOU HAVE SOME KNOTS WHICH DO NOT ENTAIL GUILT LIKE FOR CAMEL-DRIVERS' KNOTS AND SAILORS' KNOTS.<sup>16</sup> A WOMAN MAY TIE UP THE OPENING OF HER CHEMISE, THE RIBBONS OF HER HAIR-NET AND OF HER GIRDLE,<sup>17</sup> THE LACES OF HER SHOES OR SANDALS, PITCHERS OF WINE AND OIL, AND THE MEAT POT.<sup>18</sup> R. ELEAZAR B. JACOB SAID: ONE MAY TIE [A ROPE] IN FRONT OF AN ANIMAL,<sup>19</sup> THAT IT SHOULD NOT GO OUT.

GEMARA. This is self-contradictory: you say, YOU HAVE SOME KNOTS WHICH DO NOT ENTAIL GUILT LIKE FOR CAMEL-DRIVERS' KNOTS AND SAILORS' KNOTS; thus there is indeed no guilt, but there is a prohibition. Then he [the Tanna] teaches: A WOMAN MAY TIE UP THE OPENING OF HER CHEMISE, [which means] even at the very outset? — This is what he says: YOU HAVE SOME KNOTS WHICH DO NOT ENTAIL GUILT LIKE FOR CAMEL-DRIVERS' KNOTS AND SAILORS' KNOTS, and which are they?

---

(1) For thereby the moisture which it previously absorbed is wrung out, and this is forbidden. But it is unintentional, whereas R. Simeon holds that such is permitted, v. supra 75a.

(2) V. p. 357, II. 8.

(3) Viz., that whatever is unintentional is forbidden.

(4) Lit., 'men'.

(5) I.e., one of our great scholars.

(6) Yet it is permitted to all because a thing cannot be permitted to one and forbidden to another.

(7) Where it is evident that it is applied as a remedy.

(8) Tying knots is a principal labour, supra 73a.

(9) Rash: a ring was inserted through the camel's nose (this ring was of cord, and had to be knotted after passing through the nose — R. Han., and the same appears from the Gemara) and when it was to be tethered a long rope was tied thereto. The reference is to the knot that is made in tying this long rope.

(10) Rashi: a ring at the head of the ship, through which a rope was passed and tied when the ship was moored. Jast. translates: the loop which they made when attaching the sail to the rigging.

(11) Only a permanent knot entails guilt, and these are naturally untied when the camel or the ship moves on.

(12) Which are permanent.

(13) Or, loop, which, however, is strongly fastened.

- (14) Hence it does not involve guilt.  
 (15) An ordinary knot must be quite loose if it can be untied with one hand.  
 (16) Nevertheless they are forbidden. The Gemara explains which are meant.  
 (17) Rashi. Jast.: the cords of the breast bandage.  
 (18) All these are tied and untied daily, and therefore are not permanent.  
 (19) I.e., across the stable entrance.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 112a

The knot which is tied through the nose ring and the knot which is tied through the ship's ring: [for these] there is indeed no guilt, nevertheless there is a prohibition.<sup>1</sup> But some are permitted at the outset. And which are they? [A WOMAN] MAY TIE UP THE OPENING OF HER CHEMISE.

THE OPENING OF HER CHEMISE. But that is obvious? — This is necessary only where it has two pairs of bands:<sup>2</sup> you might say, One of these is disregarded:<sup>3</sup> hence he informs us [that we do not fear this].

AND THE RIBBONS OF HER HAIR-NET. But that is obvious? — This is necessary [to teach] only where it is roomy:<sup>4</sup> you might say, She will remove it [thus]:<sup>5</sup> hence he informs us that a woman is careful over<sup>6</sup> her hair and will [first] untie it.

AND THE LACES OF HER SHOES OR SANDALS. It was stated: If one unties the laces of his shoes or sandals, — one [Baraitha] taught: He is liable to a sin-offering; another taught: He is not liable, yet it is forbidden; while a third taught: It is permitted in the first place. Thus [the rulings on] shoes are contradictory, and [those on] sandals are contradictory? [The rulings on] shoes are not contradictory: when it teaches, 'he is liable to a sin-offering', it refers to cobblers' [knots];<sup>7</sup> 'he is not liable, but it is forbidden' — that refers to [a knot] of the Rabbis;<sup>8</sup> 'it is permitted in the first place', refers to [the knots] of the townspeople of Mahoza.<sup>9</sup> [The rulings on] sandals too are not contradictory: when it states that 'one is liable to a sin-offering', it refers to [sandals] of travellers<sup>10</sup> tied by cobblers; one is not liable yet it is forbidden', refers to amateur knots<sup>11</sup> tied by [the wearers] themselves; 'it is permitted at the outset', refers to sandals in which two go out,<sup>12</sup> as was the case with Rab Judah. For Rab Judah, brother of R. Salla the Pious, had a pair of sandals, at times he went out in them, at others his child. He went to Abaye and asked him, How is it in such a case?—One is liable to a sin-offering [for tying them], he replied. I do not even understand<sup>13</sup> why [though] one is not liable for this yet it is forbidden, and you tell me that one is liable to a sin-offering. What is the reason?<sup>14</sup> — Because on weekdays too, he replied, at times I go out in them, at others the child. In that case, said he, it is permitted at the outset.

R. Jeremiah was walking behind R. Abbahu in a karmelith, when the lace of his sandal snapped.<sup>15</sup> What shall I do with it? enquired he. — Take a moist reed that is fit for an animal's food and wind it about it, he replied. Abaye was standing in front of<sup>16</sup> R. Joseph,<sup>17</sup> when the lace of his sandal snapped. What shall I do with it? asked he. — Let it be, he replied.<sup>18</sup> Wherein does it differ from R. Jeremiah's [case]? — There it was not guarded;<sup>19</sup> here it is guarded. But it is still a utensil,<sup>20</sup> seeing that I could change it from the right [foot] to the left?<sup>21</sup> —Said he to him: Since R. Johanan explained [the law] on R. Judah's view, it follows that the halachah is as R. Judah.<sup>22</sup> To what does this refer? — For it was taught: If the two ears of the sandal<sup>23</sup> or its two strappings are broken, or if the entire sole is removed, it is clean.<sup>24</sup> If one of its ears or strappings [is broken], or if the greater part of the sole is removed, it is unclean. R. Judah said: If the inner one is broken, it is unclean;<sup>25</sup> if the outer, it is clean. Whereon 'Ulla-others State, Rabbah b. Bar Hanah said in R. Johanan's name: Just as the controversy in respect to uncleanness, so is there a controversy in respect to the Sabbath,<sup>26</sup> but not in respect to halizah.<sup>27</sup> Now we discussed this: To whose [view] does R. Johanan refer? Shall we say, To that of the Rabbis, [and he states], since it is a utensil in respect to uncleanness, it is also so in

respect to the Sabbath, but not in respect to halizah, where it is not a utensil? Surely we learnt: If she removes the left[-foot shoe] from the right foot,<sup>28</sup> the halizah is valid?<sup>29</sup> [Shall we] on the other hand [say that he refers] to R. Judah's [ruling]: [and means], since it is not a 'utensil' in respect to defilement, it is not a 'utensil' in respect to the Sabbath either, but that is not so in respect to halizah, where it is a 'utensil': [it may be asked against this]: Perhaps we rule, If she removes the left[-foot shoe] from the right foot the halizah is valid, only where it is a 'utensil' for its own function;<sup>30</sup> but here it is not a 'utensil' for its own function, seeing that R. Judah said: If the outer is broken, it is clean, which proves that it is not a 'utensil?'<sup>31</sup> In truth, [R. Johanan referred] to R. Judah's view: say, And it is likewise so in respect to halizah, and he informs us this: When do we say, If she removes the left [-foot shoe] from the right foot the halizah is valid, [only] where

- 
- (1) For though temporary only, as stated supra 111b, they are frequently left there a long time, and so are forbidden.
- (2) Lit., 'entrances'. The chemise ties up by two pairs of bands or strings. It can be put on and removed even when one set is actually tied, thought of course with difficulty.
- (3) I.e., when she removes it she may leave one pair tied, which makes it permanent knot; since we do not know which may be left, both should be forbidden.
- (4) Not closely fitting, so that it can be removed from the head even when tied.
- (5) Without untying the ribbons.
- (6) Lit., 'spares'.
- (7) Rashi: when the cobbler inserts the lace in the shoe, he ties it there permanently. — Perhaps the shoes and its laces were so arranged that part of the lace was permanently fastened.
- (8) Sometimes they tied it very loosely, so that the shoe could be removed and put on without untying. Thus whilst not actually permanent to involve a sin-offering, it is semi-permanent, hence forbidden.
- (9) Who were particular that all their garments should fit exactly. Hence their shoes too were tightly fastened and had to be untied every time they were put on or off. perhaps they are mentioned in particular because being well-to-do they thought more of dress; cf. Obermeyer, p. 173.
- (10) Taya'a, specially Arabian caravan merchants.
- (11) Lit., 'balls'.
- (12) They are worn by two different people on occasion. Hence they must be tied exactly each time, and therefore the knot is temporary. — In the other two the differences are the same as in the case of shoes.
- (13) Lit., 'it presents a difficulty to me'.
- (14) Abaye asked this: why do you think that it ought to be permitted?
- (15) With the result that the sandal fell off his foot.
- (16) Tosaf. in Hag. 23a s.v. **נפסקה** reads: was walking behind.
- (17) Rashi: in a courtyard.
- (18) Do not pick it (the sandal) up to put away.
- (19) In a karmelith others might take it.
- (20) Why should it not be allowed to handle the sandal?
- (21) A sandal had two strappings, perhaps like loops, through which the laces were inserted, one on the outside and the other on the inside of the foot. Now, if the inner one is broken, it can be mended, and though it is not very seemly to walk in sandals with the strappings or laces merely knotted together, nevertheless it does not matter, as it is not very noticeable on the inner part of the foot. But if the outer one is broken, one would not walk out in it until a new one is inserted; consequently it ceases to be a 'utensil', and may not be handled on the Sabbath (cf. p. 125, n. 3). In Abaye's case the outer strap was broken, hence R. Joseph's ruling. But Abaye argued that by changing the sandal to the other foot this would become the inner strapping, hence it should be permitted. Presumably their sandals were not shaped exactly to the foot, and were interchangeable.
- (22) That it ceases to be a 'utensil' if the outer is broken.
- (23) At the back, by means of which the sandal is held when it is tied up.
- (24) For here too it ceases to be a 'utensil'.
- (25) For it is still a 'utensil'.
- (26) If it is a utensil in respect of the former, it is likewise so in respect of the latter, and may be handled on the Sabbath.
- (27) V. Glos.

(28) In the ceremony of halizah the shoe must be removed from the right foot.

(29) Because they are interchangeable. But then it should also be regarded as a shoe in respect to halizah even if the outer strapping is broken.

(30) I.e., it is at least fully fit for the left foot.

(31) Even in respect of its own foot.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 112b

it is a 'utensil' for its own function, but here it is not a 'utensil' for its own function.<sup>1</sup>

Now, did R. Johanan say thus?<sup>2</sup> Surely R. Johanan said, The halachah is as an anonymous Mishnah,<sup>3</sup> and we learnt: If one of the ears of a sandal is broken and he repairs it, it [the sandal] is unclean as midras.<sup>4</sup> (If the second is broken [too] and he repairs it, it is clean in that it is not defiled as midras,<sup>5</sup> but it is unclean as that touched by midras.)<sup>6</sup> Does not [this mean that] there is no difference whether it is the inner or the outer?<sup>7</sup> — No, [it refers] only [to] the inner. Then what if the outer [is broken]? [Would it be] clean! If so, instead of teaching, If the second is broken [too] and he repairs it, it is clean in that it is not defiled as midras, but it is unclean as that touched by midras, let him [the Tanna] draw a distinction in that very matter and teach: When is that? if the inner is broken; but [if] the outer [is broken] it is clean?—Said R. Isaac b. Joseph: Let our Mishnah<sup>8</sup> treat of a sandal which has four ears and four strappings, so as not to overthrow<sup>9</sup> the words of R. Johanan.

When Rabin came,<sup>10</sup> he said: R. Hanan b. Abba said in Rab's name: The halachah is as R. Judah; while R. Johanan said: The halachah is not as R. Judah. But did R. Johanan say thus: surely since R. Johanan explained [the law] on the basis of R. Judah's view, it follows that he agrees with R. Judah? — There is [a controversy of] amoraim as to R. Johanan's opinion.

We learnt elsewhere: As for all utensils belonging to private people, their standards are [holes as large] as pomegranates.<sup>11</sup> Hezekiah asked: What if it [a utensil] receives a hole [large enough] for an olive to fall through, and he [the owner] closes it, then it receives another hole<sup>12</sup> [large enough] for an olive to fall through, and he closes it,[and so on] until it is made large enough for a pomegranate to fall through? Said R. Johanan to him, You have taught us: If one of the ears of a sandal is broken and he repairs it, it [the sandal] is unclean as midras; if the second is broken and he repairs it, it is clean in that it is not defiled as midras, but it is unclean as that touched by midras. Now we asked you: Why is it different [when] the first [is broken], — because the second is sound? But [when] the second [too] is broken, the first is [already] repaired? And you answered us: A new entity<sup>13</sup> has arrived hither;<sup>14</sup> here too, a new entity has arrived hither! [Thereupon] he [Hezekiah] exclaimed concerning him, This one is not the son of man!<sup>15</sup> Others say, Such a one is indeed the son of man!<sup>16</sup> R. Zera said in Raba b. Zimuna's name: If the earlier [scholars] were sons of angels, we are sons of men; and if the earlier [scholars] were sons of men, we are like asses, and not [even] like asses of R. Hanina b. Dosa and R. Phinehas b. Jair,<sup>17</sup> but like other asses.

PITCHERS OF WINE OR OIL. But that is obvious?—This is necessary only where they have two spouts;<sup>18</sup> you might say, He [the owner] may completely disregard one:<sup>19</sup> therefore he [the Tanna] informs us [that we do not fear this].

THE MEAT POT. But that is obvious?—This is necessary only where it has a [screwed-in] stopper: you might say, He [the owner] may completely abandon [it]:<sup>20</sup> hence he informs us [that we do not fear this].

R. ELIEZER B. JACOB SAID: ONE MAY TIE, etc. But that is obvious? This is necessary only where there are two cords: you might say,

---

\_\_\_\_\_

- (1) And this is the statement referred to above that R. Johanan explained the law on the view of R. Judah.
- (2) That the halachah is according to R. Judah.
- (3) I.e., one not taught in the name of any Rabbi.
- (4) If it belonged to a zab. V. p. 312, n.9.
- (5) I.e., it loses the midras defilement which it contracted previously.
- (6) I.e., it is unclean in the first degree, which is one degree below midras itself. It retains this lesser degree of defilement, because we regard it as having touched itself, as it were, when it was unclean as midras. — Rashal deletes the bracketed passage here.
- (7) Which is against R. Judah.
- (8) The cited anonymous Mishnah (Kel. XXVI, 4).
- (9) Lit., 'break'.
- (10) V. P. 12, n. 9.
- (11) If they are unclean, and then broken, the holes being large enough to allow a pomegranate to fall through, they cease to be utensils and become clean; cf. supra 95b.
- (12) At the side of the first.
- (13) Lit., 'face'.
- (14) I.e., subsequent to the shoe being defiled as midras, the breaking of both loops and their mending so change the shoe as to make it virtually a different utensil, not the one which was defiled.
- (15) He is superhuman.
- (16) He is a man in the full sense of the word.
- (17) The allusions are explained in Hul. 7a and Ta'an. 24a.
- (18) And the Mishnah refers to tying them up.
- (19) Lit., 'make it as nought', and use the other only; cf. p. 544, n.7.
- (20) Sc. the cloth which he ties on top, as he can unscrew the stopper and take the food out that way.

### **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 113a**

He [the owner] may completely disregard one;<sup>1</sup> hence he [the Tanna] informs us (that we do not fear this).

R. Joseph said in Rab Judah's name in Samuel's name: The halachah is as R. Eliezer b. Jacob. Said Abaye to him, [You say,] The halachah [etc.]: hence it follows that they [the Rabbis] disagree?<sup>2</sup> And what difference does that make? he replied. Shall the accepted tradition be [merely] like a song? he retorted.<sup>3</sup> MISHNAH. A BUCKET [OVER A WELL] MAY BE TIED WITH A FASCIA<sup>4</sup> BUT NOT WITH A CORD;<sup>5</sup> BUT R. JUDAH PERMITS IT. R. JUDAH STATED A GENERAL RULE: ANY KNOT THAT IS NOT PERMANENT ENTAILS NO CULPABILITY.

GEMARA. What CORD is meant. Shall we say an ordinary [bucket] cord? [How then state] R. JUDAH PERMITS IT?- [Surely] it is a permanent knot? Rather it refers to a weaver's rope.<sup>6</sup> Shall we say that the Rabbis hold, We preventively forbid a weaver's cord on account of an ordinary one,<sup>7</sup> while R. Judah holds, We do not preventively forbid? But the following contradicts it: If the cord of a bucket is broken, one must not tie it [together] but merely make a loop [slip-knot]; whereas R. Judah maintains: One may wind a hollow belt or a fascia around it, providing that he does not tie it with a slip-knot. [Thus] R. Judah's [views] are self-contradictory and [similarly] the Rabbis'?- The Rabbis' [views] are not self-contradictory: one rope may be mistaken for<sup>8</sup> another,<sup>9</sup> [whereas] looping cannot be mistaken for knotting.<sup>10</sup> R. Judah's [views] are not self-contradictory: there it is not because looping may be mistaken for knotting, but [because] looping itself is [a form of] knotting.<sup>11</sup>

R. Abba said in the name of R. Hiyya b. Ashi in Rab's name: A man may bring a cord from his house and tie it to a cow and [its] trough.<sup>12</sup> R. Aha the Long, that is R. Aha b. Papa, refuted R. Abba: If a cord [is attached] to a trough, one may tie it to [his] cow; and if [attached] to a cow, one may tie

it to a trough, provided however, that he does not bring a cord from his house and tie it to the cow and the trough? — There [the reference is to] an ordinary cord; here [we treat of] a weaver's cord.

Rab Judah said in Samuel's name: A weaver's implements may be handled on the Sabbath.<sup>13</sup> Rab Judah was asked: What of the upper beam and the lower beam?<sup>14</sup> — Yes and No, and he was uncertain about it.<sup>15</sup> It was stated: R. Nahman said in Samuel's name: A weaver's implements may be handled on the Sabbath, even the upper beam and the lower beam, but not the [vertical] rollers.<sup>16</sup> Raba asked R. Nahman: Why are rollers different, that it is not [permitted]? Shall we say, because one makes holes?<sup>17</sup> But the holes are made automatically!<sup>18</sup> For we learnt: If one stores turnips or radishes under a vine, provided some of their leaves are uncovered, he need have no fear on account of kil'ayim, the seventh year, or tithes, and they may be removed on the Sabbath?<sup>19</sup> — In a field one will not come to level [fill up] the holes; [whereas] here in the house one will come to level the holes.<sup>20</sup>

R. Johanan asked R. Judah b. Lewai: As for a weaver's implements, e.g., the upper beam and the lower beam, may they be handled on the Sabbath? They may not be handled, answered he. What is the reason? Because they cannot be taken up [moved].<sup>21</sup>

MISHNAH. ONE MAY FOLD UP GARMENTS EVEN FOUR OR FIVE TIMES,<sup>22</sup> AND SPREAD THE SHEETS ON THE BEDS ON THE NIGHT OF THE SABBATH<sup>23</sup> FOR [USE ON] THE SABBATH, BUT NOT ON THE SABBATH FOR [USE ON] THE CONCLUSION OF THE SABBATH. R. ISHMAEL SAID: ONE MAY FOLD UP GARMENTS AND SPREAD THE SHEETS ON THE BEDS ON THE DAY OF ATONEMENT FOR [USE ON] THE SABBATH,<sup>24</sup> AND THE FATS OF THE SABBATH<sup>25</sup> MAY BE OFFERED [BURNT ON THE ALTAR] ON THE DAY OF ATONEMENT,<sup>26</sup> BUT NOT THOSE OF THE DAY OF ATONEMENT ON THE SABBATH. R. AKIBA SAID: NEITHER MAY THOSE OF THE SABBATH BE OFFERED ON THE DAY OF ATONEMENT, NOR MAY THOSE OF THE DAY OF ATONEMENT BE OFFERED ON THE SABBATH.

GEMARA. The School of R. Jannai said: They learnt this only of one man, but [it may] not [be done] by two men.<sup>27</sup> And even of one man, we said [this] only of new [garments],<sup>28</sup> but not of old [ones]. And even of old [garments], we said this only of white, but not of coloured [ones].<sup>29</sup> And we said this only if he has no others to change, but if he has others to change it is not permitted. It was taught: [The members] of the household of R. Gamaliel did not fold up their white garments, because they had [others] for changing.

R. Huna said: If one has a change [of garments],<sup>30</sup> he should change [them], but if he has nothing to change into, he should lower his garments.<sup>31</sup> R. Safra demurred: But this looks like ostentation?—Since he does not do this every day, but [only] now [on the Sabbath], it does not look like ostentation.

And thou shalt honour it, not doing thine own ways:<sup>32</sup> ‘and thou shalt honour it’, that thy Sabbath garments should not be like thy weekday garments, and even as R. Johanan called his garments ‘My honourers’.<sup>33</sup> ‘Not doing thine own ways’, that thy walking on the Sabbath shall not be like thy walking on weekdays.<sup>34</sup> ‘Nor finding thine own affairs’:<sup>35</sup> thine affairs are forbidden, the affairs of Heaven [religious matters] are permitted. ‘Nor speaking thine own words:’

---

(1) He will untie only the lower one, and the animal can leave the stable by stooping.

(2) Surely not, seeing that this is exactly similar to the other cases.

(3) V. supra 57b, 106b.

(4) A band or fillet.

(5) The first is certainly not permanent, but the second may be left there, and thus a permanent knot will have been tied

on the Sabbath.

(6) He needs this and will not abandon it there.

(7) The former ought to be permitted, since the knot is only temporary (v. preceding note), and the only reason for prohibiting it is that we fear that otherwise one may fasten an ordinary rope too.

(8) Lit., 'interchanged with'.

(9) As in n. 4.

(10) No one will think that if the former is permitted the latter is too.

(11) In his view.

(12) Without fear of subsequently leaving one end tied, in which case it becomes a permanent knot.

(13) For a permissible use, though of course their normal use is forbidden on the Sabbath.

(14) Jast.: the upper beam on which the warp depends; the lower beam, the roller on which the web is wound as it advances. — Do we say that since these are costly the weaver is careful not to use them for any purpose but their own, and hence they may not be handled even for a legitimate use?

(15) Lit., 'it was weak in his hand'.

(16) Perforated rollers used by women in weaving.

(17) The roller is set in the ground, and in pulling it out one naturally dislodges the earth around it and thus makes a hole.

(18) I.e., they cannot be regarded as made by him.

(19) v. supra 50b bottom et seq. for notes. Thus we do not say that in removing them from the ground he makes holes.

(20) And for fear of this it is forbidden.

(21) Even on weekdays, owing to their heaviness. Hence they are utensils whose exclusive purpose is a labour forbidden on the Sabbath (cf. p. 167, n. 8.)

(22) Every time one takes them off, if they are to be worn again on the Sabbath.

(23) I.e., Friday night.

(24) Rashi: e.g., if the former falls on Friday. — Nowadays this can never happen, but it was possible in the age of the Mishnah, when the beginning of each month was fixed by direct observation.

(25) I.e., the fats of sacrifices offered on the Sabbath.

(26) If it follows the Sabbath. The fats were burnt during the night following the day in which the sacrifice was offered up.

(27) When two men fold up garments they naturally smooth out the creases, and thus repair them, as it were.

(28) They have less creases, and also the cloth is harder, and so the folding does not smooth them out

(29) Their creases are more easily smoothed out. — Perhaps their method of dyeing had that effect on the cloth.

(30) For the Sabbath.

(31) Wear them lower down, to make them look longer. — Wealthy men who did not work in the field generally wore longer garments than workers.

(32) Isa. LVIII, 13. The reference is to the Sabbath.

(33) The garments dignify the person.

(34) This is explained infra.

(35) Ibid. E.V.: pleasure.

## **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 113b**

that thy speech [conversation] on the Sabbath should not be like thy speech on weekdays.<sup>1</sup> 'Speaking': speech is forbidden, but thought [about mundane matters] is permitted. Now, as for all [the rest], they are intelligible; but what is meant by, 'that thy walking on the Sabbath shall not be like thy walking on weekdays'? — As R. Huna said in Rab's name-others state, R. Abba said in R. Huna's name: If one is walking on the Sabbath and comes to a stream of water, if he can put down his first foot<sup>2</sup> before lifting the second,<sup>3</sup> it is permitted;<sup>4</sup> otherwise it is forbidden.<sup>5</sup> Raba demurred: What shall he do? Shall he go round it? Then he increases the walking [distance]!<sup>6</sup> Shall he cross it [walking through]? His garments may be soaked in water and he is led to wringing [them] out!<sup>7</sup> Rather [in such a case], since it is impossible [otherwise], it is permitted [to jump across]. But [what is meant]<sup>8</sup> is as Rabbi asked R. Ishmael son of R. Jose: Is it permitted to take great strides on the

Sabbath?<sup>9</sup> — Who then permitted it on weekdays? he replied; for I maintain that a long stride takes away a five hundredth part of a man's eyesight,<sup>10</sup> and it is restored to him by the evening Kiddush.<sup>11</sup> Rabbi asked R. Ishmael son of R. Jose: May one eat earth on the Sabbath?<sup>12</sup> — Who then permitted it on weekdays? he replied. For I maintain, It is forbidden even on weekdays, because it causes illness.

R. Ammi said: He who eats earth of Babylon is as though he ate the flesh of his ancestors;<sup>13</sup> some say, It is as though he ate of abominations and creeping things, because it is written, And he dissolved every living thing, etc.<sup>14</sup> Resh Lakish said, Why is it [Babylon] called Shinar? Because all the dead of the Deluge were shaken out [deposited] thither [nin'aru lesham]. R. Johanan said: Why was it called Mezulah [depth]? Because all the dead<sup>15</sup> of the Deluge were dumped<sup>16</sup> there.

'Some say, It is as though he ate of abominations and creeping things.' But these were certainly completely dissolved?<sup>17</sup> Rather because they cause illness the Rabbis forbade them. For a certain man ate 'gargishta<sup>18</sup> and [then] ate cress, and the cress sprouted up into his heart<sup>19</sup> and he died.

Wash thyself therefore, and anoint thee, and put thy raiment upon thee.<sup>20</sup> R. Eleazar said: This refers to the Sabbath garments. Give instructions to a wise man, and he will be yet wiser.<sup>21</sup> R. Eleazar said: This alludes to Ruth the Moabitess and Samuel of Ramah.<sup>22</sup> 'Ruth' — for whereas Naomi said to her, Wash thyself therefore, and anoint thee, and put thy raiment upon thee, and get thee down to the threshing floor, yet of her it is written, And she went down unto the threshing-floor, and [only] subsequently, and did according to all that her mother-in-law bade her.<sup>23</sup> 'Samuel': for whereas Eli said to him, Lie down: and it shall be, if he call thee, that thou shalt say, Speak, Lord, for thy servant heareth;<sup>24</sup> yet of him it is written, And the Lord came, and stood, and called as at other times, Samuel, Samuel. Then Samuel said, Speak; for thy servant heareth,<sup>25</sup> but he did not say, Speak, Lord.<sup>26</sup>

And she went and came and gleaned in the field.<sup>27</sup> R. Eleazar said: She repeatedly went and came until she found decent men whom to accompany. Then said Boaz unto his servant that was set over [he reapers, whose damsel is this?<sup>28</sup> Was it then Boaz's practice to enquire about damsels?<sup>29</sup> — Said R. Eleazar: He perceived a wise dealing<sup>30</sup> in her behaviour, two ears of corn<sup>31</sup> she gleaned; three ears of corn she did not glean.<sup>32</sup> It was taught: He perceived modest behaviour in her, the standing ears<sup>33</sup> [she gleaned] standing; the fallen [she gleaned] sitting. And cleave here by my maidens:<sup>34</sup> was it then Boaz's practice to cleave<sup>35</sup> to the women?<sup>36</sup> — Said R. Eleazar, As soon as he saw that, 'and Orpah kissed her mother-in-law, but Ruth cleaved unto her,'<sup>37</sup> he said, It is permitted to cleave unto her. And at meal-time Boaz said unto her, Come hither:<sup>38</sup> Said R. Eleazar, He intimated to her,<sup>39</sup> The royal house of David is destined to come forth from thee, [the house] whereof 'hither' is written, as it is said, Then David the king went in, and sat before the Lord, — and he said, Who am I, O Lord God, and what is my house, that thou hast brought me hither?<sup>40</sup>

And dip thy morsel in vinegar.<sup>41</sup> R. Eleazar said: Hence [it may be deduced] that vinegar is beneficial in hot weather. R. Samuel b. Nahmani said: He intimated to her, A son is destined to come forth from thee whose actions shall be as sharp<sup>42</sup> as vinegar; and who was it, Manasseh — And she sat beside the reapers.<sup>43</sup> R — Eleazar observed: At the side of the reapers, but not in the midst of the reapers: he [Boaz] intimated to her<sup>44</sup> that the Kingdom of the House of David was destined to be divided.<sup>45</sup> And he reached her parched corn, and she did eat [and was sufficed, and left thereof].<sup>46</sup> Said R. Eleazar: 'She ate' in the days of David, 'she was sufficed' in the days of Solomon, 'and she left over' in the days of Hezekiah.<sup>47</sup> Some there are who interpret, 'She ate' in the days of David and Solomon, and 'she was sufficed' in the days of Hezekiah, 'and she left over' in the days of Rabbi.<sup>48</sup> For a Master said, Rabbi's house steward was wealthier than King Shapur.<sup>49</sup> In a Baraita it was taught: 'And she ate', in this world; 'and she was sufficed', in the days of the Messiah: 'and she left over', in the future that is to come.<sup>50</sup>

And beneath his glory shall he kindle a burning like the burning of a fire.<sup>51</sup> R. Johanan said: That which is 'beneath' his glory [shall be burnt], but 'glory' is not literal.<sup>52</sup> R. Johanan is consistent with his opinion, for R. Johanan called his garments 'my honourers'. R. Eleazar said, 'and beneath his glory' means literally instead of his glory.<sup>53</sup> R. Samuel b. Nahmani interpreted: 'And beneath his glory' [must be understood] like the burning of the sons of Aaron; just as there the burning of the soul [is meant], while the body remained intact,<sup>54</sup> so here too, the burning of the soul, while the body remains intact.<sup>55</sup>

R. Aha b. Abba said in R. Johanan's name:

- 
- (1) E.g., business talk is forbidden.
  - (2) On the other side of the stream.
  - (3) From this side of the stream — i.e., he can negotiate the stream in a single stride.
  - (4) Even to jump across.
  - (5) To jump across.
  - (6) Which is more tiring and certainly not preferable on the Sabbath.
  - (7) Which is forbidden.
  - (8) By 'that thy walking on the Sabbath, etc.'
  - (9) Or does it not seem in keeping with the restfulness that should characterize the Sabbath.
  - (10) Lit., 'the light of a man's eyes'.
  - (11) By drinking the wine of Kiddush, q.v. Glos.
  - (12) Rashi: 'day'. Perhaps as a cure.
  - (13) Who died there.
  - (14) Gen. VII, 23. It is now assumed that they became earth.
  - (15) Var. lec.: waters.
  - (16) Or, sunk-niztallelu.
  - (17) They did not become earth.
  - (18) A certain reddish clay.
  - (19) It took root and grew in the gargishta.
  - (20) Ruth III, 3.
  - (21) Prov. IX, 9.
  - (22) I.e., the prophet.
  - (23) Ruth III, 6. — She reversed the order, lest she be met on the way thus adorned, and suspected of being a harlot.
  - (24) I Sam. III, 9.
  - (25) I Sam. III, 10.
  - (26) Being uncertain whether it was God's voice.
  - (27) Ruth II, 3.
  - (28) Ibid. 5.
  - (29) Surely he did not ask about every maiden gleaning in the field!
  - (30) Lit., 'a matter of wisdom'. Bah, quoting Nid. 69b, translates: a knowledge (lit., 'matter of halachah').
  - (31) That fell from the reapers.
  - (32) In accordance with the law stated in Pe'ah VI, 5 — This fact attracted his attention.
  - (33) Which the reapers forgot to cut down; these belong to the poor.
  - (34) Ibid. 8.
  - (35) var. lec.: speak.
  - (36) The question as based on the verse is not clear, v. Maharsha.
  - (37) Ibid. I, 14.
  - (38) Ibid. II, 14.
  - (39) Under the action of the Holy Spirit.
  - (40) II Sam. VII, 18. E.V.: 'thus far'; Heb. in both verses, halom.
  - (41) Ruth II, 14.

(42) Lit., 'hard', 'grievous'.

(43) Ibid.

(44) By seating her thus.

(45) Just as the reapers made a division between her and him.

(46) Ruth II, 14.

(47) This metaphorically indicates the progressive stages of prosperity during the reigns of these three monarchs.

(48) R. Judah the Prince, who was a descendant of the House of David.

(49) Shapur I, King of Persia and a contemporary of Samuel (third century).

(50) Cf. Sanh., Sonc. ed., p. 601, n. 3.

(51) Isa. X, 16.

(52) For the literal meaning of 'glory' in reference to a man is his body, the flesh which gives him his beauty; hence beneath his 'glory' would have to mean his soul, which R. Johanan regards as unsuited to the context. Therefore 'glory,' must refer to his garments, which dignify him, whilst 'beneath his 'glory' denotes the body.

(53) Tahath means both 'beneath' and 'instead'. He too maintains that the body shall be burnt and translates, instead of his glory — sc. his body there shall be the ashes to which it is reduced.

(54) v. Sanh. 52a.

(55) He translates tahath 'beneath', like R. Johanan, and 'glory' his body, like R. Eleazar, and hence arrives at this conclusion. — In Sanh. 94a R. Eleazar's view and R. Samuel b. Nahmani's are combined; v. *ibid.*, Sonc. ed., p. 634.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 114a

Whence do we learn change of garments<sup>1</sup> in the Torah? Because it is said, And he shall put off his garments, and put on other garments,<sup>2</sup> and the School of R. Ishmael taught: The Torah teaches you manners: In the garments in which one cooked a dish for his master, one should not mix a cup [of wine] for his master.<sup>3</sup>

R. Hiyya b. Abba said in R. Johanan's name: It is a disgrace for a scholar to go out with patched shoes into the market place. But R. Aha b. Hanina did go out [thus]? — Said R. Aha son of R. Nahman: The reference is to patches upon patches. R. Hiyya b. Abba also said in R. Johanan's name: Any scholar upon whose garment a [grease] stain is found is worthy of death,<sup>4</sup> for it is said, All they that hate me [mesanne'ai] love [merit] death.<sup>5</sup> read not mesanne'ai but masni'ai [that make me hated, i.e., despised].<sup>6</sup> Rabina said: This was stated about a thick patch.<sup>7</sup> Yet they do not differ: one refers to the upper garment [coat], the other to a shirt.

R. Hiyya b. Abba also said in R. Johanan's name: What is meant by the verse, Like as my servant Isaiah hath walked naked and barefoot?<sup>8</sup> 'Naked' means in worn-out garments; 'barefoot' in patched shoes.

We learnt elsewhere: A grease stain upon a saddle constitutes an interposition.<sup>9</sup> R. Simeon b. Gamaliel said: [The inferior limit is] as much as an Italian issar.<sup>10</sup> On garments: [if the stain is] on one side, it does not interpose; [if] on both sides,<sup>11</sup> it interposes. R. Judah said in R. Ishmael's name: Even on one side it interposes.<sup>12</sup>

R. Simeon b. Lakish asked R. Hanina: In the case of a saddle, [can the stain be] on one side, or [must it be] on both sides?<sup>13</sup> I have not heard this, he replied, but have heard something similar. For we learnt, R. Jose said: [The garments] of banna'im: [a stain even] on one side [interposes]; of uncultured persons, [only a stain] on both sides [interposes].<sup>14</sup> And surely a saddle does not stand higher than the garment of an ignoramus!<sup>15</sup> What are banna'im — Said R. Johanan: These are scholars, who are engaged all their days in the upbuilding of the world.<sup>16</sup>

R. Johanan also said: Who is the scholar to whom a lost article is returned on his recognition thereof?<sup>17</sup> That [scholar] who is particular to turn his shirt.<sup>18</sup> R. Johanan also said: Who is the

scholar that is appointed a leader of the community? He who when asked a matter of halachah in any place can answer it, even in the Tractate Kallah.<sup>19</sup> R. Johanan also said: Who is the scholar whose work it is the duty of his townspeople to perform?<sup>20</sup> He who abandons his own interest and engages in religious affairs; yet that is only to provide<sup>21</sup> his bread.<sup>22</sup>

R. Johanan also said: Who is a scholar? He who is asked a halachah in any place and can state it, In respect of what practical matter?—To appoint him a leader of the community: if [he is well versed only] in one Tractate, [he can be appointed] in his own town; if in the whole [field of] learning,<sup>23</sup> [he can be appointed] as the head of an academy.<sup>24</sup>

R. Simeon b Lakish said: This means<sup>25</sup> the court robes [olaryin]<sup>26</sup> that come from overseas, Shall we say that they are white? But R. Jannai said to his sons, ‘My sons, bury me neither in white shrouds nor in black shrouds, White, lest I do not merit,<sup>27</sup> and am like a bridegroom among mourners: black, in case I have merit, and am like a mourner among bridegrooms. But [bury me] in court garments [olaryin] that come from overseas. This proves that they are coloured. — There is no difficulty: one refers to robes,<sup>28</sup> the other to shirts.<sup>29</sup>

R. ISHMAEL SAID: ONE MAY FOLD UP, etc. Our Rabbis taught: The burnt-offering of the Sabbath, on the Sabbath thereof:<sup>30</sup> this teaches concerning the fats of the Sabbath, that they may be offered [burnt] on the Day of Atonement. One might think. Those of the Day of Atonement [can] also [be burnt] on the Sabbath, therefore it is stated, ‘on the Sabbath thereof’: this is R. Ishmael’s opinion. R. Akiba said: ‘The burnt-offering of the Sabbath on the Sabbath thereof’: this teaches concerning the fats of the sabbath, that they can be offered on a Festival.<sup>31</sup> One might think, On the Day of Atonement too, therefore it is stated, ‘on the Sabbath thereof.’ When you examine the matter,<sup>32</sup> according to R. Ishmael’s opinion, vows<sup>33</sup> and freewill-offerings<sup>34</sup> may be sacrificed on a Festival, hence the verse is required in respect of the Day of Atonement.<sup>35</sup> [But] on the view of R. Akiba, vows and freewill-offerings cannot be sacrificed on a Festival; hence the verse is required to permit [the burning of the fats on] Festivals.

R. Zera said:

---

(1) As an act of honour.

(2) Lev. VI, 4.

(3) In Talmudic times liquor was diluted with water.

(4) This expression merely denotes strong indignation a scholar should set a high standard of cleanliness.

(5) Prov. VIII, 36. The speaker is learning personified.

(6) For a scholar who has no pride in his personal appearance brings contempt upon his learning.

(7) Jast.; v. however, Rashi.

(8) Isa. XX, 3.

(9) When an article is unclean and requires tebillah (v. Glos.), nothing may interpose between it and the water; otherwise the tebillah is invalid. With respect to stains, etc., if one generally objects to them, they are an interposition; if not, they are not an interposition. A grease stain belongs to the former category.

(10) A certain coin. The stain must be at least that size for it to interpose.

(11) The greasiness having soaked through.

(12) V. Kel. IX, 5, 6.

(13) In R. Ishmael’s view.

(14) The former are more fastidious than the latter. R. Jose disagrees with R. Judah and maintains that according to R. Ishmael a stain on the garments of banna'im (explained below as meaning scholars) interposes even if it is on one side only. — This passage is cited to show that scholars must be particular.

(15) I.e., an uncultured person. On ‘am ha-arez v. p 51, n. 1 .

(16) Banna'im lit. means builders. Frankel, Zeitschrift für die Religiösen Interessen des Judentums', 1846 p. 455 maintains that the term banna'im was originally applied to the Essenes. — Ignorance is the greatest enemy of stability,

but it should be noted that the phrase (disciple of the wise) (talmid hakam) always denoted scholarship plus piety.

(17) Lit., 'on impression of the eye'. The ordinary person in claiming a lost article must state identification marks, but a scholar is believed if he simply states that he recognizes it; B.M. 23b.

(18) For the seams and rough edges to be on the inside. It appears that not all were particular about this.

(19) A short tractate of that name. Rashi: Though this is not generally studied. Others: the laws of Festivals (Kallah was the name given to the general assemblies in Elul and Adar, when the laws of the Festivals were popularly expounded). v. Kid., Sonc. ed., p. 247, nn 3-4.

(20) V. Yoma 72b; cf. Aboth III, and note a.l. in Sonc. ed. The present passage supports the thirteenth century interpretation quoted there, and suggests that it was similarly interpreted in Talmudic ages too.

(21) Lit., 'take trouble over'.

(22) I.e., he can only demand the necessities of existence.

(23) Jast. the Mishnah, [Kaplan, J. op. cit. p. 250 understands this as a technical term denoting the summary embodying conclusions arrived at in schools as a result of the discussions based on the Mishnah]

(24) It may be observed that it is automatically assumed that the leader of a community must be a scholar for Jewry sought to promote an aristocracy of learning, not of birth. Cf. Halevi, Doroth, I, 3, pp. 640 seq.

(25) Resh Lakish gives his definition of the garments of 'banna'im'.

(26) Jast. Rashi reads: olyarim (from Gr. \*\*): costly wraps used by wealthy persons at the baths.

(27) To be amongst the righteous.

(28) Upper garments, which were coloured,

(29) Or, chemises. These were white.

(30) Num. XXXVIII, 10. This is interpreted with and without the 'thereof' (the suffix ך). Thus: (i) The burnt-offering of one Sabbath may be completed (i.e., its fat burnt on the altar) on another Sabbath; (ii) The burnt-offering of one Sabbath must be completed on that self-same Sabbath. In this connection it must be observed that the Day of Atonement too is designated Sabbath in Lev. XXIII, 32

(31) Following the Sabbath.

(32) Lit., 'when you find to say',

(33) I.e. vowed sacrifices,

(34) For the difference v. R. H. 6a. Both, of course, are voluntary sacrifices,

(35) For if even voluntary offerings, which can be brought on weekdays, may be sacrificed on a Festival, it goes without saying that fats left over from the obligatory public sacrifices of the Sabbath can be burnt in the evening, even if it is a Festival, and no verse is necessary to teach this. Consequently the verse must be referred to the Day of Atonement,

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 114b

When I was in Babylon<sup>1</sup> I thought,<sup>2</sup> That which was taught, If the Day of Atonement fell on the eve of the sabbath [Friday], it [the Shofar] was not sounded,<sup>3</sup> while [if it fell] at the termination of the Sabbath, habdalah was not recited,<sup>4</sup> is a unanimous opinion. But when I emigrated thither [to Palestine]. I found Judah the son of R. Simeon b. Pazzi sitting and saying, This is according to Akiba [only];<sup>5</sup> for if [it agrees with] R. Ishmael, — since he maintains, The fats of the Sabbath may be offered on the Day of Atonement, let it [the Shofar] be sounded, so that it may be known that the fats of the Sabbath can be offered on the Day of Atonement,<sup>6</sup> Whereupon I said to him, The priests<sup>7</sup> are zealous.<sup>8</sup>

Mar Kashisha son of R. Hisda said to R. Ashi: Do we then say, Priests are zealous? Surely we learnt: Three [blasts were blown] to cause the people to cease work; three, to distinguish between the holy [day] and weekdays?<sup>9</sup> — As Abaye answered,<sup>10</sup> it was for the rest of the people in Jerusalem; so here too it was for the rest of the people in Jerusalem.

Yet let it [the Shofar] be blown, so that they might know that the trimming of vegetables is permitted [on the Day of Atonement] from the [time of] minhah<sup>11</sup> and onwards?<sup>12</sup> Said R. Joseph: Because a shebuth<sup>13</sup> is not superseded in order to give permission.<sup>14</sup> While R. Shisha son of R. Idi answered: A shehuth [of] immediate<sup>15</sup> [importance] was permitted; a shebuth [of] distant

[importance] was not permitted<sup>16</sup> But did they permit a shebuth [of] immediate [importance]? Surely we learnt: If a Festival falls on Friday, we sound [the shofar] but do not recite habdalah;<sup>17</sup> [if it falls] at the termination of the Sabbath, we recite habdalah<sup>18</sup> but do not sound [the shofar].<sup>19</sup> But why so: let it be sounded so that it may be known that killing [animals for food] is permitted immediately [the Sabbath ends]?<sup>20</sup> Rather it is clear that it is as R. Joseph [answered]. R. Zera said in R. Huna's name — others state, R. Abba said in R. Huna's name: If the Day of Atonement falls on the Sabbath, the trimming of vegetables is forbidden. R. Mana said, It was taught likewise: How do we know that if the Day of Atonement falls on the Sabbath, the trimming of vegetables<sup>21</sup> is forbidden? Because it is said, Shabbathon; it is a shebuth.<sup>22</sup> Now, in respect of what [is it stated]: shall we say. In respect of labour<sup>23</sup> — surely it is written, thou shalt not do any work?<sup>24</sup> Hence it must surely refer to the trimming of vegetables;<sup>25</sup> this proves it.

A. Hiyya b. Abba said in R. Johanan's name: If the Day of Atonement falls on the Sabbath, the trimming of vegetables is permitted. An objection is raised: How do we know that if the Day of Atonement falls on the Sabbath, the trimming of vegetables is forbidden? Because shabbathon is stated: it is a shebuth. In respect of what: shall we say in respect of labour, — surely it is written, 'thou shalt not do any work'? Hence it must surely refer to the trimming of vegetables! — No: in truth it refers to actual work, but [it is stated] to [show that] one violates an affirmative and a negative injunction on account thereof.<sup>26</sup> It was taught in accordance with R. Johanan: If the Day of Atonement falls on the Sabbath,

---

(1) R. Zera was a Babylonian who studied at home first and then emigrated to Palestine,

(2) Lit., 'said',

(3) As on ordinary Fridays, supra 35b.

(4) In the evening prayer, V. Glos. When a Festival falls on Sunday, habdalah is recited in the evening to signify that there is a distinction between the holiness of the Sabbath and that of Festivals.

(5) Since he maintains that the fats of the Sabbath may not be burnt on the Day of Atonement and vice versa, he evidently holds that they each enjoy equal sanctity. Therefore neither habdalah nor the sounding of the shofar is required, for these are necessary only to mark a difference in the degree of sanctity.

(6) For the sounding of the shofar would teach that the Day of Atonement possessed a lower degree of holiness.

(7) Who burn the fats.

(8) They take care to know the law and need no reminder.

(9) This was done in the Temple, and he assumed that it was in order to remind the priests,

(10) In reference to another matter; v, Yoma 37b,

(11) V. Glos.

(12) In this it differs from the Sabbath, when it is forbidden, V. infra.

(13) V. Glos.; the blowing of the shofar is a shebuth.

(14) But only where it is necessary to emphasize prohibitions, e.g., if Friday is a Festival, so that many things permitted thereon are forbidden on the Sabbath,

(15) Lit., 'near',

(16) If it were of immediate importance, the shebuth would have been permitted. But in any case when the day of Atonement falls on Friday, the vegetables, even if trimmed, cannot be cooked on the Sabbath. So that the sounding of the shofar would only be of importance for subsequent Days of Atonement, and in such a case the shebuth is not superseded.

(17) On Friday evening, because habdalah is recited only when a more stringent holiness is left behind.

(18) On Saturday evening.

(19) Saturday afternoon.

(20) For the preparation of food is permitted on Festivals, Ex, XII. 6.

(21) I.e., cutting away those parts of vegetables which are not edible. The reference is of course to unattached vegetables.

(22) Ex. XVI, 23: E.V. (solemn) rest. Here it is translated as shebuth, and thus intimates such labour as trimming vegetables.

(23) I.e., the word forbids actual labour, e.g. the trimming of vegetables that are still attached to the soil, supra 73b. — The discussion here treats of vegetables already cut off from the ground.

(24) Ex, XX, 9, hence shabbathon is superfluous.

(25) The verse is merely a support (asmakta), the prohibition being a Rabbinical one only (Ri).

(26) Shabbathon is an affirmative command, bidding one to rest,

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 115a

the trimming of vegetables is permitted. Nuts may be cracked and pomegranates scraped from the [time of] minhah and onwards, on account of one's vexation.<sup>1</sup> The household of Rab Judah trimmed cabbage. Rabbah's household scraped pumpkins. Seeing that they were doing this [too] early,<sup>2</sup> he said to them, A letter has come from the west in R. Johanan's name [to the elect] that this is forbidden.<sup>3</sup>

### CHAPTER XVI

MISHNAH. ALL SACRED WRITINGS<sup>4</sup> MAY<sup>5</sup> BE SAVED FROM A FIRE,<sup>6</sup> WHETHER WE READ THEM OR NOT;<sup>7</sup> AND EVEN IF THEY ARE WRITTEN IN ANY LANGUAGE, THEY MUST BE HIDDEN.<sup>8</sup> AND WHY DO WE NOT READ [CERTAIN OF THE SACRED WRITINGS]? BECAUSE OF THE NEGLIGENCE OF THE BETH HAMIDRASH.<sup>9</sup>

GEMARA. It was stated: If they are written in Targum<sup>10</sup> or in any [other] language, — R. Huna said: They must not be saved from a fire; while R. Hisda ruled: They may be saved from a fire. On the view that it is permissible to read them,<sup>11</sup> all agree that they must be saved. They differ only according to the view that they may not be read. R. Huna says: We may not save [them], since they may not be read. R. Hisda says: We must save [them], because of the disgrace to Holy Writings.<sup>12</sup> We learnt: ALL SACRED WRITINGS MAY BE SAVED FROM THE FIRE, WHETHER WE READ THEM OR NOT, and even if they are written in any language. Surely WHETHER WE READ THEM refers to the Prophets, whilst OR NOT refers to the Writings, AND EVEN IF THEY ARE WRITTEN IN ANY LANGUAGE, though they may not be read [publicly], yet he [the Tanna] teaches that they MAY BE SAVED, which refutes R. Huna? — R. Huna can answer you: Is that logical? Consider the second clause: THEY MUST BE HIDDEN: seeing that they must be saved,<sup>13</sup> need hiding be mentioned?<sup>14</sup> But R. Huna explains it in accordance with his view, while R. Hisda explains it according to his. R. Huna explains it in accordance with his view. WHETHER WE READ THEM, [i.e.] the Prophets; OR NOT, [i.e.,] the Writings. That is only if they are written in the Holy Tongue [Hebrew], but if they are written in any [other] language, we may not save them, yet even so they must be hidden. R. Hisda explains it according to his view: WHETHER WE READ THEM, [i.e.,] the Prophets, OR NOT, [i.e.,] the Writings; EVEN IF THEY ARE WRITTEN IN ANY LANGUAGE, we must still save them. And this is what he states: And [even] their worm-eaten [material] MUST BE HIDDEN.

An objection is raised: If they are written in Targum or in any [other] language, they may be saved from the fire: this refutes R. Huna? — R. Huna answers you: This Tanna holds, They may be read. Come and hear: If they are written in Egyptian,<sup>15</sup> Median, a trans[-Euphratean]<sup>16</sup> Aramaic, Elamitic,<sup>17</sup> or Greek, though they may not be read, they may be saved from a fire: this refutes R. Huna? — R. Huna can answer you: It is [a controversy of] Tannaim. For it was taught: If they are written in Targum or in any language, they may be saved from a fire. R. Jose said: They may not be saved from a fire. Said R. Jose: It once happened that my father Halafta visited R. Gamaliel Berabbi<sup>18</sup> at Tiberias and found him sitting at the table of Johanan b. Nizuf with the Targum of the Book of Job in his hand<sup>19</sup> which he was reading. Said he to him, 'I remember that R. Gamaliel, your grandfather, was standing on a high eminence on the Temple Mount, when the Book of Job in a Targumic version was brought before him, whereupon he said to the builder, "Bury it under the

bricks."<sup>20</sup> He [R. Gamaliel II] too gave orders, and they hid it.'<sup>21</sup> R. Jose son of R. Judah said: They overturned a tub of mortar upon it. Said Rabbi: There are two objections to this: Firstly, how came mortar on the Temple Mount?<sup>22</sup> Moreover, is it then permitted to destroy them with one's own hands? For they must be put in a neglected place to decay of their own accord.<sup>23</sup> Which Tannaim [differ on this question]?<sup>24</sup>

- 
- (1) Lit., 'grief of the soul'. It would be very vexing if the breaking of the Fast had to be delayed whilst these are prepared (Baal Ha-Ma'or V. Marginal Gloss.; Rashi explains it differently)
- (2) Before the time of minhah.
- (3) Such letters afford examples of early Rabbinic Responsa.
- (4) E.g., the Torah, Prophets, and Writings.
- (5) In this connection 'may' is the equivalent of 'must', and similarly in the Gemara.
- (6) By being moved from one domain to another on the Sabbath. V. next Mishnah.
- (7) The reference is to public readings. There was (and is) public reading from the Prophets but not from the Writings (Hagiographa). Rashi quotes another explanation: even private individuals did not read the Writings (on the Sabbath), because public lectures were given on that day, which left no time for private reading.
- (8) If they become unfit for use. V. p. 429, n. 5.
- (9) The public lectures would be neglected. For a general discussion on the manner, etc. of these lectures v. Zunz, G. V. Ch. 20.
- (10) The Aramaic translation of the Pentateuch and other portions of the Bible are called Targum — the translation par excellence. But v. Kaplan, op. cit. pp. 283 seq.
- (11) publicly; v. Meg. 8b.
- (12) It disgraces them if they are allowed to be burnt like something worthless.
- (13) On your hypothesis.
- (14) Obviously if they have sufficient sanctity to be saved on the Sabbath they must not be simply thrown away when no longer fit for use.
- (15) Or, Coptic.
- (16) עברית so Jast.: perhaps the reference is to Hebrew in transliteration.
- (17) Of Elam, south of Assyria.
- (18) A title of scholars most frequently applied to disciples of R. Judah ha-Nasi and his contemporaries, but also to some of his predecessors (as here), and sometimes to the first Amoraim (Jast.). V. Naz., Sonc. ed., p. 64, n. 1.
- (19) This shows that a Targum of Job existed already in the middle of the first century C.E. This is not identical with the extant Targum, which on internal evidence must have been composed later; v. J.E. art. Targum, Vol. XII, p. 62; Zunz, G. V. 64 seq.
- (20) Lit., 'the course (of stones)'.  
 (21) The spread of words inimical to Judaism, both through the rise of Christianity and false claimants to the Messiahship, caused the Rabbis to frown upon books other than those admitted to the Holy Scriptures, even such as were not actually inimical thereto. — Weiss, Dor, I, 212, 236.
- (22) A mixture of lime and sand was used, but not mortar, which is made of earth and water.
- (23) The objection to writing down the Targum was probably due to the fear that it might in time be regarded as sacred. V. also Kaplan, op. cit., p. 285.
- (24) Sc. whether they may be rescued from a fire.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 115b

Shall we say the first Tanna and R. Jose, — but perhaps they differ in this: one Master holds, It is permitted to read them; while the other holds, It is not permitted to read them?<sup>1</sup> Rather [they are] R. Jose and the Tanna [who taught the law] about the Egyptian [script].

Our Rabbis taught: Benedictions and amulets, though they contain letters of the [Divine] Name and many passages of the Torah, must not be rescued from a fire but must be burnt where they lie,<sup>2</sup> they together with their Names. Hence it was said, They who write down Benedictions are as though

they burnt a Torah.<sup>3</sup> It happened that one was once writing in Sidon. R. Ishmael was informed thereof, and he went to question him [about it]. As he was ascending the ladder, he [the writer] became aware of him, [so] he took a sheaf of benedictions and plunged them into a bowl of water. In these words<sup>4</sup> did R. Ishmael speak to him: The punishment for the latter [deed] is greater than for the former.

The Resh Galutha<sup>5</sup> asked Rabbah son of R. Huna: If they are written with paint [dye], sikra,<sup>6</sup> gum ink, or calcanthum,<sup>7</sup> in Hebrew, may they be rescued from a fire or not? This is asked whether on the view that we may save<sup>8</sup> or that we may not save. It is asked on the view that we may not save: that may be only if they are written in Targum or any [other] language; but here that they are written in Hebrew, we may rescue [them]. Or perhaps even on the view that we may save [them], that is only when they are written in ink, which is lasting; but here, since it [the writing] is not permanent, [we may] not [rescue them]? — We may not save [them], answered he. But R. Hammuna recited, We may save [them]? — If it was taught, it was taught, replied he.<sup>9</sup> Where was it taught? — Said R. Ashi, Even as it was taught: The only difference between the [other] Books<sup>10</sup> and the Megillah<sup>11</sup> is that the Books can be written in any language, whereas a Megillah must be written in Assyrian,<sup>12</sup> on a Scroll, and in ink.<sup>13</sup>

R. Huna b. Halub asked R. Nahman: A Scroll of the Law in which eighty-five letters cannot be gathered,<sup>14</sup> such as the section, And it came to pass when the Ark set forward [etc.],<sup>15</sup> may it be saved from a fire or not? — Said he, Then ask about the section, ‘and it came to pass, etc.,’ itself!<sup>16</sup> — If the section, ‘And it came to pass, etc.,’ is defective [through effacing], I have no problem, for since it contains the Divine Name, even if it does not contain eighty-five letters we must rescue it. My only problem is about a Scroll of the Law wherein [this number] cannot be gathered: what then? We may not save it, he answered.

He refuted him: If Targum is written as Mikra,<sup>17</sup> or Mikra is written in Targum or in Hebrew characters,<sup>18</sup> they must be saved from a fire, and the Targum in Ezra, Daniel and the Torah [the Pentateuch] go without saying. Now, what is the Targum in the Torah? [The words], Yegar sahadutha;<sup>19</sup> and though it does not contain eighty-five letters [it must be saved]? — That was taught in respect of completing [the number].<sup>20</sup>

The scholars asked: These eighty-five letters, [must they be] together or [even] scattered? R. Huna said: [They must be] together; R. Hisda said: Even scattered. An objection is raised: If a Scroll of the Law is decayed, if eighty-five letters can be gathered therein, such as the section, ‘and it came to pass when the ark set forward etc.,’ we must save it; if not, we may not save it. This refutes R. Huna?<sup>21</sup> — R. Hisda expounded it on the basis of R. Huna's [ruling as referring] to words.<sup>22</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: ‘And it came to pass when the ark set forward that Moses said, [etc.]’: for this section the Holy One, blessed be He, provided signs above and below,<sup>23</sup> to teach

---

(1) And the question whether they may be saved depends on whether they may be read.

(2) Lit., ‘in their place’.

(3) Since should fire break out they may not be saved (Rashi).

(4) Lit., ‘this language’.

(5) V. p. 217, n. 7.

(6) A red paint.

(7) Vitriol used as an ingredient of shoe-black and of ink (Jast.).

(8) Holy writings written in other languages.

(9) Then I am wrong.

(10) Comprising the Bible — i.e., the Torah, Prophets and Hagiographa.

(11) The Book of Esther.

- (12) The modern square Hebrew characters, which superseded the older Hebrew, viz., Syriac or Samaritan form. V. Meg., Sonc. ed., p. 47 n. 4 and Sanh., Sonc., ed. p. 120, n. 4.
- (13) Ri: this is only in respect of saving them from a fire. Other books even if not written on a scroll and in ink must be saved, whereas for a Megillah these conditions are necessary.
- (14) I.e., the whole Scroll is effaced and eighty-five clear letters cannot be found in it. This is the minimum for a Scroll to retain its sanctity.
- (15) Num. X, 35-36. That contains eighty-five letters, and as stated infra it is designated a separate 'Book'.
- (16) If it is written separately upon a piece of parchment, and one or more of its letters are effaced.
- (17) I.e., if the Biblical passages which are in Aramaic in the original are written in Hebrew, as practically the whole of the Pentateuch (mikra — lit., 'reading') is.
- (18) Samaritan script. V. p. 66, n. 9.
- (19) Gen. XXXI, 47 q.v.
- (20) I.e., if the Scroll contains eighty-five uneffaced letters including yegar sahadutha, it must be saved.
- (21) Because 'can be gathered' implies that they are scattered.
- (22) It contains complete words scattered about which total to eighty-five letters. They differ where all the eighty-five letters are scattered, the Scroll containing no complete words at all.
- (23) I.e., at the beginning and at the end. — In the Scrolls the section is preceded and followed by a reversed nun, which distinguishes and divorces it from the adjoining passages.

### **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 116a**

that this is not its place. Rabbi said: It is not on that account,<sup>1</sup> but because it ranks as a separate Book. With whom does the following dictum of R. Samuel b. Nahmani in R. Jonathan's name agree: She [Wisdom] hath hewn out her seven pillars:<sup>2</sup> this refers to the seven Books of the Law? With whom? With Rabbi.<sup>3</sup> Who is the Tanna that disagrees with Rabbi? It is R. Simeon b. Gamaliel. For it was taught, R. Simeon b. Gamaliel said: This section is destined to be removed from here and written in its [right place].<sup>4</sup> And why is it written here? In order to provide a break between the first [account of] punishment and the second [account of] punishment.<sup>5</sup> What is the second [account of] punishment? — And the people were as murmurers, [etc.].<sup>6</sup> The first [account of] punishment? — And they 'moved away from the mount of the Lord,<sup>7</sup> which R. Hama b. R. Hanina expounded [as meaning] that they turned away from following the Lord. And where is its [rightful] place? — In [the chapter on] the banners.<sup>8</sup>

The scholars asked: The blank spaces of a Scroll of the Law, may we rescue them from fire or not? — Come and hear: If a Scroll of the Law is decayed, if eighty-five letters can be gathered therein, such as the section 'and it came to pass when the ark set forward,' we must save it; if not, we may not save it. But why so? conclude [that it may be saved] on account of its blank space?<sup>9</sup> That which is decayed is different.<sup>10</sup> Come and hear: If a Scroll of the Law is effaced, if eighty-five letters can be gathered therein, such as the section, 'and it came to pass when the ark set forward,' we must save it; if not, we may not save it. But why so: conclude [that we must save it] on account of its blank space?<sup>11</sup> — As for the place of the writing, I have no doubt, for when it was sanctified it was on account of the writing, [and] when its writing goes its sanctity goes (too). My problem is only in respect of [the blank spaces] above and below, between the sections, between the columns, [and] at the beginning and the end of the Scroll. Yet conclude [that it must be saved] on that account?<sup>12</sup> — It may mean [there] that one had cut off [the blank spaces] and thrown them away.

Come and hear: The blank spaces above and below, between the sections, between the columns, at the beginning and at the end of the Scroll, defile one's hands.<sup>13</sup> — It may be that [when they are] together with the Scroll of the Law they are different.<sup>14</sup> Come and hear: The blank spaces<sup>15</sup> and the Books of the Minim<sup>16</sup> may not be saved from a fire, but they must be burnt in their place, they and the Divine Names occurring in them. Now surely it means the blank portions of a Scroll of the Law? No: the blank spaces in the Books of Minim. Seeing that we may not save the Books of Minim

themselves, need their blank spaces be stated? — This is its meaning: And the Books of Minim are like blank spaces.

It was stated in the text: The blank spaces and the Books of the Minim, we may not save them from a fire. R. Jose said: On weekdays one must cut out the Divine Names which they contain, hide them,<sup>17</sup> and burn the rest. R. Tarfon said: May I bury my son if I would not burn them together with their Divine Names if they came to my hand. For even if one pursued me<sup>18</sup> to slay me, or a snake pursued me to bite me, I would enter a heathen Temple [for refuge], but not the houses of these [people], for the latter know (of God) yet deny [Him], whereas the former are ignorant and deny [Him], and of them the Writ saith, and behind the doors and the posts hast thou set up thy memorial.<sup>19</sup> R. Ishmael said: [One can reason] a minori: If in order to make peace between man and wife the Torah decreed, Let my Name, written in sanctity, be blotted out in water,<sup>20</sup> these, who stir up jealousy, enmity, and wrath between Israel and their Father in Heaven, how much more so;<sup>21</sup> and of them David said, Do not I hate them, O Lord, that hate thee? And am I not grieved with those that rise up against thee? I hate them with perfect hatred: I count them mine enemies.<sup>22</sup> And just as we may not rescue them from a fire, so may we not rescue them from a collapse [of debris] or from water or from anything that may destroy them.

R. Joseph b. Hanin asked R. Abbahu: As for the Books of Be Abedan,<sup>23</sup> may we save them from a fire or not? — Yes and No, and he was uncertain about the matter.<sup>24</sup> Rab would not enter a Be Abedan, and certainly not a Be Nizrefe;<sup>25</sup> Samuel would not enter a Be Nizrefe, yet he would enter a Be Abedan. Raba was asked: Why did you not attend at the Be Abedan? A certain palm-tree stands in the way, replied he, and it is difficult for me [to pass it].<sup>26</sup> Then we will remove it? — Its spot will present difficulties to me.<sup>27</sup> Mar b. Joseph said: I am one of them<sup>28</sup> and do not fear them. On one occasion he went there, [and] they wanted to harm him.<sup>29</sup>

Imma Shalom, R. Eliezer's wife, was R. Gamaliel's sister. Now, a certain philosopher<sup>30</sup> lived in his vicinity,

---

(1) Lit., 'designation'.

(2) Prov. IX, 1.

(3) Since that section is a separate Book, the portions of Numbers preceding and following it are also separate Books; hence there are seven in all.

(4) Viz., in the section dealing with the disposition of the Israelites according to their banners and their travelling arrangements, Num. II.

(5) So as to relieve the gloomy effect that would otherwise be produced.

(6) Num. XI, 1 seq.

(7) Ibid. X, 33.

(8) But in the future, when all evil and its consequent retribution has ceased, this section will be inserted in its right place.

(9) And since we do not reason thus, it follows that the margin may not be saved.

(10) For the parchment of the margins too is perished. The question is where the parchment is quite sound, but the writing is effaced.

(11) Which is now the entire Scroll.

(12) Even if the place of the writing is no longer sacred, if the margins must be saved, the entire Scroll must be saved ipso facto.

(13) Cf. supra 14a. This proves that they have the same sacred character as the rest of the Scroll.

(14) The writing there being sound.

(15) Jast. s.v. יִיִּשׁׁוּ translates, the gospels, though observing that here it is understood as blanks. V. Herford, R.T., 'Christianity in the Talmud', p. 155 n.

(16) Sectarious. The term denotes various kinds of Jewish sectarians, such as the Sadducees, Samaritans, Judeo-Christians, etc., according to the date of the passage in which the term is used. The reference here is probably to

the last-named. V. J.E., art. Min; Bacher in REJ. XXXVIII, 38. Rashi translates: Hebrew Bibles written by men in the service of idolatry.

(17) v. p. 429, n. 5.

(18) Lit., 'him' — he meant himself but used the third person owing to a reluctance to speak even hypothetically of evil befalling himself.

(19) Isa. LVII, 8; they know of the true God, but have rejected Him, thrusting Him out of sight, as it were.

(20) The reference is to the trial of a wife accused of adultery; v. Num. V, 23f.

(21) Not only do they themselves go astray from God, but lead many others astray from Him.

(22) Ps. CXXXIX, 21f.

(23) The meeting place of early Christians where religious controversies were held (Jast.). Rashi: the books written for the purpose of these controversies; v. also Weiss, Dor, III, p. 166 and n. 13. [The meaning of Be Abedan is still obscure in spite of the many and varied explanations suggested; e.g., (a) House of the Ebionites; (b) Abadan (Pers.) 'forum'; (c) Beth Mebedhan (Pers.) 'House of the chief Magi'; v. Krauss's Synagogale Altertumer, p. 31].

(24) V. supra 113a.

(25) **בֵּי נִצְרָפִי**; a meeting place of the Nazarenes, Jewish Christians, where local matters were discussed and religious debates were held. (Levy). [Ginzberg, MGWJ LXXVIII, p. 23 regards it as the name of a Persian house of worship meaning the Asylum of Helplessness].

(26) This of course was merely an evasion.

(27) It will leave a hole and render the road impassable.

(28) I am well acquainted with them.

(29) Uncensored text adds: R. Meir called it (the Gospel) 'Awen Gilyon, the falsehood of blank Paper; R. Johanan called it 'Awon Gilyon, the sin of etc. On the whole passage v. Herford, op. cit., pp. 161-171.

(30) Rashi: min (i.e., sectarian).

## **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 116b**

and he bore a reputation that he did not accept bribes.<sup>1</sup> They wished to expose him,<sup>2</sup> so she brought him a golden lamp, went before him, [and] said to him, 'I desire that a share be given me in my [deceased] father's estate.' 'Divide,' ordered he. Said he [R. Gamaliel] to him, 'It is decreed for us, Where there is a son, a daughter does not inherit.' [He replied], 'Since the day that you were exiled from your land the Law of Moses has been superseded<sup>3</sup> and another book<sup>4</sup> given, wherein it is written, 'A son and a daughter inherit equally.'<sup>5</sup> The next day, he [R. Gamaliel] brought him a Lybian ass. Said he to them, 'Look<sup>6</sup> at the end of the book, wherein it is written, I came not to destroy the Law of Moses nor<sup>7</sup> to add to the Law of Moses,<sup>8</sup> and it is written therein, A daughter does not inherit where there is a son. Said she to him, 'Let thy light shine forth like a lamp.'<sup>9</sup> Said R. Gamaliel to him, 'An ass came and knocked the lamp over!'<sup>10</sup>

AND WHY DO WE NOT READ [THEM], etc. Rab said: They learnt this only for the time of the Beth Hamidrash, but we may read [them] when it is not the time of the Beth Hamidrash. But Samuel said: We may not read them [on the Sabbath] even when it is not the time of the Beth Hamidrash. But that is not so, for Nehardea was Samuel's town, and in Nehardea they closed the prescribed lesson [of the Pentateuch] with [a reading from] the Hagiographa at minhah on the Sabbath?<sup>11</sup> Rather if stated it was thus stated: Rab said, They learnt this only in the place of the Beth Hamidrash; but we may read [them] elsewhere than in the Beth Hamidrash. While Samuel said: Whether in the place of the Beth Hamidrash or elsewhere, at the time of the Beth Hamidrash<sup>12</sup> we may not read [them]; when it is not the time of the Beth Hamidrash we may read them. And Samuel is consistent with his view, for in Nehardea they closed the prescribed lesson [of the Pentateuch] with<sup>13</sup> [a reading from] the Hagiographa. R. Ashi said, In truth, it is as we first stated, Samuel [ruling] according to R. Nehemiah.<sup>14</sup> For it was taught: Though they [the Sages] said, Holy writings may not be read, yet they may be studied, and lectures thereon may be given. If one needs a verse, he may bring [a Scroll] and see [it] therein. R. Nehemiah said: Why did they rule, Holy Writings may not be read? So that people may say, If Holy Writings may not be read, how much more so secular documents!<sup>15</sup>

MISHNAH. ONE MAY SAVE THE SHEATH OF A SCROLL TOGETHER WITH THE SCROLL, AND THE CONTAINER OF TEFILLIN<sup>16</sup> TOGETHER WITH THE TEFILLIN, EVEN IF IT [ALSO] CONTAINS MONEY. AND WHITHER MAY WE RESCUE THEM? INTO A CLOSED ALLEY; BEN BATHYRA RULED: EVEN INTO AN OPEN ONE.<sup>17</sup>

GEMARA. Our Rabbis taught: If the fourteenth [of Nisan] falls on the Sabbath, the Passover sacrifice is flayed as far as the breast:<sup>18</sup> this is the view of R. Ishmael son of R. Johanan b. Berokah. But the Sages maintain: We flay the whole of it. As for R. Ishmael son of R. Johanan b. Berokah, it is well, [the reason being] that the requirements for the Sanctuary<sup>19</sup> have been fulfilled;<sup>20</sup> but what is the reason of the Rabbis? — Said Rabbah b. Bar Hanah in R. Johanan's name: Because Scripture saith, The Lord hath made every thing for his own purpose.<sup>21</sup> But what is there here 'for his own purpose?' R. Joseph said: So that it should not putrefy.<sup>22</sup> Raba said: So that Divine sacrifices should not lie like a nebelah. Wherein do they differ? — They differ where it is lying on a gold table,<sup>23</sup> or if it is a day of the north wind.<sup>24</sup> Now R. Ishmael son of R. Johanan b. Berokah, how does he dispose of this [verse], 'The Lord hath made every thing for his own purpose'?- [That teaches] that one must not draw out the emurim<sup>25</sup> before the stripping of the skin.<sup>26</sup> What is the reason?-Said R. Huna son of R. Nathan: On account of the threads.<sup>27</sup>

R. Hisda observed in Mar 'Ukba's name: What did his companions answer to R. Ishmael son of R. Johanan b. Berokah? They argued thus with him: If the sheath of a Scroll may be rescued together with the Scroll, shall we then not flay the Passover sacrifice of its skin?<sup>28</sup> How compare! There it is [mere] handling, whereas here it is work.<sup>29</sup> — Said R. Ashi, They differ in two things, viz., in respect of both handling and labour, and they argue thus with him: If the sheath of a Scroll may be saved together with the Scroll, shall we not handle the skin on account of the flesh.<sup>30</sup>

---

(1) He was a judge.

(2) Lit., 'make sport of him'.

(3) Lit., 'taken away'.

(4) The reading in Cod. Oxford is: and the law of the Evangelium has been given.

(5) There is no passage in any known Gospel that a son and daughter inherit alike.

(6) Lit., 'descend to'.

(7) Var. lec.: but; v. Weiss, Dor, I, p. 233, n. 1.

(8) Cf. Matt. V, 17 seq.

(9) Alluding to the lamp which she presented him on the preceding day.

(10) This story is discussed in Bacher, Ag. d. Pal. Am. 11, p. 424 n. V. also R.T. Herford, op. cit., pp. 146-154, though his conjecture that the story ends with a covert gibe at Christianity is hardly substantiated.

(11) As a Haftarah (q.v. Glos.) after the Reading of the Law: so Jast. V. Rashi; cf. supra 24a. [Aliter: They expounded a part of Scripture from the Hagiographa etc. V. Bacher, Terminologie s.v. סדרה]

(12) I.e., when the public lectures are given.

(13) The text should read בכתובים as above, not דכתובים.

(14) But he does not state his own view there.

(15) E.g., bills, documents relating to business transactions, etc.

(16) I.e., the bag or box in which they are kept.

(17) This is discussed infra.

(18) Starting from the hind legs. One can then remove the fats which 'are to be burnt on the altar (these are called emurim, lit., 'devoted objects'), the burning being permitted on the Sabbath. Since the rest of the skin must be flayed only in order to reach the portion which he himself will eat in the evening, this is regarded as having a secular purpose, and therefore must be left for the evening.

(19) Lit., 'the Most High'.

(20) When it is flayed thus far, as explained supra note 1.

(21) I.e., His honour. Prov. XVI, 4.

- (22) One may still fear putrefaction, but it is certainly not lying like a nebelah. Hence according to R. Joseph it must be completely stripped even so, but not according to Raba.
- (23) It is not in keeping with the honour due to God that the meat of the sacrifices offered to Him should turn putrid.
- (24) Which keeps the meat fresh.
- (25) V. n. 1.
- (26) As far as the breast.
- (27) Of wool, which would otherwise adhere to the fats, etc.
- (28) Surely the two are identical, for the sheath too is not sacred, just as the flaying of the skin after the breast has been reached serves a secular purpose only.
- (29) Flaying being a principal labour, v. supra 73a.
- (30) Rashi: R. Ishmael holding that once the emurim have been drawn out the animal may not be handled because of the skin, while the Rabbis argue that on the contrary since the flesh itself might be handled the skin may be likewise in virtue thereof. According to this they differ where the animal has only been partially flayed. Tosaf. interprets the passage differently.

### Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 117a

How compare! There it [the sheath] had become as a stand to that which is permitted,<sup>1</sup> whereas here it [the skin] had become a stand to a thing that is forbidden!<sup>2</sup> Rather they say thus to him, If we may save the sheath of a Scroll together with the Scroll, though it also contains money,<sup>3</sup> shall we not handle the skin on account of the flesh? How compare! There it [the sheath] became a stand for something that is forbidden (the money) and something that is permitted [the Scroll]; whereas here the whole has become a stand for that which is forbidden? — Rather they say thus to him: If a sheath containing money may be brought from elsewhere to save a Scroll of the Law with it, shall we not handle the skin in virtue of the flesh? And how do we know that itself? Shall we say, since one need not throw them [the coins] out when it contains them,<sup>4</sup> he may bring it [the sheath] too? How compare! There, in the meanwhile the fire may alight [upon the Scroll];<sup>5</sup> but here, let them be thrown out in the meantime?<sup>6</sup> Rather said Mar son of R. Ashi: In truth it is as we originally explained it; and as to your objection, There it is (mere) handling, whereas here it is work, — [that is answered] e.g., that he does not require the skin.<sup>7</sup> But Abaye and Raba both say: R. Simeon agrees in a case of ‘cut off its head but let it not die?’<sup>8</sup> — He removes it [the skin] in strips.<sup>9</sup>

AND WHITHER MAY WE RESCUE THEM, etc. What is an open [alley] and what is a closed [one]? — R. Hisda said: [[fit contains] three walls and two stakes,<sup>10</sup> it is a closed alley; three walls and one stake, it is an open alley. And both of them<sup>11</sup> are based on R. Eliezer[‘s opinion]. For we learnt: To make an alley eligible,<sup>12</sup> Beth Shammai maintain: [It requires] a stake and a beam;<sup>13</sup> Beth Hillel say: Either a stake or a beam; R. Eliezer said: Two stakes.<sup>14</sup> Said Rabbah to him, If there are three walls and one stake, do you call it open!<sup>15</sup> Moreover, according to the Rabbis, let us save thither even foodstuffs and liquids?<sup>16</sup> Rather said Rabbah, [it is to be explained thus]: [If it contains] two walls and two stakes,<sup>17</sup> it is a closed alley; two walls and one stake, it is an open alley, and both<sup>18</sup> are based on [the view of] R. Judah. For it was taught: Even more than this did R. Judah say: If one owns two houses on the opposite sides of the street, he can place a stake or a beam at each side and carry between them. Said they to him: A street cannot be made fit for carrying by an ‘erub in this way.<sup>19</sup> Said Abaye to him, But according to you too, on [the view of] the Rabbis let us save thither even foodstuffs and liquids?<sup>20</sup> [

(1) Sc. the Scroll, which may be handled in any case, even if there is no fire.

(2) Sc. the flesh, which may not be handled until the evening before which it is not required (Rashi). Tosaf.: the flesh may be handled now, but before the sacrifice was killed the whole animal was mukzeh.

(3) Which by itself may not be handled.

(4) V. Mishnah.

(5) If one should first have to empty the sheath of its money.

- (6) Whilst carrying the sheath to the Scroll it can be emptied of its money without loss of time.
- (7) Hence the flaying is unintentional, as far as the skin is concerned.—On this explanation they differ only in respect of skinning the animal, as was first suggested.
- (8) v. p. 357, n. 8.
- (9) Not as one piece. It is not even real flaying them and only counts as a shebuth (Rashi).
- (10) I.e., it is a cul-de-sac leading off a street, and stakes are planted in the ground at either side of the opening. These stakes legally count as a fourth wall, and thus the alley is regarded as entirely enclosed.
- (11) The Rabbis and Ben Bathyra.
- (12) To rank technically as an 'alley' wherein carrying on the Sabbath is permitted under certain conditions.
- (13) A stake at the side of the entrance and a beam across it.
- (14) Ben Bathyra however holds that in order to save holy writings R. Eliezer too is more lenient.
- (15) Surely not, even if it be conceded that two stakes are required to make it fit.
- (16) I.e., where it is closed with two stakes carrying should be entirely permitted therein, and not restricted to holy writings. [The Rabbis state infra 120a that foodstuffs may be saved by carrying them into a courtyard furnished with an 'erub, but not into an alley.]
- (17) I.e., it is open at each end, and a stake is placed at both entrances.
- (18) V. n. 4.
- (19) V. supra 6a bottom for notes. Ben Bathyra holds that where the saving of holy writings is in question R. Judah is more lenient.
- (20) Seeing that in your opinion the Rabbis hold with R. Judah that two partitions and two stakes render the space fit for carrying.

## **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 117b**

Rather said R. Ashi: Three walls and one stake, that is a closed alley; three walls without a stake, that is an open alley. And even according to R. Eliezer who maintains [that] we require two stakes, that is only in respect of foodstuffs and liquids, but for a Scroll of the Law one stake is sufficient.

MISHNAH. FOOD FOR THREE MEALS MAY BE SAVED, THAT WHICH IS FIT FOR MAN, FOR MAN, THAT WHICH IS FIT FOR ANIMALS, FOR ANIMALS.<sup>1</sup> HOW SO? IF A FIRE BREAKS OUT SABBATH NIGHT,<sup>2</sup> FOOD FOR THREE MEALS MAY BE SAVED; [IF] IN THE MORNING, FOOD FOR TWO MEALS MAY BE SAVED; AT [THE TIME OF] MINHAH, FOOD FOR ONE MEAL.<sup>3</sup> R. JOSE SAID: AT ALL TIMES WE MAY SAVE FOOD FOR THREE MEALS.<sup>4</sup>

GEMARA. Consider: He labours<sup>5</sup> in that which is permissible;<sup>6</sup> then let us save more? — Said Raba: Since a man is excited over his property, if you permit him [to save more], he may come to extinguish [the fire]. Said Abaye to him, Then as to what was taught: If one's barrel [of wine] is broken on the top of his roof he may bring a vessel and place [it] underneath, provided that he does not bring another vessel and catch (the dripping liquid)<sup>7</sup> or another vessel and join it (to the roof)<sup>8</sup> what preventive measure is required there? — Here too it is a preventive measure lest he bring a utensil through the street.

[To turn to] the main text: If one's barrel is broken on the top of his roof, he may bring a vessel and place it underneath, provided that he does not bring another vessel and catch (the dripping liquid) or another vessel and join it [to the roof]. If guests happen to visit him, he may bring another vessel and catch [the dripping liquid], or another vessel and join it [to the roof]. He must not catch [the liquid] and then invite [the guests], but must first invite [them] and then catch [the liquid]; and one must not evade the law in this matter.<sup>9</sup> In R. Jose son of R. Judah's name it was said: We may evade [the law]. Shall we say that they disagree in the [same] controversy [as that] of R. Eliezer and R. Joshua? For it was taught: If an animal<sup>10</sup> and its young<sup>11</sup> fall into a pit,<sup>12</sup> R. Eliezer said: One may haul up the first in order to slaughter it, and for the second he makes provision where it lies, so that it

should not die. R. Joshua said: One may haul up the first in order to kill it, but he does not kill it, then he practises an evasion and hauls up the second, and kills whichever he desires!<sup>13</sup> — How so? perhaps R. Eliezer rules thus only there, because provisions can be made, but not here, seeing that that is impossible. And perhaps R. Joshua rules thus only there because suffering of dumb animals is involved; but not here that there is no suffering of dumb animals?<sup>14</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: If he saved bread [made] of fine flour, he must not save coarse bread; (if he saved] coarse bread, he may [still] save a fine [flour] bread.<sup>15</sup> And one may save on the Day of Atonement for the Sabbath,<sup>16</sup> but not on the Sabbath for the Day of Atonement,<sup>17</sup> and it goes without saying (that one must not rescue food] on the Sabbath for a Festival, or on a Sabbath for the following Sabbath. Our Rabbis taught: If one forgets a loaf in an oven, and the day becomes holy upon him,<sup>18</sup> food for three meals may be saved,<sup>19</sup> and he may say to others, ‘Come and save for yourselves.’ And when he removes [the bread], he must not remove it with a *mardeh*<sup>20</sup> but with a knife.<sup>21</sup> But that is not so, for the School of R. Ishmael taught: Thou shalt not do any work:<sup>22</sup> the blowing of the shofar and the removal of bread (from the oven] are excluded as being an art, not work?- As much as is possible to vary (it)<sup>23</sup> we do so.

R. Hisda said: One should always make early [preparations]<sup>24</sup> against the termination of the Sabbath, for it is said, And it shall come to pass on the sixth day, that they shall prepare that which they bring in<sup>25</sup> — [i.e.,] immediately.

R. Abba said: On the Sabbath it is one's duty to break bread<sup>26</sup> over two loaves, for it is written, twice as much bread.<sup>27</sup> R. Ashi said: I saw that R. Kahana held two [loaves] but broke bread over one, observing, ‘they gathered’ is written,<sup>28</sup> R. Zera broke enough bread for the whole meal.<sup>29</sup> Said Rabina to R. Ashi: But that looks like greed? — Since he does not do this every day, he replied, but only now [the Sabbath], it does not look like greed, he replied.<sup>30</sup> R. Ammi and R. Assi, when they came across the bread of an ‘erub, would commence (their meal] therewith,<sup>31</sup> observing, ‘Since one precept has been performed with it,<sup>32</sup> let another precept be performed with it.’

HOW SO? IF A FIRE BREAKS OUT, etc. Our Rabbis taught: How many meals must one eat on the Sabbath? Three. R. Hidka said: Four. R. Johanan observed, Both expound the same verse: And Moses said, Eat that to-day; for to-day is a Sabbath unto the Lord: to-day ye shall not find it in the field.<sup>33</sup> R. Hidka holds: These three ‘to-days’ are [reckoned] apart from the evening;<sup>34</sup> whereas the Rabbis hold, They include [that of] the evening. We learnt, IF A FIRE BREAKS OUT SABBATH NIGHT,

---

(1) I.e., three meals per person and per animal, taking into account what is fit for man and what is fit for beast.

(2) Before the first meal has been eaten.

(3) In each case food may be saved for as many meals as will yet be required for that Sabbath,

(4) Whenever the fire breaks out.

(5) Lit., ‘troubles’.

(6) Food may be handled on the Sabbath, and he carries it out into a courtyard provided with an ‘erub (infra 120a), whither carrying is permitted in any case.

(7) As it falls through the air.

(8) I.e., set it near the roof, so that the liquid may flow along the roof and into the vessel. These are forbidden because it is manifest that the vessels are brought in order to save the wine or oil.

(9) I.e., he may not invite guests merely as a pretence, and when the wine is saved they will not drink it after all, but only guests who have not yet dined will drink it.

(10) Lit., ‘it’.

(11) The reference is to animals that may be eaten. These may not be slaughtered together with their young on the same day. V. Lev. XXII, 28.

(12) On a Festival.

(13) V. Bez. 37a.

(14) It is noteworthy that to save animals from suffering is regarded as a stronger reason for desecrating the Festival than to save one from personal loss.

(15) There is no evasion in saying that he prefers the latter, hence it is still a Sabbath need.

(16) This is permitted, as the food is required immediately the Sabbath commences.

(17) Which falls on Sunday. This is forbidden, as he can procure food on the termination of the Fast.

(18) I.e., the Sabbath commenced.

(19) Before the bread is burnt.

(20) A bakers shovel; the oven tool generally used for removing bread.

(21) To emphasize that it is the Sabbath.

(22) Ex. XX, 10.

(23) Viz., the usual procedure, so that the Sabbath may not be treated like a weekday.

(24) On Friday.

(25) Ibid. XVI, 5.

(26) I.e., to recite the benediction.

(27) Ibid, 22.

(28) Ibid. One merely requires two loaves before him, thus 'gathering' double the usual portion, but recites the benediction over one loaf.

(29) I.e., he cut off so much bread, reciting the blessing over it.

(30) But is manifestly in honour of the Sabbath.

(31) I.e., they said the blessing over it.

(32) Sc. that of 'erub.

(33) Ibid. 25.

(34) Each 'to-day' denotes one meal, and a fourth is the meal on Friday night.

## **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 118a**

FOOD FOR THREE MEALS MAY BE SAVED: surely that is where one has not [yet] eaten?<sup>1</sup> -No: it is where he has [already eaten]. [IF] IN THE MORNING, FOOD FOR TWO MEALS MAY BE SAVED: surely that is where one has not yet eaten? — No: [where] he has eaten. AT [THE TIME OF] MINHAH, FOOD FOR ONE MEAL: surely that is where one has not eaten? - No: [where] he has eaten. But since the final section states, R. JOSE SAID: AT ALL TIMES WE MAY SAVE FOOD FOR THREE MEALS, it follows that the first Tanna holds [that] three [are required]. Hence it is clear that our Mishnah does not agree with R. Hisda.

Now, as to what we learnt: He who has food for two meals must not accept [relief] from the tamhuy: food for fourteen meals, must not accept from the kuppah,<sup>2</sup> — who [is the authority for this], [for] it is neither the Rabbis nor R. Hidka? If the Rabbis, there are fifteen meals; if R. Hidka, there are sixteen?<sup>3</sup> — In truth, it is the Rabbis, for we say to him [the recipient], 'What you require to eat at the conclusion of the Sabbath, eat it on the Sabbath.'<sup>4</sup> Shall we say then that it agrees [only] with the Rabbis and not with R. Hidka? — You may even say [that it agrees with] R. Hidka: we say to him, 'What you require to eat on the eve of the Sabbath [before nightfall], eat it on the Sabbath.'<sup>5</sup> And the whole day of Sabbath eve [Friday] we make him spend in fasting?<sup>6</sup> Rather the author of this is R. Akiba, who said: Treat thy Sabbath like a weekday rather than be dependent on men.<sup>7</sup> Now, as to what we learnt: 'A poor man travelling from place to place must be given not less than a loaf [valued] at a pundion when four se'ahs cost one sela';<sup>8</sup> if he stays overnight, he must be given the requirements for spending the night; while if he spends the Sabbath there, he must be given food for three meals'<sup>9</sup> — shall we say that this is [according to] the Rabbis [only], not R. Hidka? — In truth, it may [agree with] R. Hidkah, [the circumstances being] e.g., where he [already] has one meal with him, so we say to him, 'Eat that which you have with you.' And when he departs, shall he depart empty-handed!<sup>10</sup> — We provide him with a meal to accompany him. 'What is meant by 'the requirements of spending the night?' — Said R. Papa: A bed and a bolster.

Our Rabbis taught: The plates in which one eats in the evening [Friday night] may be washed for eating in them in the morning; [those which are used] in the morning may be washed to eat in them at midday; [those used] at midday are washed to eat in them at minhah; but from minhah and onwards they may no longer be washed;<sup>11</sup> but goblets, [drink-]ladles and flasks, one may go on washing [them] all day, because there is no fixed time for drinking.

R. Simeon b. Pazzi said in the name of R. Joshua b. Levi in Bar Kappara's name: He who observes [the practice of] three meals on the Sabbath is saved from three evils: the travails of the Messiah,<sup>12</sup> the retribution of Gehinnom,<sup>13</sup> and the wars of Gog and Magog.<sup>14</sup> 'The travails of the Messiah': 'day' is written here;<sup>15</sup> whilst there it is written, Behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet before the great and terrible day of the Lord comes.<sup>16</sup> The retribution of Gehinnom': 'day' is written here; whilst there it is written, That day is a day of wrath.<sup>17</sup> 'The wars of Gog and Magog': 'day' is written here; whilst there it is written, in that day when Gog shall come.<sup>18</sup>

R. Johanan said in R. Jose's name: He who delights in the Sabbath is given an unbounded heritage, for it is written, Then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord, and I will make thee to ride upon the high places of the earth; and I will feed thee

---

(1) Thus proving that our Mishnah disagrees with R Hidka.

(2) Tamhuy is the charity plate, the food collected from contributors and distributed daily; kuppah (lit., 'heap', 'pile'), the communal charity, from which weekly grants were made every Friday for food. With two meals one has enough for the day; with fourteen he has enough for the week, hence he must not accept relief from either respectively; v. Pe'ah VIII, 7.

(3) In the week.

(4) Just before its termination.

(5) I.e., after nightfall.

(6) It is virtually a fast if he must postpone his second meal to the night.

(7) Hence if he has fourteen meals he can eat two on the Sabbath rather than receive charity. — This saying of R. Akiba is sometimes quoted nowadays to show that one may even desecrate the Sabbath rather than descend to charity. It is quite obvious that R. Akiba had no such thing in mind but merely meant that one should not seek to obtain the extra luxuries of the Sabbath through charity.

(8) A pundion = one-twelfth of a denar = one forty-eighth of a sela'. A loaf of that size is sufficient for the average two meals.

(9) V. Pe'ah ibid.

(10) Surely not.

(11) Since they are not required for the Sabbath any more.

(12) The advent of the Messiah was pictured as being preceded by years of great distress.

(13) Purgatory.

(14) Also a time of intense suffering.

(15) V. supra 117b bottom.

(16) Mal. III, 2. (E.V. IV, 5). This is understood to refer to the advent of the Messiah.

(17) Zeph. I, 15.

(18) Ezek. XXXVIII, 18. Since 'day' is mentioned three times in connection with the Sabbath meals (supra 117b), their observance will save one from the bitter experiences of these three 'days'.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 118b

with the heritage of Jacob thy father, etc.<sup>1</sup> Not like Abraham, of whom it is written, Arise, walk through the land in the length of it, etc.;<sup>2</sup> nor like Isaac of whom it is written, for unto thee, and unto thy seed, I will give all these lands, etc.;<sup>3</sup> but like Jacob, of whom it is written, and thou shalt spread abroad to the west, and to the east, and to the north, and to the south.<sup>4</sup> R. Nahman b. Isaac said, He is

saved from the servitude of the Diaspora: here it is written, and I will make thee to ride upon the high places of the earth; whilst there it is written, and thou shalt tread upon their high places.<sup>5</sup>

Rab Judah said in Rab's name: He who delights in the Sabbath is granted his heart's desires, for it is said, Delight thyself also in the Lord; And he shall give thee the desires of thine heart.<sup>6</sup> Now, I do not know what this 'delight' refers to; but when it is said, and thou shalt call the Sabbath a delight,<sup>7</sup> you must say that it refers to the delight of the Sabbath.<sup>8</sup>

Wherewith does one show his delight therein? — Rab Judah son of R. Samuel b. Shilath said in Rab's name: With a dish of beets, large fish, and heads of garlic. R. Hiyya b. Ashi said in Rab's name: Even a trifle, if it is prepared in honor of the Sabbath, is delight. What is it [the trifle]?-Said R. Papa: A pie of fish-hash.

R. Hiyya b. Abba said in R. Johanan's name: He who observes the Sabbath according to its laws, even if he practises idolatry like the generation of Enosh,<sup>9</sup> is forgiven, for it is said, Blessed is Enosh<sup>10</sup> that doeth this ... [that keepeth the Sabbath mehallello from profaning it]:<sup>11</sup> read not mehallello but mahul lo [he is forgiven].

Rab Judah said in Rab's name: Had Israel kept the first Sabbath, no nation or tongue would have enjoyed dominion over them, for it is said, And it came to pass on the seventh day, that there went out some of the people for to gather;<sup>12</sup> which is followed by, Then came Amalek.<sup>13</sup> R. Johanan said in the name of R. Simeon b. Yohai: If Israel were to keep two Sabbaths according to the laws thereof, they would be redeemed immediately, for it is said, Thus saith the Lord of the eunuch that keep my Sabbaths,<sup>14</sup> which is followed by, even them will I bring to my holy mountain, etc.<sup>15</sup>

R. Jose said: May my portion be of those who eat three meals on the Sabbath. R. Jose [also] said: May my portion be of those who recite the entire Hallel<sup>16</sup> every day. But that is not so, for a Master said: He who reads Hallel every day blasphemes and reproaches [the Divine Name]?<sup>17</sup> — We refer to the 'Verses of Song'.<sup>18</sup>

R. Jose said: May my portion be of those who pray with the red glow of the sun.<sup>19</sup> R. Hiyya b. Abba said in R. Johanan's name: It is virtuous to pray with the red glow of the sun. R. Zera observed: What verse [intimates this]? They shall revere thee with [i.e., at the time of the sun [rise], and before the moon [shines],<sup>20</sup> throughout all generations.<sup>21</sup> observes R. Jose also said: May my lot be of those who die with bowel trouble,<sup>22</sup> for a Master said, The majority of the righteous die of trouble in the bowels. R. Jose also said: May my portion be of those who die on the way to the performance of a religious duty.<sup>23</sup> R. Jose also said: May my lot be of those who welcome the Sabbath in Tiberias and who let it depart in Sepphoris.<sup>24</sup> R. Jose also said: May my lot be of those who seat [pupils] in the Beth Hamidrash,<sup>25</sup> and not of those who order [them] to rise [depart] from the Beth Hamidrash.<sup>26</sup> R. Jose also said: May my lot be of those who collect charity, but not of those who distribute charity.<sup>27</sup> R. Jose also said: May my lot be of those who are suspected whilst innocent.<sup>28</sup> R. Papa said: I was suspected [of something] of which I was free.<sup>29</sup>

R. Jose said: I cohabited five times and planted five cedars in Israel. Who are they? R. Ishmael son of R. Jose, R. Eleazar<sup>30</sup> son of R. Jose, R. Halafta son of R. Jose, R. Abtilos son of R. Jose, and R. Menahem son of R. Jose. But there was Wardimos?— Wardimos and Menahem are identical, and why was he called Wardimos? Because his face was like a rose [werad]. Shall we say that R. Jose did not fulfil his marital duties?<sup>31</sup> — Rather say, I cohabited five times and repeated.<sup>32</sup>

R. Jose said: I have never called my wife 'my wife' or my ox my ox', but my wife [I called] 'my home,' and my ox 'my field'.

R. Jose said: I have never looked at my circumcised membrum. But that is not so, for Rabbi was asked, Why were you called 'Our holy Teacher?' Said he to them, I have never looked at my observes membrum?<sup>33</sup> — In Rabbi's case there was another thing to his credit, viz., he did not insert his hand beneath his girdle. R. Jose also said: The beams of my house have never seen the seams of my shirt.<sup>34</sup>

R. Jose also said: I have never disregarded the words of my neighbours. I know of myself that I am not a priest, [yet] if my neighbours were to tell me to ascend the dais,<sup>35</sup> I would ascend [it].<sup>36</sup> R. Jose also said: I have never in my life said anything from which I retracted.<sup>37</sup>

R. Nahman said: May I be rewarded<sup>38</sup> for observing three meals on the Sabbath. Rab Judah said: May I be rewarded for observing devotion in prayers.<sup>39</sup> R. Huna son of R. Joshua said: May I be rewarded for never walking four cubits bareheaded.<sup>40</sup> r. Shesheth said: May I be rewarded for fulfilling the precept of tefillin.<sup>41</sup> R. Nahman also said: May I be rewarded for fulfilling the precept of fringes.

R. Joseph asked R. Joseph son of Rabbah: Of what is thy father most observant? Of fringes, he replied. One day he was ascending a ladder<sup>42</sup> when a thread [of his fringes] broke, and he would not descend until [another] was inserted.

Abaye said: May I be rewarded for that when I saw that a disciple had completed his tractate,

---

(1) Isa. LVIII, 14.

(2) Gen. XIII, 17,

(3) Ibid. XXVI, 3.

(4) Ibid. XXVIII, 14.

(5) Deut. XXXIII, 29. The underlying idea is probably the same as that of Heine's 'Princess Sabbath'.

(6) Ps. XXXVII, 3.

(7) Isa. *ibid*, 13.

(8) The emphasis on the importance of observing the Sabbath with those meals and as a day of delight was meant according to Weiss (Dor I, 122) to counteract the ascetic tendencies of the Essenes.

(9) Gen. IV, 26. According to tradition idolatry commenced in his days.

(10) E.V. 'the man'.

(11) Isa. LVI, 2.

(12) Ex. XVI, 27. This refers to the manna, in connection with which the Sabbath is mentioned for the first time explicitly.

(13) Ibid. XVII, 8.

(14) Isa. LVI, 4.

(15) Ibid. 7.

(16) Lit. 'praise' Ps. CXIII-CXVIII which was inserted in the service on Festivals, Hanukkah, and New Moon — on the latter occasion, as well as from the third day of Passover, chs. CXV, 1-11 and CXVI, 1-11 are omitted.

(17) Because its recital was instituted for special occasions only, and by reading it every day he treats it as a mere song.

(18) The name given to Ps. CXLV-CL which are designated here as Hallel on account of the term 'praise' recurring in them; v. Elbogen, *Der Judische Gottesdienst*, p. 83, 2.

(19) Rashi Jast.: The time in the morning and the evening when the sun appears to stand still or be silent, viz., dawn and sunset.

(20) I.e., at sunset.

(21) Ps. LXXII, 5. Cf. R. Johanan's statement in Ber. 9b on the wathikin (R. Zera quotes this verse there too, which makes it probable that the same time is referred to there and here); Elbogen, *op. cit.* p. 246.

(22) The suffering involved effects atonement (Rashi).

(23) I.e., while engaged in the performance of a good deed (Maharsha).

(24) In Tiberias, which was situated in a valley, the Sabbath commenced rather earlier, whilst in Sepphoris, which was

on a mountain, it terminated rather later than elsewhere.

(25) Rashi: the ushers who collect the pupils.

(26) To adjourn for meals.

(27) It is very difficult to perform the latter with absolute impartiality, as personal predilections are apt to intervene.

(28) Lit., 'and it is not in him'.

(29) V. Ber. 8b.

(30) Var. lec.: Eliezer.

(31) Except on five occasions.

(32) Cf. 'Er. 100b.

(33) Which shows that this modesty was peculiar to him.

(34) I.e., he did not turn his shirt inside out when he undressed but pulled it over his head whilst sitting up in bed, so that he remained covered as much as possible out of modesty.

(35) When the priests recite the priestly blessing; v. Num. VI, 22-27.

(36) Though he certainly would not recite the blessing with the other priests, which is forbidden, but merely stand there (Maharsha).

(37) Rashi refers this] to his opinions on other people: even if unfavourable he did not retract even in the owner's presence, because he did not state them in the first place without being perfectly sure of their truth.

(38) Lit., 'may it (sc. reward) come to me

(39) I did not pray mechanically. — The same phrase is used in a derogatory and possibly opposite sense elsewhere, v. Ber. 55a, B.B. 164b.

(40) Cf. infra 156b.

(41) V. Glos. Rashi: he never walked four cubits without wearing his tefillin; similarly with respect to fringes.

(42) Or, stairs.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 119a

I made it a festive day for the scholars. Raba said: May I be rewarded for that when a disciple came before me in a lawsuit, I did not lay my head upon my pillow before I had sought [points in] his favour.<sup>1</sup> Mar son of R. Ashi said: I am unfit to judge in a scholar's lawsuit. What is the reason? He is as dear to me as myself, and a man cannot see [anything] to his own disadvantage.

R. Hanina robed himself and stood at sunset of Sabbath eve [and] exclaimed, 'Come and let us go forth to welcome the queen Sabbath.'<sup>2</sup> R. Jannai donned his robes, on Sabbath eve and exclaimed, 'Come, O bride, Come, O bride!'

Rabbah son of R. Huna visited the home of Rabbah son of R. Nahman, [and] was offered three se'ahs of oiled cakes. 'Did you know that I was coming?' asked he. 'Are you then more important<sup>3</sup> to us than it [the Sabbath]?' replied he.<sup>4</sup>

R. Abba bought meat for thirteen istira peshita<sup>5</sup> from thirteen butchers<sup>6</sup> and handed it over to them [his servants]<sup>7</sup> as soon as the door was turned<sup>8</sup> and urged them, 'Make haste, Quick Make haste, Quick!'<sup>9</sup>

R. Abbahu used to sit on an ivory stool and fan the fire. R. 'Anan used to wear an overall,<sup>10</sup> for the School of R. Ishmael taught: The clothes in which one cooks a dish for his master, let him not pour out<sup>11</sup> a cup [of wine] for his master in them. R. Safra would singe the head [of an animal]. Raba salted shibuta.<sup>12</sup> R. Huna lit the lamp. R. Papa plaited the wicks. R. Hisda cut up the beetroots. Rabbah and R. Joseph chopped wood. R. Zera kindled the fire. R. Nahman b. Isaac carried<sup>13</sup> in and out,<sup>14</sup> saying, 'If R. Ammi and R. Assi visited me, would I not carry for them?'<sup>15</sup>

Others state: R. Ammi and R. Assi carried in and out, saying, 'If R. Johanan visited us, would we not carry before him?'<sup>16</sup> Joseph-who-honours-the-Sabbaths had in his victory a certain gentile who

owned much property. Soothsayers<sup>17</sup> told him, 'Joseph-who-honours-the-Sabbaths will consume all your property.'<sup>18</sup> — [So] he went, sold all his property, and bought a precious stone with the proceeds, which he set in his turban. As he was crossing a bridge the wind blew it off and cast it into the water, [and] a fish swallowed it. [Subsequently] it [the fish] was hauled up and brought [to market] on the Sabbath eve towards sunset. 'Who will buy now?' cried they. 'Go and take them to Joseph-who-honours-the-Sabbaths,' they were told, 'as he is accustomed to buy.' So they took it to him. He bought it, opened it, found the jewel therein, and sold it for thirteen roomfuls<sup>19</sup> of gold denarii.<sup>20</sup> A certain old man met him [and] said, 'He who lends to the Sabbath,<sup>21</sup> the Sabbath repays him.'

Rabbi asked R. Ishmael son of R. Jose, The wealthy in Palestine, whereby do they merit [wealth]?<sup>22</sup> — Because they give tithes, he replied, as it is written, 'Asser te'asser<sup>23</sup> [which means], give tithes ['asser] so that thou mayest become wealthy [tith'asser].<sup>24</sup> Those in Babylon, wherewith do they merit [it]? — Because they honour the Torah, replied he. And those in other countries, whereby do they merit it? — Because they honour the Sabbath, answered he. For R. Hiyya b. Abba related: I was once a guest of a man in Laodicea,<sup>25</sup> and a golden table was brought before him, which had to be carried by sixteen men; sixteen silver chains were fixed in it, and plates, goblets, pitchers and flasks were set thereon, thereon,<sup>26</sup> and upon it were all kinds of food, dainties and spices. When they set it down they recited, The earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof;<sup>27</sup> and when they removed it [after the meal] they recited, The heavens are the heavens of the Lord, But the earth hath he given to the children of men.<sup>28</sup> Said I to him, 'My son! whereby hast thou merited this?' 'I was a butcher,' replied he, 'and of every fine beast I used to say, "'This shall be for the Sabbath"'. Said I to him, 'Happy art thou that thou hast [so] merited, and praised be the Omnipresent who has permitted thee to enjoy [all] this.'

The emperor said to R. Joshua b. Hanania,<sup>29</sup> 'Why has the Sabbath dish such a fragrant odour?' 'We have a certain seasoning,' replied he, 'called the Sabbath, which we put into it, and that gives it a fragrant odour.' 'Give us some of it,' asked he. 'To him who keeps the Sabbath,' retorted he, 'it is efficacious; but to him who does not keep the Sabbath it is of no use.'

The Resh Galutha<sup>30</sup> asked R. Hamnuna: What is meant by the verse, [and thou shalt call ... ] the holy of the Lord honourable?<sup>31</sup> — This<sup>32</sup> refers to the Day of Atonement, replied he, in which there is neither eating nor drinking, [hence] the Torah instructed, Honour it with clean [festive] garments. And thou shalt honour it.<sup>33</sup> Rab said: By fixing [it] earlier;<sup>34</sup> Samuel maintained: By postponing [it].<sup>35</sup> The sons of R. Papa b. Abba asked R. Papa: We, for instance, who have meat and wine every day, how shall we mark a change? If you are accustomed to [dine] early,<sup>36</sup> postpone it, if you are accustomed to [dine] late, have it earlier, answered he.

R. Shesheth used to place his scholars in a place exposed to the sun in summer, and in a shady place in winter, so that they should arise quickly.<sup>37</sup> R. Zera

---

(1) Certainly not in a spirit of partiality, but because he had such a high opinion of scholars that he felt that they would not engage in a lawsuit unless they know right to be on their side (Maharsha).

(2) Cf. Elbogen, op. cit., p.108

(3) Lit., 'better'.

(4) We prepared them in honour of the Sabbath.

(5) An istira peshita=a half zuz.

(6) To make sure that some of it at least would be the best obtainable. 'Thirteen' is not meant literally, but merely denotes many; cf. P. 586, n. 4.

(7) Or, paid them.

(8) Lit., by the pivot of the door.'

(9) All in honour of the Sabbath.

- (10) Whilst attending to the cooking etc.
- (11) Lit., 'mix'.
- (12) A kind of fish, probably mullet.
- (13) Lit., 'carried'.
- (14) Whatever was necessary for the Sabbath.
- (15) E.g., place a seat for them.
- (16) The point of all these statements is that the Rabbis did not think it beneath their dignity to engage in menial labour in honour of the Sabbath.
- (17) Lit., 'Chaldeans'.
- (18) It will eventually pass into his possession.
- (19) R. Tam translates: vessels.
- (20) This, of course is an exaggeration, and merely implies much money, 'thirteen' often being used figuratively in that sense, cf. supra p. 585, n. 6; Hul. 95b (Rashi).
- (21) I.e., expends money in its honour.
- (22) The verb denotes to obtain through merit.
- (23) E. V. 'Thou shalt surely tithe', Deut. XIV, 22.
- (24) A play on words.
- (25) Several towns bore this name.
- (26) Kebu'oth denotes that they were fastened thereto — probably by the chains.
- (27) Ps. XXIV, 1.
- (28) Ps. CXV, 16.
- (29) The emperor referred to is Hadrian, his contemporary, with whom he had much intercourse; cf. Gen. Rab. X, 3; Hul. 59b, 60a; Ber. 56a.
- (30) V. P. 217, n. 7.
- (31) Isa. LVIII, 13.
- (32) 'The holy of the Lord'.
- (33) Ibid. With reference to the Sabbath.
- (34) One honours the Sabbath by dining at an earlier hour than usual.
- (35) To a later hour, as one eats then with a better appetite — this view would naturally commend itself to Samuel on medical grounds.
- (36) Rashi: with reference to the midday meal.
- (37) This was on the Sabbath. He himself was blind, and he did not wish them to stay too long in the Beth Hamidrash.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 119b

used to seek out pairs of scholars<sup>1</sup> and say to them, 'I beg of you, do not profane it.'<sup>2</sup>

Raba-others state, R. Joshua b. Levi said: Even if an individual prays on the eve of the Sabbath, he must recite, And [the heaven and the earth] were finished [etc.];<sup>3</sup> for R. Hamnuna said: He who prays on the eve of the Sabbath and recites 'and [the heaven and the earth] were finished,' the Writ treats of him as though he had become a partner with the Holy One, blessed be He, in the Creation, for it is said, Wa-yekullu [and they were finished]; read not wa-yekullu but wa-yekallu [and they finished].<sup>4</sup> R. Eleazar said: How do we know that speech is like action? Because it is said, By the word of the Lord were the heavens made.<sup>5</sup> R. Hisda said in Mar 'Ukba's name: He who prays on the eve of the Sabbath and recites and [the heaven and the earth] were finished, the two ministering angels who accompany man place their hands on his head and say to him, and thine iniquity is taken away, and thy sin purged.<sup>6</sup>

It was taught, R. Jose son of R. Judah said: Two ministering angels accompany man on the eve of the Sabbath from the synagogue to his home, one a good [angel] and one an evil [one]. And when he arrives home and finds the lamp burning, the table laid and the couch [bed] covered with a spread, the good angel exclaims, 'May it be even thus on another Sabbath [too],' and the evil angel

unwillingly responds 'amen'. But if not,<sup>7</sup> the evil angel exclaims, 'May it be even thus on another Sabbath [too,]' and the good angel unwillingly responds, 'amen'.

R. Eleazar said: One should always set his table on the eve of the Sabbath, even if he needs only the size of an olive. While R. Hanina said: One should always set his table on the termination of the Sabbath, even if he merely requires as much as an olive.<sup>8</sup> Hot water after the termination of the Sabbath is soothing; fresh. [warm] bread after the termination of the Sabbath is soothing.<sup>9</sup>

A three-year old<sup>10</sup> calf used to be prepared for R. Abbahu on the termination of the Sabbath, of which he ate a kidney. When his son Abimi grew up he said to him, Why should you waste so much? let us leave over a kidney from Sabbath eve. So he left it over, and a lion came and devoured it.<sup>11</sup>

R. Joshua b. Levi said: He who responds, 'Amen, May His great Name be blessed,' with all his might, his decreed sentence<sup>12</sup> is torn up, as it is said, When retribution was annulled<sup>13</sup> in Israel, For that the people offered themselves willingly, Bless ye the Lord:<sup>14</sup> why when retribution was annulled'? Because they blessed the Lord. R. Hiyya b. Abba said in R. Johanan's name: Even if he has a taint of idolatry, he is forgiven: it is written here, 'when retribution was annulled [bifroa' pera'oth]'; whilst elsewhere it is written, And Moses saw that the people were broken loose [parua']; for Aaron had let them loose.<sup>15</sup>

Resh Lakish said: He who responds 'Amen' with all his might, has the gates of Paradise opened for him, as it is written, Open ye the gates, that the righteous nation which keepeth truth [shomer emunim] may enter in:<sup>16</sup> read not 'shomer emunim' but 'she'omrim amen' [that say, amen]. What does 'amen' mean? — Said R. Hanina: God, faithful King.<sup>17</sup>

Rab Judah son of R. Samuel said in Rab's name: An [outbreak of] fire occurs only in a place where there is desecration of the Sabbath, for it is said, But if ye will not hearken unto me to hallow the Sabbath day and not to bear a burden ... then will I kindle a fire in the gates thereof, and it shall devour the palaces of Jerusalem, and it shall not be quenched.<sup>18</sup> What does 'and it shall not be quenched' mean? — Said R. Nahman b. Isaac: At the time when no people are available to quench it.

Abaye said: Jerusalem was destroyed only because the Sabbath was desecrated therein, as it is said, and they have hid their eyes from My sabbaths, therefore I am profaned among them.<sup>19</sup>

R. Abbahu said: Jerusalem was destroyed only because the reading of the shema<sup>20</sup> morning and evening was neglected [therein], for it is said, Woe unto them that rise up early in the morning, that they may follow strong drink [etc.]; and it is written, And the harp and the lute, the tabret and the pipe, and wine, are in their feasts: but they regard not the work of the Lord; and it is written, Therefore my people are gone into captivity, for lack of knowledge.<sup>21</sup>

R. Hamnuna said: Jerusalem was destroyed only because they neglected [the education of] school children; for it is said, pour it out [sc. God's wrath] because of the children in the street:<sup>22</sup> why pour it out? Because the child is in the street.<sup>23</sup>

'Ulla said: Jerusalem was destroyed only because they [its inhabitants] were not ashamed of each other, for it is written, Were they ashamed when they committed abomination? nay, they were not at all ashamed [... therefore they shall fall].<sup>24</sup>

R. Isaac said: Jerusalem was destroyed only because the small and the great were made equal, for it is said, And it shall be, like people like priest; which is followed by, The earth shall be utterly emptied.<sup>25 25</sup>

R. Amram son of R. Simeon b. Abba said in R. Simeon b. Abba's name in R. Hanina's name: Jerusalem was destroyed only because they did not rebuke each other: for it is said, Her princes are become like harts that find no pasture:<sup>26</sup> Just as the hart, the head of one is at the side of the others's tail, so Israel of that generation hid their faces in the earth,<sup>27</sup> and did not rebuke each other.

Rab Judah said: Jerusalem was destroyed only because scholars were despised therein: for it is said, but they mocked the messengers of God, and despised his words, and scoffed at his prophets, until the wrath of the Lord arose against his people, till there was no remedy.<sup>28</sup> What does 'till there was no remedy' intimate? Said Rab Judah in Rab's name: He who despises a scholar, has no remedy for his wounds.

Rab Judah said in Rab's name: What is meant by. Touch not mine anointed, and do my prophets no harm?<sup>29</sup> Touch not mine anointed' refers to school children;<sup>30</sup> 'and do my prophets no harm', to disciples of the Sages. Resh Lakish said in the name of R. Judah the Prince:<sup>31</sup> The world endures only for the sake of the breath of school children. Said R. Papa to Abaye, What about mine and yours? Breath in which there is sin is not like breath in which there is no sin, replied he. Resh Lakish also said in the name of R. Judah the Prince: School children may not be made to neglect [their studies] even for the building of the Temple. Resh Lakish also said to R. Judah the Prince: I have this tradition from my fathers — others state, from your fathers: Every town in which there are no school children shall be destroyed. Rabina said: It shall be laid desolate.<sup>32</sup>

Raba said: Jerusalem was destroyed only because men of faith<sup>33</sup> ceased therein: for it is said, Run ye to and fro in the streets of Jerusalem, and see now, and know, and seek in the broad places thereof, if ye can find a man, if there be any that doeth justly, that seeketh faithfulness; and I will pardon her.<sup>34</sup> But that is not so? For R. Kattina said: Even at the time of Jerusalem's downfall men of faith did not cease therein, for it is said, When a man shall take hold of his brother in the house of his father, saying, Thou hast clothing, be thou our ruler.<sup>35</sup> [this means,] things wherewith men cover themselves as [with] a garment<sup>36</sup> are in thy hand. And let this stumbling<sup>37</sup> be under thy hand:<sup>38</sup>

---

(1) Engaged in halachic discussions.

(2) The Sabbath, by neglecting its delights and good cheer.

(3) Gen. II, 1.

(4) 'They' referring to God and to him who praises God for the Creation.

(5) Ps. XXXIII, 6.

(6) Isa. VI, 7.

(7) If everything is in disorder and gloomy.

(8) That too honours the Sabbath, just as a royal visitor is not allowed to depart without a retinue accompanying him.

(9) That would not be difficult to obtain, as bread is baked very quickly in the East.

(10) Or, a third grown; or, third born.

(11) The calf that would have been killed.

(12) If Heaven has decreed evil for him.

(13) Sic. E. V.: 'For that the leaders took the lead'.

(14) Judg. V, 2.

(15) Ex. XXXII, 25; the reference is to the idolatrous worship of the Golden Calf.

(16) Isa. XXVI, 2.

(17) Interpreting it as an abbreviation: el melek ne'eman.

(18) Jer. XVII, 27.

(19) Ezek. XXII, 26. God's name is profane when the holy city lies in ruins.

(20) V. Glos.

(21) Isa. V. 11-13.

(22) Jer. VI, 11.

- (23) Instead of having schools provided for him.
- (24) Ibid. 15.
- (25) Isa. XXIV, 2f. 'People' is understood as a synonym for the humble masses; 'priest' symbolizes the great.
- (26) Lam. I, 6.
- (27) A metaphor for deliberately shutting their eyes to evil.
- (28) II Chron. XXXVI, 16.
- (29) I Chron. XVI, 22.
- (30) Whom it was customary to anoint with oil, cf. supra 10b.
- (31) Nesi'ah, Judah II.
- (32) This is more thorough-going than the former.
- (33) I.e., men completely truthful and trustworthy.
- (34) Jer. V, 1.
- (35) Or, judge, Isa. III, 6.
- (36) Rashi: when questioned on learning they hide themselves, pretending not to hear, because they cannot answer.
- (37) E.V. 'ruin'.
- (38) Ibid.

### Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 120a

things of which people are not sure<sup>1</sup> unless they [first] stumble over them<sup>2</sup> are in thy hands; [therefore] be thou our judge. In that day [yissa] shall he lift up [his voice] saying, I will not be an healer:<sup>3</sup> 'yissa' denotes nought but swearing, and thus it is said, Thou shalt not take [tissa] the name of the Lord [thy God in vain].<sup>4</sup> I will not be a binder up [hobesh]: I will not be of those who shut themselves up [hobeshe] in the Beth Hamidrash. And in my house in neither bread nor clothing: I possess no mikra,<sup>5</sup> mishnah, or gemara<sup>6</sup> — How does that follow: perhaps it is different there, for had he said to them, 'I have studied them' [the reasons of the Law], they would have retorted, 'Then tell [them] to us'? — Then let him say that he had learnt and forgotten: why [state], 'I will not be a binder up' at all?<sup>7</sup> — There is no difficulty: here it is in connection with learning,<sup>8</sup> there in connection with worldly affairs.

MISHNAH. ONE MAY SAVE A BASKET FULL OF LOAVES, EVEN IF IT CONTAINS [SUFFICIENT FOR] A HUNDRED MEALS, AND A ROUND CAKE OF PRESSED FIGS,<sup>9</sup> AND A BARREL OF WINE, AND HE [THE OWNER] MAY SAY TO OTHERS, 'COME AND SAVE FOR YOURSELVES'; AND IF THEY ARE WISE, THEY MAKE A RECKONING WITH HIM AFTER THE SABBATH.<sup>10</sup> WHITHER MAY THEY BE SAVED? INTO A COURTYARD PROVIDED WITH AN 'ERUB. BEN BATHYRA SAID: EVEN INTO A COURTYARD UNPROVIDED WITH AN 'ERUB. AND THITHER HE MAY CARRY OUT ALL. THE UTENSILS [HE REQUIRES] FOR HIS USE;<sup>11</sup> AND HE PUTS ON ALL THAT HE CAN PUT ON AND WRAPS HIMSELF IN ALL WHEREWITH HE CAN WRAP HIMSELF;<sup>12</sup> R. JOSE SAID: [ONLY] EIGHTEEN GARMENTS.<sup>13</sup> THEN HE MAY PUT ON [GARMENTS] AFRESH<sup>14</sup> AND CARRY THEM OUT, AND SAY TO OTHERS, 'COME AND RESCUE WITH ME.'<sup>15</sup> GEMARA. But he [the Tanna] teaches in the first clause,<sup>16</sup> three meals, but no more? — Said R. Huna, There is no difficulty: here it means that he comes to save [the whole basket simultaneously]; there he comes to collect [food]: if he comes to save, he may save all;<sup>17</sup> if he comes to collect, he may collect only for three meals. R. Abba b. Zabda said in R. Idi's name: Both are where one comes to collect, yet there is no difficulty: here it is into the same courtyard;<sup>18</sup> there it is into another courtyard.

R. Huna the son of R. Joshua asked: What if one spreads out his garments, collects and places [therein], collects and places [therein]?<sup>19</sup> Is it like one who comes to save,<sup>20</sup> or like one who comes to collect? — [Come and hear]:<sup>21</sup> Since Raba said, R. Shizbi misled R. Hisda by teaching, 'Provided that he does not procure a vessel which holds more than three meals', it follows that it is like one who comes to save,<sup>22</sup> and it is permitted. R. Nahman b. Isaac observed to Raba: Why is it an error?

— He replied: Because it is stated, ‘provided that he does not bring another vessel and catch [the dripping liquid] or another vessel and join it [to the roof]’: [thus] only another vessel may not [be brought], but he may save as much as he desires in the same vessel.

AND A ROUND CAKE OF PRESSED FIGS, etc. What have we to do with a reckoning? Surely they acquire it from hefker?<sup>23</sup> — Said R. Hisda: They spoke here of pious conduct.<sup>24</sup> Will pious men take payment for the Sabbath? objected Raba.<sup>25</sup> Rather said Raba, We refer here to a God-fearing person, who does not wish to benefit from others, yet is unwilling to trouble for nothing, and this is its meaning: AND IF THEY ARE WISE, that they know that in such a case it is not payment for the Sabbath,<sup>26</sup> THEY MAKE A RECKONING WITH HIM AFTER THE SABBATH.

WHITHER MAY THEY BE SAVED, etc. Why does he state here [SAVE] FOR YOURSELVES, whilst there he states, RESCUE WITH ME? — I will tell you: in connection with food he states, FOR YOURSELVES, because food for three meals only is fit for himself; but in connection with garments he states, RESCUE WITH ME, because they are fit for him all day.<sup>27</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: He may put on, carry out, and take off, then again put on, carry out, and take off, even all day: this is R. Meir's view. R. Jose said: [Only] eighteen garments. And these are the eighteen garments: a cloak, undertunic,<sup>28</sup> hollow belt,<sup>29</sup> linen [sleeveless] tunic, shirt, felt cap, apron, a pair<sup>30</sup> of trousers, a pair of shoes, a pair of socks, a pair of breeches, the girdle round his loins, the hat on his head and the scarf round his neck.<sup>31</sup>

MISHNAH. R. SIMEON B. NANNOS SAID: ONE MAY SPREAD A GOAT SKIN<sup>32</sup> OVER A BOX, CHEST, OR TRUNK<sup>33</sup> WHICH HAS CAUGHT FIRE, BECAUSE HE SINGES;<sup>34</sup> AND ONE MAY MAKE A BARRIER WITH ALL VESSELS, WHETHER FULL [OF WATER] OR EMPTY, THAT THE FIRE SHOULD NOT TRAVEL ONWARD. R. JOSE FORBIDS IN THE CASE OF NEW EARTHEN VESSELS FILLED WITH WATER, BECAUSE SINCE THEY CANNOT STAND THE HEAT, THEY WILL BURST AND EXTINGUISH THE FIRE.<sup>35</sup>

GEMARA. Rab Judah said in Rab's name: If a garment catches fire on one side, water may be poured on to it on the other, and if it is [thereby] extinguished, it is extinguished. An objection is raised: If a garment catches fire on one side, one may take it off and cover himself with it, and if it is extinguished, if it is extinguished; and likewise if a Scroll of the Law catches fire, one may spread it out and read it, and if it is extinguished, it is extinguished?<sup>36</sup>

---

(1) Lit., ‘do not stand by them’.

(2) They must first make mistakes before they arrive at certainty.

(3) Or, a binder up.

(4) Ex. XX, 7. This is an injunction against false swearing.

(5) Scriptural knowledge.

(6) Gemara, which was often substituted by the censors for Talmud, is generally understood to mean the discussion on the Mishnah; v. however Kaplan, *Redaction of the Talmud* pp. 195-7, where he maintains that gemara does not mean discussions but the final decisions arising out of the discussions. — Returning to our text, we see that there were ‘faithful’, i.e., truthful men in Jerusalem who confessed their ignorance and refused office on that account.

(7) This proves that he was animated by a desire for truth, and thus contradicts Raba.

(8) In this respect they were truthful.

(9) Although it is very large.

(10) They may demand payment for their labour.

(11) On that day e.g., plates, glasses, etc.

(12) And thus saves them from the fire.

(13) Which are normally worn; v. Gemara infra.

(14) Having taken off the first; this is the first Tanna's view, not R. Jose's.

- (15) In the same manner.
- (16) Sc. the Mishnah supra 117b.
- (17) In the basket, no matter how much it contains.
- (18) Sc. that of the house which is on fire.
- (19) More than three meals.
- (20) The whole simultaneously, since it is all to be carried out together.
- (21) V.
- (22) For Raba evidently holds that one may bring a vessel and collect more than for three meals — the reference is to the Baraitha supra 117b: ‘if one’s barrel burst on the top of his roof’ etc.
- (23) V. Glos. Seeing that he tells them to save it for themselves, it is theirs altogether.
- (24) A pious man will not take advantage of the fire to keep the food for himself.
- (25) Surely not. (11) Hasiduth (piety) however is a higher stage than God-fearingness.
- (26) Since it is actually hefker and they do not stipulate for payment beforehand.
- (27) He may wish to change many times during the day, so that he needs all for himself.
- (28) Jast.: an easy dress worn in the house and, under the cloak, in the street, but in which it was unbecoming to appear in public.
- (29) A money bag.
- (30) Lit., ‘two’.
- (31) Some of these translations are only approximate: Felt-cap and hat, as well as ‘trousers’ and ‘breeches’ were obviously garments both worn at the time.
- (32) Rashi: which is damp.
- (33) Lit., ‘turret’. — Three kinds of boxes or chests are meant.
- (34) But does not burn it and at the same time it protects the boxes.
- (35) Which is forbidden as a principal labour, v. supra 73a.
- (36) In each case probably the motion extinguishes it if the flame is very small. But the Tanna does not permit water.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 120b

— He rules as R. Simeon b. Nannos.<sup>1</sup> Yet perhaps R. Simeon b. Nannos said [merely], BECAUSE HE SINGES: but did he rule [thus] of indirect extinguishing?<sup>2</sup> — Yet, since the final clause teaches, R. JOSE FORBIDS IN THE CASE OF NEW EARTHEN VESSELS FILLED WITH WATER, BECAUSE SINCE THEY CANNOT STAND THE HEAT THEY WILL BURST AND EXTINGUISH THE FIRE, it follows that the first Tanna permits it.

Our Rabbis taught: If a lamp is on a board, one may shake [tip up] the board and it [the lamp] falls off, and if it is extinguished, it is extinguished. The School of R. Jannai said: They learnt this only if one forgot [it there]; but if he placed [it there], it [the board] became a stand for a forbidden article.<sup>3</sup> A Tanna taught: If a lamp is behind a door, one may open and close [it] naturally, and if it is extinguished<sup>4</sup> it is extinguished. Rab cursed this [ruling]. Said Rabina to R. Aha the son of Raba — others state, R. Aha the son of Raba to R. Ashi — why did Rab curse this? Shall we say because Rab holds with R. Judah,<sup>5</sup> whereas the Tanna teaches as R. Simeon? Because Rab holds with R. Judah, if one teaches as R. Simeon, shall he curse him! — Here, he replied, even R. Simeon agrees, for Abaye and Raba both said: R. Simeon agrees in a case of ‘cut off his head and let him not die.’<sup>6</sup>

Rab Judah said: One may open a door opposite a fire on the Sabbath.<sup>7</sup> Abaye cursed this. What are the circumstances? If there is a normal wind [blowing], what is the reason of the one who forbids?<sup>8</sup> — If there is an abnormal wind, what is the reason of the one who permits?<sup>9</sup> — In truth, it refers to a normal wind: one Master holds, we prohibit preventively;<sup>10</sup> whilst the other Master holds, We do not prohibit preventively.

ONE MAY MAKE A BARRIER, etc. Shall we say that the Rabbis hold, Indirect extinguishing<sup>11</sup> is permitted, while R. Jose holds that it is forbidden? But we know them [to maintain] the reverse.

For it was taught: One may make a barrier of empty vessels and of full vessels which are not liable to burst; metal vessels. R. Jose said: The vessels of Kefar Shihin and Kefar Hananiah<sup>12</sup> too are not likely to burst!<sup>13</sup> And should you answer, Reverse our Mishnah while R. Jose of the Baraita argues on the view of the Rabbis;<sup>14</sup> [it may be asked], But can you reverse them? Surely Rabbah b. Tahlifa said in Rab's name: 'Which Tanna holds that indirect extinguishing is forbidden? R. Jose!' Hence in truth you must not reverse it, the whole of the Baraita being [the view] of R. Jose but there is a lacuna, and it was thus taught: One may make a barrier with empty vessels and with full vessels that are not likely to burst, and these are the vessels which are not likely to burst: metal vessels, and the vessels of Kefar Shihin and Kefar Hananiah too are not likely to burst. For R. Jose maintains: The vessels of Kefar Shihin and Kefar Hananiah too are not likely to burst.

Now, the Rabbis are self-contradictory and R. Jose is self-contradictory. For it was taught: If one has the [Divine] Name written on his skin, he must not bathe nor anoint [himself] nor stand in an unclean place. If he must perform an obligatory tebillah, he must wind a reed<sup>15</sup> about it and descend and perform tebillah. R. Jose said: He may at all times descend and perform tebillah in the ordinary way, provided that he does not rub [it]?<sup>16</sup> — There it is different, because Scripture saith, And ye shall destroy their name out of that place. Ye shall not do so unto the Lord your God:<sup>17</sup> only [direct] action is forbidden, but indirect action is permitted. If so, here too it is written, thou shalt not do any work:<sup>18</sup> only [direct] action is forbidden, but indirect action is permitted? — Since a man is excited over his property if you permit him [indirect action], he may come to extinguish it. If so, the Rabbis are self-contradictory: if there, though a man is excited over his property, it is permitted, how much more so here? — Now, is that logical:<sup>19</sup> this reed, how is it meant? If it is wound tightly, it is an interposition;<sup>20</sup> [while] if it is not wound tightly the water enters. ([You speak of] 'an interposition' that follows from the ink?<sup>21</sup> — The reference is to wet [ink for it was taught: Blood, ink, honey, and milk, if dry [on the skin] constitute an interposition; if moist, they do not constitute an interposition.) Yet still there is the difficulty?<sup>22</sup> — Rather said Raba b. Shila, This is the reason of the Rabbis: because they hold one must not stand nude in the presence of the Divine Name. Hence it follows that R. Jose holds that one may stand nude in the presence of the Divine Name?<sup>23</sup> — He places his hand upon it. Then according to the Rabbis too, let him place his hand upon it? He may chance to forget and remove it. Then according to R. Jose too, he may forget and remove it? — Rather [reply thus]. If a reed is available that is indeed so.<sup>24</sup> The discussion is about going to seek a reed:<sup>25</sup> the Rabbis hold,

---

(1) Just as the fire may be arrested by a goatskin, so may it be arrested by water, seeing that it is not poured directly on the flame.

(2) Such as water.

(3) Sc. the lamp, which may not be handled on the Sabbath, and then the same applies to the board too; cf. supra 117a and note a.l.

(4) By the draught.

(5) That even an unintentional action is forbidden.

(6) V. p. 357, n. 8.

(7) Medurah is a fire for heating, e.g., in the fire place, and the door is opened for the draught to fan it.

(8) It is generally insufficient to fan it into a blaze, hence it is not a case of 'cut off his head' etc.

(9) It will certainly make it burn up.

(10) Because if that is permitted, one will think that the door may be opened even if an abnormal wind is blowing.

(11) Lit., 'a cause of extinguishing'.

(12) Kefar means a village or country town. The former was probably near Shihin in the vicinity of Sepphoris; the latter was a town in Galilee. The earthen vessels made there were fire proof.

(13) This shows that he too permits only such. The Baraita is thus not actually the reverse of the Mishnah, but generally speaking we see that R. Jose is more lenient in the former, whereas in the Mishnah he is more stringent (Tosaf.).

(14) Thus R. Jose himself holds that even if they are likely to burst they are permitted, but he argues that even on the more stringent view of the Rabbis the vessels of Kefar Shihin etc. should be permitted too.

- (15) As assumed at present in order to prevent effacement of the Name.
- (16) Intentionally with his hands. — Thus the Rabbis forbid even an indirect action, whereas R. Jose forbids only a direct action.
- (17) Deut. XII, 3f.
- (18) Ex. XX, 9.
- (19) That the need of a reed according to the Rabbis is to prevent effacement.
- (20) Between the water and the flesh, which invalidates tebillah.
- (21) With which the Name is written. This interrupts the thread of argument: if you object to the reed because it is an interposition, what of the ink itself?
- (22) About the reed. Why do the Rabbis insist on a reed? — This difficulty is raised to show that the Rabbis' view has nothing to do with the question whether indirect action is permitted or not.
- (23) Surely not,
- (24) All agree that it must be used — even R. Jose, the reason being that one may not stand nude in the presence of the Name.
- (25) I.e., whether one must postpone the tebillah until he obtains it.

### **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 121a**

Tebillah in its [due] time is not obligatory,<sup>1</sup> hence we seek [it]; whereas R. Jose holds, Tebillah in its [due] time is obligatory, hence we do not seek [it].

Now, does then R. Jose hold, Tebillah in its [due] time is obligatory? Surely it was taught: A zab and a zabah, a male leper and a female leper, he who cohabits with a niddah,<sup>2</sup> and he who is defiled through a corpse, [perform] their tebillah by day.<sup>3</sup> A niddah and woman in confinement [perform] their tebillah at night.<sup>4</sup> A ba'al kerî<sup>5</sup> must proceed with tebillah at any time of the day.<sup>6</sup> R. Jose said: [If the mishap happened] from minhah and beyond he need not<sup>7</sup> perform tebillah.<sup>8</sup> — [The author of] that is R. Jose son of R. Judah who maintained: [One] tebillah at the end suffices for her.<sup>9</sup> MISHNAH. IF A GENTILE COMES TO EXTINGUISH, WE DO NOT SAY TO HIM, 'EXTINGUISH IT' OR 'DO NOT EXTINGUISH,' BECAUSE HIS RESTING IS NOT OUR OBLIGATION.<sup>10</sup> BUT IF A MINOR COMES TO EXTINGUISH, WE MUST NOT PERMIT HIM,<sup>11</sup> BECAUSE HIS RESTING IS OUR OBLIGATION.

GEMARA. R. Ammi said: In the case of a conflagration they [the Rabbis] permitted one to announce, 'Whoever extinguishes [it] will not lose [thereby].' Shall we say that this supports him: IF A GENTILE COMES TO EXTINGUISH, WE DO NOT SAY TO HIM, EXTINGUISH OR DO NOT EXTINGUISH, BECAUSE HIS RESTING IS NOT OUR OBLIGATION: thus we [merely] may not say to him, Extinguish [it],' but we may say, 'Whoever extinguishes [it] will not lose [thereby].' Then consider the second clause: WE DO NOT SAY TO HIM... DO NOT EXTINGUISH but neither may we say to him, 'Whoever extinguishes [it] will not lose [thereby]?'<sup>12</sup> Rather no deduction can be made from this.<sup>13</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: It once happened that a fire broke out in the courtyard of Joseph b. Simai in Shihin, and the men of the garrison at Sepphoris<sup>14</sup> came to extinguish it, because he was a steward of the king.<sup>15</sup> But he did not permit them, in honour of the Sabbath, and a miracle happened on his behalf, rain descended and extinguished [it]. In the evening he sent two sela' to each of them, and fifty to their captain. But when the Sages heard of it they said, He did not need this, for we learnt: IF A GENTILE COMES TO EXTINGUISH, WE DO NOT SAY TO HIM, 'EXTINGUISH' OR 'DO NOT EXTINGUISH'.

BUT IF A MINOR COMES TO EXTINGUISH, WE DO NOT PERMIT HIM, BECAUSE HIS RESTING IS OUR OBLIGATION. You may infer from this [that] if a minor eats nebeloth,<sup>16</sup> it is the duty of Beth din to restrain him?<sup>17</sup> — Said R. Johanan: This refers to a minor acting at his

father's desire.<sup>18</sup> Then by analogy, in respect to the Gentile, he [too] acts at the Jew's desire: is this permitted? — A Gentile acts at his own desire.<sup>19</sup>

**MISHNAH.** A DISH MAY BE INVERTED OVER A LAMP, THAT THE BEAMS SHOULD NOT CATCH [FIRE], AND OVER AN INFANT'S EXCREMENT, AND OVER A SCORPION, THAT IT SHOULD NOT BITE. R. JUDAH SAID: AN INCIDENT CAME BEFORE R. JOHANAN B. ZAKKAI IN ARAB,<sup>20</sup> AND HE SAID, I FEAR ON HIS ACCOUNT [THAT HE MAY BE LIABLE TO] A SIN-OFFERING.<sup>21</sup>

**GEMARA.** Rab Judah and R. Jeremiah b. Abba and R. Hanan b. Raba visited the home of Abin of Neshikya.<sup>22</sup> For Rab Judah and R. Jeremiah b. Abba

- (1) Even an obligatory tebillah need not be performed just when it is due.
- (2) Which defiles him — such coition is strictly forbidden.
- (3) The seventh day from their defilement. They can perform tebillah any time after dawn, even if it is not yet seven full days of twenty-four hours each from the time of defilement, and even if this falls on the Day of Atonement.
- (4) The evening following the day which completes their period of uncleanness, the full period being required in their case. This holds good even if the evening belongs to the Day of Atonement.
- (5) Lit., 'one whom a mishap has befallen' — a euphemism for one who discharged semen. By Rabbinical law he requires tebillah before he can engage in the study of Torah.
- (6) Lit., 'the whole day'. Even if he discharged semen in the late afternoon of the Day of Atonement, he may perform tebillah on the same day and need not wait for the evening, because tebillah in its right time is obligatory. [A non-obligatory bath is prohibited on the Day of Atonement.]
- (7) [Var. lec. he may not, v. Tosaf. a.l.]
- (8) Because tebillah at its right time is not obligatory, which is the point of the objection. The circumstances here are that he has already recited all the prayers of the day (Tosaf.), or at least minhah, while the ne'ilah (concluding) service may be recited at night.
- (9) The reference is to a woman who gave birth without knowing exactly when, what, and whether it was with or without a gonorrhoeic discharge. The first view is that all possibilities must be taken into account and she must perform tebillah at the due times posited by these. R. Jose b. R. Judah, however, rules that a single tebillah, performed at the end of the whole period that is in doubt, is sufficient, though actually the right time may have been earlier, for in any case tebillah at the time when it becomes due is not obligatory.
- (10) Lit., 'their obligation'. It is not the duty of Israelites to see that he rests on the Sabbath, hence we need not forbid him. On the other hand by Rabbinical law one must not instruct a Gentile to work — hence we may not tell him to extinguish the fire.
- (11) Lit., 'we do not hearken to him'.
- (12) For the second clause merely states that it is unnecessary to stop him, which implies, however, that one must not give him a hint to extinguish.
- (13) For one clause of the Mishnah must be exact, even in respect of its implication, whereas the other clause is not to be stressed so far, and it is not known which is exact.
- (14) [The Acropolis mentioned in Josephus, Vita 67].
- (15) [Agrippa II, v. Klein, S., Beitrage p. 66, n. 1 and Graetz, MGWJ, 1881, p. 484].
- (16) V. Glos.; i.e., any forbidden food.
- (17) Lit., 'to keep him away'. — In Yeb. 114a this is in doubt.
- (18) But where he acts entirely of his own accord it may not be so.
- (19) Though he knows that the Jew too desires it, he may nevertheless act on his own accord. But a minor is more likely to be directly influenced by what he understands to be his father's wish.
- (20) [Near Sepphoris, v. Klein Beitrage P. 75].
- (21) Since the snake was not pursuing him, his action may constitute trapping, which involves a sin-offering.
- (22) A town in Babylonia.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 121b

couches were brought; for R. Hanan b. Raba none was brought.<sup>1</sup> Now, he found him reciting to his son, AND OVER AN INFANT'S EXCREMENT, on account of the infant.<sup>2</sup> Said he to him, 'Abin! a fool recites nonsense to his son:<sup>3</sup> surely that itself is fit for dogs! And should you say that it was not fit for him from yesterday,<sup>4</sup> surely it was taught: Flowing rivers and gushing springs are as the feet of all men?<sup>5</sup> Then how shall I recite it? — Say: Over the excrement of fowls, on account of an infant.<sup>6</sup> But deduce it<sup>7</sup> because it is [as] a vessel for excrements.<sup>8</sup> And should you answer, The vessel of excrements is only [permitted] in virtue of the utensil,<sup>9</sup> yet that itself may not [be carried out], — but a mouse was found in R. Ashi's spices, and he said to them [his servants], 'Take it by the tail and throw it out?'<sup>10</sup> — This refers to a dung heap.<sup>11</sup> But what business has an infant with a dung heap?<sup>12</sup> — It is in the courtyard.<sup>13</sup> But in a courtyard too it is a vessel of excrements? — It refers to a dung heap in the courtyard.

AND OVER A SCORPION, THAT IT SHOULD NOT BITE. R. Joshua b. Levi said: All [animals, etc.] that cause injury<sup>14</sup> may be killed on the Sabbath. R. Joseph objected: Five may be killed on the Sabbath, and these are they: the Egyptian fly, the hornet of Nineweh, the scorpion of Adiabene,<sup>15</sup> the snake in Palestine, and a mad dog anywhere. Now, who [is the authority?] Shall we say, R. Judah? Surely he maintains, One is guilty on account of a labour not required for itself?<sup>16</sup> Hence it must be R. Simeon, and only these are permitted, but not others? — Said R. Jeremiah, And who tells us that this is correct: perhaps it is corrupt? Said R. Joseph: I recited it and I raised the objection, and I can answer it: This is where they are pursuing him, and is unanimous.<sup>17</sup>

A tanna recited before Rabbah son of R. Huna: If one kills snakes or scorpions on the Sabbath, the spirit of the pious<sup>18</sup> is displeased with him. He retorted, And as to those pious men, the spirit of the Sages is displeased with them. Now, he disagrees with R. Huna, for R. Huna saw a man kill a wasp. Said he to him, 'Have you wiped them all out?'<sup>19</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: If one chances upon snakes and scorpions, and he kills them, it is manifest that he had chanced upon them in order to kill them; if he does not kill them, it is manifest that he had chanced upon them that they should kill him, but that a miracle was performed by Heaven on his behalf. 'Ulla said: — others state, Rabbah b. Bar Hanah said in R. Johanan's name — That is when they hiss at him.<sup>20</sup>

R. Abba b. Kahana said: One [of them] once fell in the Beth Hamidrash, and a Nabatean<sup>21</sup> arose and killed it.<sup>22</sup> Said Rabbi: A similar one must have attacked him. The scholars asked: 'A similar one must have attacked him' [means] that he had done well, or not?<sup>23</sup> — Come and hear: For R. Abba, son of R. Hiyya b. Abba, and R. Zera were sitting in the anteroom of R. Jannai's academy, [when] something issued from between them.<sup>24</sup> [So] they asked R. Jannai: May one kill snakes and scorpions on the Sabbath? Said he to them: I kill a hornet, how much more so snakes and scorpions! But perhaps that is [only] incidentally,<sup>25</sup> for Rab Judah said: One can tread down saliva incidentally:<sup>26</sup> and R. Shesheth said, One can tread down a snake incidentally, and R. Kattina said, One may tread down a scorpion incidentally.<sup>27</sup>

Abba b. Martha, who is Abba b. Minyomi, owed money to the house of the Resh Galutha. [So] they brought him [before the Resh Galutha]; he distressed him [and] he<sup>28</sup> spat out saliva,<sup>29</sup> [whereupon] the Resh Galutha ordered, 'Bring a vessel and cover it . Said he to them, 'You do not need this, [for] thus did Rab Judah say: One can tread down saliva incidentally.' 'He is a scholar,' remarked he [the Resh Galutha]; 'let him go'.

R. Abba b. Kahana also said in R. Hanina's name: The candlesticks<sup>30</sup> of Rabbi's household may be handled on the Sabbath.

R. Zera asked him: [Does that mean] where they can be taken up with one hand, or [even] with two hands?

- 
- (1) He had to sit on the ground.
  - (2) To prevent him from dabbling with it.
  - (3) This rude remark was made in spleen at his host's discourtesy. (11) Mukeneth, Lit., 'stands prepared'. Hence it may be handled and therefore one can carry it out altogether; why then overturn a dish upon it?
  - (4) Sc. Friday; thus it is newly-created, as it were, on the Sabbath (technically called *nolad v. Glos.*), and as such may not be handled.
  - (5) On the Sabbath or Festival an article may be carried, where carrying is permitted through an 'erub, only where its owner may go, i.e., it is 'as the feet of its owner'. But this does not apply to the water of a flowing river, and every man may carry it whither he himself may go, though not all may go to the same place (*v. Bez. 39a*). Now, that which comes on the Sabbath from without the *tehum* (*v. Glos.*) may not be taken anywhere within the *tehum*. But although the water of a flowing river does come from without, it may be carried within. This shows that though that particular water was not there on the Friday, it is regarded as fit on the Sabbath, because it was naturally expected. Hence the same applies to the excrement: though it did not exist before the Sabbath, it was expected, and therefore may be handled, seeing that it can be put to a legitimate use.
  - (6) *V. p. 600, n. 9*. But this may not be handled itself, because it is not fit for dogs. — He interprets the Mishnah thus.
  - (7) That one may carry it out.
  - (8) Which may be cleared away on account of its repulsiveness.
  - (9) Which contains the excrements.
  - (10) And a mouse is the same as excrement.
  - (11) Which stands apart.
  - (12) Which was usually in the street.
  - (13) It is now assumed that this refers to the excrement, not the dung heap.
  - (14) Rashi: that kill.
  - (15) A district of Assyria between the rivers Lycus and Caprus.
  - (16) *Supra 12a, 31b*; the present killing falls within the same category.
  - (17) I.e., R. Joshua's statement refers to this case. But in the Baraitha they are not pursuing him, and it is taught on R. Simeon's view.
  - (18) Heb. *hasidim*. Here probably no particular sect is meant. Weiss, *Dor, I. 109*, maintains that the early *hasidim* are probably referred to.
  - (19) Sarcastically. I.e., you have achieved nothing, and should not have done it on the Sabbath.
  - (20) Otherwise it is not to be assumed that they were meant to kill him.
  - (21) Rashi, a Jew from Nabatea.
  - (22) This was on a Sabbath.
  - (23) Did Rabbi speak seriously or sarcastically?
  - (24) Or, the question came up (for discussion) between them.
  - (25) Lit., 'in one's simplicity' — i.e., not intentionally, but in the course of his walking.
  - (26) I.e., on Sabbath, despite the possibility of levelling thereby some grooves in the soil.
  - (27) Thus the question remains unanswered.
  - (28) Abba.
  - (29) There happened to be saliva spat out. *V. Rashi*.
  - (30) Rashi: a one-piece lamp; *v. p. 202., n. 6*.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 122a

Such as those of your father's house, he replied.<sup>1</sup>

R. Abba b. Kahana also said in R. Hanina's name: The litters<sup>2</sup> of Rabbi's household may be handled on the Sabbath. R. Zera asked him: [Does that mean] those that can be moved with one hand, or [even] with two hands? Such as those of your father's house, replied he.

R. Abba b. Kahana also said: R. Hanina permitted Rabbi's household to drink wine [carried]<sup>3</sup> in gentile coaches<sup>4</sup> [sealed] with one seal,<sup>5</sup> and I do not know whether it is because he agrees with R. Eliezer<sup>6</sup> or because of the [Gentile's] fear of the Nasi's household.<sup>7</sup> MISHNAH. IF A GENTILE LIGHTS A LAMP, AN ISRAELITE MAY MAKE USE OF ITS LIGHT; BUT IF [HE DOES IT] FOR THE SAKE OF THE ISRAELITE, IT IS FORBIDDEN. IF HE DRAWS WATER<sup>8</sup> TO GIVE HIS OWN ANIMAL, TO DRINK, AN ISRAELITE MAY WATER [HIS] AFTER HIM; BUT IF [HE DRAWS IT] FOR THE ISRAELITES SAKE, IT IS FORBIDDEN. IF A GENTILE MAKES A STAIRWAY TO DESCEND BY IT,<sup>9</sup> AN ISRAELITE MAY DESCEND AFTER HIM; BUT IF ON THE ISRAELITES ACCOUNT, IT IS FORBIDDEN. IT ONCE HAPPENED THAT R. GAMALIEL AND THE ELDERS WERE TRAVELING IN A SHIP, WHEN A GENTILE MADE A STAIRWAY FOR GOING DOWN, AND R. GAMALIEL, AND THE ELDERS DESCENDED BY IT.

GEMARA. Now these are [all] necessary. For if we were informed [about] a lamp, that is because a lamp for one is a lamp for a hundred; but as for water, [I might say] let us forbid it,<sup>10</sup> lest he come to increase [the quantity drawn] on the Israelite's account.<sup>11</sup> What is the need of [the ruling about] a stairway?<sup>12</sup> He tells us the story of R. Gamaliel and the elders.

Our Rabbis taught: if a Gentile gathers herbs,<sup>13</sup> an Israelite may feed [his cattle therewith] after him, but if [he gathers] on the Israelite's account, it is forbidden. If he draws water to give his cattle to drink, an Israelite may water [his] after him, but if on the Israelite's account, it is forbidden. When is that? If he does not know him; but if he knows him it is forbidden. But that is not so? For R. Huna said in R. Hanina's name: A man may stand his cattle on grass on the Sabbath,<sup>14</sup> but not on mukzeh<sup>15</sup> on the Sabbath!<sup>16</sup> — It means that he stands in front of it [the animal], and so it goes [there] and eats. The Master said: 'When is that? If he does not know him; but if he knows him, it is forbidden.' But R. Gamaliel [is a case where] he knew him?<sup>17</sup> — Said Abaye: It was not [made] in his presence.<sup>18</sup> Raba said: You may even say that it was in his presence: 'a lamp for one is a lamp for a hundred.'<sup>19</sup> An objection is raised: R. Gamaliel said to them, 'Since he did not make it in our presence, let us go down by it?' — Say: 'Since he made it, let us go down by it.' Come and hear: If a city inhabited by Israelites and Gentiles contains baths where there is bathing on the Sabbath, if the majority are Gentiles, one [an Israelite] may bathe therein immediately;<sup>20</sup> if the majority are Israelites, one must wait until hot water could be heated.<sup>21</sup> — There, when they heat, they do so with a view to the majority.<sup>22</sup>

Come and hear: If a lamp is burning at a banqueting party:<sup>23</sup> if the majority are Gentiles, one may make use of its light; if the majority are Israelites, it is forbidden; if half and half, it is forbidden?<sup>24</sup> — There too, when they light it,

---

(1) Small ones. But heavy ones generally have an appointed place and may not be moved.

(2) For carrying people.

(3) V. MS.M.

(4) Left in the charge of Gentiles.

(5) To prevent the Gentiles from tampering with it. Normally two seals are required.

(6) In A.Z. 31a, that for wine only one seal is required.

- (7) Which would prevent the Gentile from tampering with the wine.
- (8) From a pit in the street.
- (9) Rashi: a gangway from a large ship to dry land.
- (10) Even when the Gentile draws it for his own use.
- (11) Whilst ostensibly drawing it for himself.
- (12) That is analogous to a lamp — the same stairway suffices for many as for one.
- (13) As animal fodder.
- (14) I.e., on grass attached to the soil, and we do not fear that he may thereby come to cut grass for his animal.
- (15) Fodder stored away for later use; this may not be handled on the Sabbath as mukzeh (v. Glos.); hence its designation.
- (16) Lest he take it and feed the animal. But grass cut on the Sabbath is also mukzeh and may not be handled, since it was not fit for handling detached before the Sabbath. (10) Barring its way to elsewhere and so making it go on to the detached grass; but he does not actually lead the animal himself; then it is permitted.
- (17) Since he travelled with R. Gamaliel in the boat.
- (18) Then the Gentile certainly did not make it for him.
- (19) He needed the gangway for himself, and there is no extra work even if he had R. Gamaliel in mind. But one may cut more grass on the Jew's account.
- (20) After the Sabbath, because it was heated primarily for Gentiles.
- (21) After the Sabbath, so as not to benefit from the heating of the water on the Sabbath. Now, the water had to be heated for the Gentiles in any case, and there is no real difference between heating for one or for many; further, it was not heated in the Jews' presence, yet one must not benefit from it. This contradicts both Abaye and Raba.
- (22) Hence it is regarded as specifically for Jews.
- (23) Having been lit on the Sabbath.
- (24) This contradicts Raba.

## **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 122b**

they do so with a view to the majority.

Samuel visited the house of Abin of Toran.<sup>1</sup> A Gentile came and lit a lamp, [whereupon] Samuel turned his face away.<sup>2</sup> — On seeing that he [the Gentile] had brought a document and was reading it, he observed, 'He has lit it for himself'; [so] he [too] [Samuel] turned his face to the lamp.

## **CHAPTER XVII**

**MISHNAH.** ALL UTENSILS MAY<sup>3</sup> BE HANDLED ON THE SABBATH AND THEIR DOORS<sup>4</sup> WITH THEM, EVEN IF THEY ARE DETACHED, FOR THEY ARE NOT LIKE THE DOORS OF A HOUSE, WHICH ARE NOT OF MUKAN.<sup>5</sup> A MAN MAY TAKE A HAMMER TO SPLIT NUTS, A CHOPPER TO CUT [A ROUND OF] PRESSED FIGS, A SAW FOR SAWING CHEESE, A SPADE TO SCOOP DRIED FIGS,<sup>6</sup> A WINNOWING SHOVEL AND A PITCHFORK TO PLACE [FOOD] UPON IT FOR A CHILD, A REED OR A WHORL TO STICK [FOOD], A SMALL NEEDLE<sup>7</sup> TO REMOVE A THORN, AND A SACK [NEEDLE] TO OPEN A DOOR THEREWITH.<sup>8</sup>

**GEMARA.** ALL UTENSILS MAY BE HANDLED, ... EVEN IF THEY ARE DETACHED on the Sabbath,<sup>9</sup> while it goes without saying [if detached] on a weekday;<sup>9</sup> on the contrary, on the Sabbath they stand 'prepared' in virtue of their origin;<sup>10</sup> [whereas if detached] on a weekday, they do not stand 'prepared' in virtue of their origin?<sup>11</sup> Said Abaye, This is its meaning: ALL UTENSILS MAY BE HANDLED ON THE SABBATH, THEIR DOORS WITH THEM, EVEN IF THEY ARE DETACHED on a weekday, they may be handled on the Sabbath. Our Rabbis taught: The door of a box, chest, or coffer<sup>12</sup> may be removed, but not replaced; that of a hen-roost may neither be removed nor replaced. As for that of a hen-roost, it is well! he holds that since they [the hen-roosts] are

attached to the ground, [the interdict of] building applies to the ground and that of demolishing applies to the ground;<sup>13</sup> but as for that of a box, chest, or coffer, what is his opinion? If he holds, [The interdict of] building applies to utensils, then that of demolishing [too] applies to utensils; whilst if there is no [prohibition of] building in respect to utensils, there is no [prohibition of] demolishing in respect to utensils [either]?<sup>14</sup> — Said Abaye: In truth he holds: There is [the prohibition of] building in the case of utensils, and there is [that of] demolishing in respect of utensils, but he means, Those that were removed [may not be replaced].<sup>15</sup> Said Raba to him, There are two objections to this: one, since he teaches that they may be removed; and two, how [explain] ‘but not replaced?’ — Rather said Raba: He holds, [The interdict of] building does not apply to utensils, and the interdict of demolishing does not ‘apply to utensils, yet it is a preventive measure, lest he fix it firmly.’<sup>16</sup>

A MAN MAY TAKE A HAMMER, etc. Rab Judah said: [This means,] a nut hammer to split nuts therewith, but not a smith's [hammer]: he holds, An article whose function is a forbidden labour is forbidden [even] when required for itself.<sup>17</sup> Said Rabbah to him: If so, when the second clause teaches, A WINNOWING SHOVEL AND A PITCH-FORK, TO PLACE [FOOD] UPON IT FOR

A CHILD, are a winnowing shovel and a pitch-fork set aside specially for a child?<sup>18</sup> Rather said Rabbah: [it means] a smith's hammer to split nuts therewith; he holds,

---

(1) MS.M. To Abitoran.

(2) So as not to benefit from it.

(3) Tosaf. reads: ALL UTENSILS WHICH MAY, etc., for in fact there are many that may not be handled.

(4) Those that have doors or lids, e.g., a chest or coffer.

(5) v. Glos. The doors of a house, if detached, may not be handled on the Sabbath, because they are not parts of utensils which stand ‘prepared’ for handling. But the doors of utensils are like the utensils themselves.

(6) Out of the barrel.

(7) Lit., ‘hand-needle’.

(8) If the key is lost.

(9) This is now the assumed meaning and implication of the Mishnah.

(10) Lit., ‘father’. If they became detached on the Sabbath since they were fit to handle at the beginning of the Sabbath, when they were part of the whole, they remain so for the whole Sabbath.

(11) For when the Sabbath commenced they were not part of the utensil.

(12) Lit., ‘tower’ or ‘turret’ — a large box or chest.

(13) I.e., it is like fitting or removing a house door, which constitutes building and demolishing; v. supra 73a.

(14) Thus removing and refitting should be the same.

(15) Thus only one law is stated; the doors of a chest, box, and coffer, if detached (before the Sabbath), may not be refitted.

(16) Nailing or screwing it on, which is certainly labour; hence he must not put it back at all.

(17) For a permitted labour. I.e., since the normal function of a smith's hammer is to perform labour forbidden on the Sabbath, it may not be handled even for a permitted purpose.

(18) Surely not!

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 123a

An article whose function is a forbidden labour is permitted when required for itself.

Abaye raised an objection to Rabbah: A mortar,<sup>1</sup> if containing garlic, may be moved;<sup>2</sup> if not, it may not be moved?<sup>3</sup> — The author of this is R. Nehemiah, he replied, who maintains, A utensil may be handled only for the purpose of its [normal] use.<sup>4</sup> He objected to him: Yet both hold alike that if he has [already] cut meat upon it, it may not be handled?<sup>5</sup> — He thought of answering him that this agrees with R. Nehemiah, but when he heard R. Hinena b. Shalmia's dictum in Rab's name: All agree

in respect of the dyer's pins, tubs, and beams:<sup>6</sup> since one is particular about them he appoints a [special] place for them; so here too one appoints a special place for it [the pestle].<sup>7</sup>

It was stated, R. Hiyya b. Abba said in R. Johanan's name: We learnt [in our Mishnah] of a goldsmith's hammer; R. Shaman b. Abba said: We learnt of a spice hammer. He who says a spice [hammer], all the more so a goldsmith's [hammer].<sup>8</sup> He who says a goldsmith's, — but one is particular about a spice [hammer].<sup>9</sup>

A REED OR A WHORL, etc. Our Rabbis taught: If an unripe fig was hidden in straw,<sup>10</sup> or a cake which was hidden in live coals,<sup>11</sup> and part thereof is uncovered, it may be handled;<sup>12</sup> but if not, it may not be handled. R. Eleazar b. Taddai said: One impales them on a reed or a whorl, and they [the straw or coals] are shaken off of their own accord. R. Nahman said: The halachah is as R. Eleazar b. Taddai. Shall we say that R. Nahman holds, Indirect<sup>13</sup> handling is not designated handling?<sup>14</sup> Surely R. Nahman said: 'A radish, if it is the right way up, is permitted; if it is reversed,<sup>15</sup> it is forbidden.'<sup>16</sup> — R. Nahman retracted from that [ruling].

A SMALL NEEDLE TO REMOVE A THORN, etc. Raba son of Rabbah sent to R. Joseph: Let our Master teach us, What of a needle from which the eye or the point has been removed?<sup>17</sup> We have learnt it, he replied: A SMALL NEEDLE TO REMOVE A THORN: now, what does it matter to the thorn whether it has an eye or not? He [thereupon] put an objection to him: If the eye or the point of a needle is removed, it is clean?<sup>18</sup> — Said Abaye: You oppose defilement to the Sabbath! [For] defilement we require a working utensil,<sup>19</sup> [whereas] in respect to the Sabbath we require anything that is fit, and this too is fit for removing a splinter. Raba observed, He who raises the objection does so rightly: since it is not a utensil in respect to defilement, it is not a utensil in respect to the Sabbath.

An objection is raised: A needle, whether with or without an eye, may be handled on the Sabbath, while one with an eye was specified only in respect to defilement?<sup>20</sup> — Abaye interpreted it on the view of Raba as referring to unfinished utensils, for sometimes he may decide to use it thus and make it rank as a utensil; but if the eye or point is removed one throws it away among the rubbish.<sup>21</sup>

Causing a new-born babe to vomit,<sup>22</sup> R. Nahman forbids, while R. Shesheth permits. R. Nahman said: Whence do I rule thus? Because we learnt: One must not use an emetic<sup>23</sup>

---

(1) For pounding garlic.

(2) On account of the garlic, to which the mortar is merely subsidiary.

(3) Since its essential function is forbidden, it may not be moved even for a permitted purpose, which refutes Rabbah.

(4) V. supra 36a. Whereas our Mishnah disagrees with R. Nehemiah.

(5) The reference is to a pestle: Beth Shammai rule that it must not be handled on a Festival for cutting meat thereon, because its normal use, sc. pounding, is forbidden on a Festival; Beth Hillel permit it, so as not to hinder the joy of the Festival. But if the meat has already been cut upon it, so that the permissive reason no longer holds good, Beth Hillel admits that it may not be handled.

(6) Rashi and Jast.

(7) Whence it is not to be moved for any other purpose but its own. This lays a stronger prohibition upon it; hence it may not be handled.

(8) That it may be used, and the more so is an ordinary smith's hammer — in agreement with Rabbah.

(9) Not to use it for anything else, lest it become too soiled for subsequent use on spices.

(10) For it to ripen. Straw is mukzeh for making bricks.

(11) Before the Sabbath.

(12) Since the straw or the coals themselves need not be handled.

(13) Lit., 'from the side'.

(14) V. supra 43b.

(15) Lit., 'from top to bottom ... from bottom to top'.

(16) The reference is to a detached radish stored in loose earth in the ground: if it is the right side up, one may pull it out, because since the top of the radish is broader than the bottom he does not dislodge any earth; but if reversed, the loose soil will naturally cave in, hence it is tantamount to handling the soil and is forbidden, though it is only indirect handling.

(17) Does it still rank as a utensil and permitted to be handled on the Sabbath?

(18) Which shows that it is not a utensil.

(19) But if the eye or point is removed the needle is no longer a utensil.

(20) V. supra 52b. This refutes Raba.

(21) Not regarding it as a utensil at all.

(22) By inserting the finger in its mouth in order to relieve it of its phlegm (Jast.). Rashi: To manipulate and ease a child's limbs.

(23) In order to leave room for mere food.

## **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 123b**

on the Sabbath.<sup>1</sup> And R. Shesheth?<sup>2</sup> — There it is unnatural, whereas here it is natural<sup>3</sup> R. Shesheth said, Whence do I rule thus? Because we learnt: A SMALL NEEDLE TO REMOVE A THORN.<sup>4</sup> And R. Nahman? — There it is [externally] deposited,<sup>5</sup> whereas here it is not [externally] deposited.<sup>6</sup>

MISHNAH. A CANE FOR OLIVES,<sup>7</sup> IF IT HAS A BULB ON TOP,<sup>8</sup> IS SUSCEPTIBLE TO DEFILEMENT; IF NOT, IT IS NOT SUSCEPTIBLE TO DEFILEMENT. IN BOTH CASES IT MAY BE HANDLED ON THE SABBATH.

GEMARA. Why so? It is a flat wooden utensil, and these are not susceptible to uncleanness; what is the reason? We require [something] similar to a 'sack'?'<sup>9</sup> — It was taught in R. Nehemiah's name: When he turns the olives he reverses it and looks at it.<sup>10</sup>

MISHNAH. R. JOSE SAID: ALL UTENSILS MAY BE HANDLED, EXCEPT A LARGE SAW AND THE PIN OF A PLOUGH.<sup>11</sup>

GEMARA. R. Nahman said: A fuller's trough<sup>12</sup> is like the pin of a plough. Abaye said: A cobbler's knife and a butcher's chopper and a carpenter's adze are like the pin of a plough.<sup>13</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: At first they [the Sages] ruled, Three utensils may be handled on the Sabbath: A fig-cake knife,<sup>14</sup> a pot soup ladle,<sup>15</sup> and a small table-knife. Then<sup>16</sup> they permitted [other articles], and they permitted again [still more], and they permitted still further, until they ruled: All utensils may be handled on the Sabbath except a large saw and the pin of a plough. What is meant by 'then they permitted [other articles], and they permitted again [still more], and they permitted still further'? — Said Abaye: [First] they permitted an article whose function is for a permitted purpose, provided it was required for itself;<sup>17</sup> then they further permitted an article whose function is for a permitted purpose, even when its place is required; then they further permitted an article whose function is for a forbidden purpose, provided it was required for itself,<sup>18</sup> but not when its place is required. Yet still [these might be handled] with one hand only, but not with two hands,<sup>19</sup> until they [finally] ruled, All utensils may be handled on the Sabbath even with both hands. Raba observed to him, Consider: he [the Tanna] teaches, they permitted [other things], what difference is it whether they are required for themselves or their place is needed?<sup>20</sup> Rather said Raba: [First] they permitted an article whose function is for a permitted purpose, both when required itself or when its place is required; then they further permitted [it to be moved] from the sun to the shade;<sup>21</sup> then they further permitted an article whose function is for a forbidden purpose [to be moved] only when it is required for itself or when its place is required, but not from the sun to the shade. Yet [it might] still [be moved] by one person only, but not by two,<sup>22</sup> until they ruled: All utensils may be handled on the Sabbath, even by two persons.

Abaye put an objection to him: A mortar containing garlic may be handled; if not, it may not be handled?<sup>23</sup> — We treat here of [moving it] from the sun to the shade. He refuted him: And both hold alike that if he had cut meat upon it it may not be handled?<sup>24</sup> Here too it means from the sun to the shade.

R. Hanina said: This Mishnah<sup>25</sup> was taught in the days of Nehemiah the son of Hacaliah, for it is written, In those days I saw in Judah some treading winepresses on the Sabbath, and bringing in sheaves.<sup>26</sup>

R. Eleazar said: [The laws about] canes, staves, fastenings, and mortar<sup>27</sup> were all learnt before the permission re [the handling of] utensils. 'Canes', for we learnt: Neither the placing of the canes nor their removal supersedes the Sabbath.<sup>28</sup> 'Staves', as we learnt: There were thin smooth staves there, which one placed on his shoulder and his fellow's shoulder, then he suspended [the sacrifice upon them] and skinned it.<sup>29</sup> R. Eleazar said: If the fourteenth [of Nisan] fell on a Sabbath, one placed

---

(1) v. infra 147a.

(2) How does he explain that?

(3) Hence it is the same as feeding an infant.

(4) And this is similar.

(5) The thorn is laid in the flesh, as it were, but has not entered the system.

(6) But is within the system, and to bring it out by causing vomiting is like mending a person, which is similar to repairing a utensil (cf. supra 106a).

(7) Used for stirring a mass of maturing olives to see whether they are fit for pressing.

(8) Closing one end of the reed.

(9) Which has a receptacle. The reference is to Lev. XI, 32.

(10) Viz., at the oil which penetrates the hollow reed; for this a bulbous (closed) top is required, which turns the cane into a utensil technically containing a receptacle.

(11) One is very particular not to use these for any purpose but their own, and this makes them mukzeh.

(12) Rashi: (i) A sieve-like perforated tub placed above the linen; water is poured over it, whereby the linen is sprinkled through the holes. Or (ii) the same, the linen being placed inside and incense is burnt underneath, so that the fragrance ascends and perfumes the garments.

(13) They may not be handled.

(14) I.e., for cutting a cake of pressed figs.

(15) **זוהמא ליסטרון** (v. infra p. 612, n. 5). Rashi: for removing the scum of the soup.

(16) When they saw that the people became more strict in Sabbath observance.

(17) I.e., when it was required for use, but not when its place was required.

(18) To use it in a permitted labour.

(19) I.e., if too heavy for one hand they might not be handled.

(20) When they permitted the one they would certainly simultaneously permit the other.

(21) To avoid scorching; though here neither the article itself is required for use, nor the place where it lies.

(22) Cf. p. 611, n. 7.

(23) Abaye can explain that it may not be handled when its place only is required, since its normal function is forbidden; but how can Raba explain it?

(24) V. supra a for notes.

(25) Sc. the first ruling which permitted only three utensils to be handled but forbade all others.

(26) Neh. XIII, 15. To counteract this laxity the Rabbis had to be particularly severe. — v. Halevy: Doroth, I, 3, pp. 310-345 for the dates of the Rabbinical enactments, and particularly pp. 344 seqq. for the present passage. Weiss, Dor, I, p. 57, n. 2 argues that the Greek form of the word **זומליסטרון** (this is the form given in Kel. XIII, 2, though it is variously corrupted elsewhere Gr. \*\* = \*\*) proves that this ruling must be much later, certainly not before the Greeks spread in Palestine and the Jews became acquainted with them. This is not conclusive: the original enactment may have employed a Hebrew word which was changed later in the academies, when the Greek form became more familiar.

(27) The Gemara proceeds to state these laws.

(28) Canes were placed between the loaves of showbread, to permit the air to circulate about them, so that they should not become mouldy. The loaves were set from one Sabbath to the next. Since the canes might not be handled then, they would have to be removed on Friday and rearranged at the conclusion of the Sabbath. Thus for a short while the loaves would be without them.

(29) These staves were placed in the Temple court and used for the Passover sacrifice in the manner stated.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 124a

his hand upon his fellow's shoulder, and his fellow's hand [rested] upon his shoulder, and so [the animal] was suspended and skinned.<sup>1</sup> 'A fastening', as we learnt: If a door-bolt has on its top a fastening contrivance,<sup>2</sup> R. Joshua said: One may shift it from one door and hang it on another on the Sabbath;<sup>3</sup> R. Tarfon said: It is like all utensils, and may be moved about in a courtyard. 'A mortar': that which we have stated.<sup>4</sup> Said Rabbah, Whence [does that follow]: perhaps in truth I may argue that they were learnt after the permission re utensils. [Thus:] what was the reason of [placing] canes? On account of mouldiness; but in that short while<sup>5</sup> they would not become mouldy. As for the staves, it was possible [to act] as R. Eleazar [stated]. The fastening may be as R. Jannai, who said: We treat here of a courtyard not provided with an 'erub:<sup>6</sup> [now,] R. Joshua holds, The inside of the door<sup>7</sup> is as within, so one carries a utensil of the house through the courtyard;<sup>8</sup> whereas R. Tarfon holds that the inside of the door is as without, so one carries a utensil of the courtyard in the courtyard. As for a mortar, that agrees with R. Nehemiah.<sup>9</sup> MISHNAH. ALL UTENSILS MAY BE HANDLED WHETHER REQUIRED OR NOT REQUIRED. R. NEHEMIAH SAID: THEY MAY BE HANDLED ONLY WHEN REQUIRED.

GEMARA. What does REQUIRED AND NOT REQUIRED mean? — Rabbah<sup>10</sup> said: REQUIRED: an article whose function is for a permitted purpose [may be moved] when required itself; NOT REQUIRED: an article whose function is for a permitted purpose [may be moved] when its place is required;<sup>11</sup> but an article whose function is for a forbidden purpose may [be handled] only when required itself,<sup>12</sup> but not when its place is required. Whereupon R. Nehemiah comes to say that even an article whose function is for a permitted purpose [may be handled] only when required itself, but not when its place [alone] is required. Said Raba to him: If its place is required — do you call it: NOT REQUIRED! Rather said Raba: REQUIRED: an article whose function is for a permitted purpose [may be handled] whether required itself or its place is required: NOT REQUIRED [means] even from the sun to the shade; whilst an article whose function is for a forbidden purpose [may be moved] only when required itself or its place is required but not from the sun to the shade. Whereupon R. Nehemiah comes to say that even an article whose function is for a permitted purpose [may be moved] only when required itself or its place is required — but not from the sun to the shade. Now, R. Safra, R. Aha b. Huna, and R. Huna b. Hanina sat and reasoned: According to Rabbah on R. Nehemiah's view, how may we move plates?<sup>13</sup> Said R. Safra to them, By analogy with a pot of excrement.<sup>14</sup> Abaye asked Rabbah: According to you on R. Nehemiah's view, how may we move plates? — R. Safra our colleague has answered it, By analogy with a pot of excrement, he replied.

Abaye objected to Raba: A mortar, if containing garlic, may be handled; if not, it may not be handled? — We treat here of [moving it] from the sun to the shade. He [further] objected to him: And both hold alike that if he had already cut meat upon it, it may not be moved?<sup>15</sup> — Here too it means from the sun to the shade. Now, as to what we learnt: 'One may not support a pot with a leg, and the same applies to a door',<sup>16</sup> — but surely a log on a Festival is an article whose function is for a permitted purpose,<sup>17</sup> which shows that an article whose function is for a permitted purpose 'may not [be handled] whether required itself or its place is needed?'<sup>18</sup> — There this is the reason: since on the Sabbath it is an article whose function is for a forbidden purpose, is it preventively forbidden on Festivals on account of the Sabbath.<sup>19</sup> And should you say, Let the Sabbath itself be permitted, since an article whose function is for a forbidden purpose may be [handled] when required itself or its

place is required, — that is only where it comes within the category of a utensil, but not where it does not come within the category of a utensil.<sup>20</sup>

Yet do we enact a preventive measure? Surely we learnt: Produce<sup>21</sup> may be dropped down through a skylight<sup>22</sup> on Festivals, but not on the Sabbath?<sup>23</sup> — Do we then not preventively prohibit? Surely we learnt: The only difference between Festivals and the Sabbath is in respect of food for consumption?<sup>24</sup> — Said R. Joseph, There is no difficulty: the one is [according to] R. Eliezer; the other, R. Joshua. For it was taught: If an animal<sup>25</sup> and its young fall into a pit, — R. Eliezer said: One may haul up the first in order to kill it, and for the second provisions are made where it lies that it should not die. R. Joshua said: One hauls up the first in order to kill it, but he does not kill it, then he practises an evasion and hauls up the second, and kills whichever he desires.<sup>26</sup> How so? Perhaps R. Eliezer rules [thus] only there, because provisions can be made, but not where provisions can not be made. Or perhaps R. Joshua rules thus only there, since an evasion is possible; but not where an evasion is impossible? Rather said R. Papa: There is no difficulty: one is [according to] Beth Shammai; the other, Beth Hillel. For we learnt, Beth Shammai say:

- 
- (1) But the staves might not be used then.
  - (2) This had a thick head and could be used as a pestle.
  - (3) Shometah implies that it may be pushed from one to the other, but not picked up in the usual way.
  - (4) Supra 123b. Now R. Eleazar maintains that all these prohibitions held good only before the extended permission in respect to utensils, by which they were abolished.
  - (5) V. p. 612, n. 7.
  - (6) Many houses open into the courtyard. Utensils may not be carried from the houses into the yard, but those already in the yard from before the Sabbath may be moved about therein.
  - (7) Where the fastening contrivance is to be found.
  - (8) Which if done in the normal way is forbidden; therefore it may only be shifted' (v. n. 4).
  - (9) Who maintains that no utensil may be moved for any but its normal use. Hence all four may have been taught after the extended permission was given: the first two remain forbidden because there was no need for handling them at all, the third is connected with the interdict of carrying from one domain to another, whilst the fourth represents an individual view.
  - (10) Alfasi and Asheri read: Abaye.
  - (11) Though the article itself is not.
  - (12) For a permitted labour.
  - (13) After eating the last Sabbath meal, seeing that they are not required for further use on the Sabbath.
  - (14) Which may be removed because it is repulsive, and the same applies to dirty plates.
  - (15) V. supra 123a notes.
  - (16) On Festivals. V. Bez. 32b
  - (17) Sc. it is used for fuel.
  - (18) For even the first is forbidden here, and the second all the more so.
  - (19) If the former is permitted, it may be thought that the latter too is permitted.
  - (20) A log does not rank as a utensil.
  - (21) Spread out on the roof to dry.
  - (22) When it is about to rain.
  - (23) v. Bez. 35b. Thus we do not argue as in n. 5.
  - (24) Which may be prepared on Festivals, e.g., by baking, cooking, etc., but not on the Sabbaths. Thus on all matters they are alike.
  - (25) Lit., 'it'.
  - (26) V. supra 117b for notes. Just as R. Joshua permits both animals to be brought up so he permits one to lower the produce on a Festival to avoid financial loss.

## **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 124b**

One may not carry out an infant, a lulab,<sup>1</sup> or a Scroll of the Law into the street;<sup>2</sup> but Beth Hillel permit it.<sup>3</sup> But perhaps you know<sup>4</sup> Beth Shammai [to rule thus only in respect of] carrying out; do you know them [to rule likewise in respect of] handling? — Is then handling itself not [forbidden on account of] carrying out?<sup>5</sup>

Now, Rab too holds this [view] of Raba. For Rab said: [Moving] a hoe lest it be stolen is unnecessary handling, and is forbidden.<sup>6</sup> Thus only when it is in order that it should not be stolen, but if it is required for itself or its place is required, it is permitted. But that is not so? For R. Kahana visited Rab's house, whereupon he ordered, Bring a log of wood<sup>7</sup> for Kahana to sit. [Now] surely that was to imply that a thing whose function is for a forbidden purpose<sup>8</sup> [may be handled] only when required itself,<sup>9</sup> but not [merely] when its place is required? — This is what he said to them: Remove the log from Kahana's presence.<sup>10</sup> Alternatively, there it was [moved] from the sun to the shade.<sup>11</sup>

R. Mari b. Rachel<sup>12</sup> had some pillows<sup>13</sup> lying in the sun. He went to Raba and asked him, May these be moved? — It is permitted replied he.<sup>14</sup> [But] I have others?<sup>15</sup> — They are of use for guests. I have [some] for guests too? — You have revealed your opinion that you agree with Rabbah,<sup>16</sup> observed he: to all others it is permitted, but to you it is forbidden.

R. Abba said in the name of R. Hiyya b. Ashi in Rab's name: Table brushes<sup>17</sup> [made] of cloth may be handled on the Sabbath, but not [those made] of palm[-twigs];<sup>18</sup> R. Eleazar maintained: Even [those made] of palm[-twigs]. What are we discussing: Shall we say [where they are handled] when required in themselves or their place is required, shall Rab rule here 'but not [those made] of palm[-twigs]'? Surely Rab agrees with Raba?<sup>19</sup> Again, if it means from the sun to the shade, shall R. Eleazar rule here 'even [those made] of palms'?<sup>20</sup> — In truth [it means] from the sun to the shade: say, And thus did R. Eleazar rule.<sup>21</sup>

**MISHNAH.** ALL UTENSILS WHICH MAY BE HANDLED ON THE SABBATH, THEIR FRAGMENTS MAY BE HANDLED TOO,<sup>22</sup> PROVIDED, HOWEVER, THAT THEY CAN PERFORM SOMETHING IN THE NATURE OF WORK. [THUS]: THE FRAGMENTS OF A KNEADING TROUGH [THAT CAN BE USED] TO COVER THE MOUTH OF A BARREL THEREWITH, [AND] THE FRAGMENTS OF A GLASS, TO COVER THEREWITH THE MOUTH OF A CRUSE. R. JUDAH MAINTAINED: PROVIDED THAT THEY CAN PERFORM SOMETHING IN THE NATURE OF THEIR OWN [FORMER] WORK;<sup>23</sup> [THUS:] THE FRAGMENTS OF A KNEADING TROUGH, TO POUR A THICK MASS THEREIN;<sup>24</sup> OR OF A GLASS, TO POUR OIL THEREIN.

**GEMARA.** Rab Judah said in Samuel's name: The controversy is only if they were broken from the eve of the Sabbath, one Master holding: Only [provided they are fit for] something in the nature of their own [former] work, but not for something in the nature of a different work; whereas the other Master holds: Even [if fit] for something in the nature of a different work. But if they are broken on the Sabbath, all agree that they are permitted,<sup>25</sup> since they are *mukan*<sup>26</sup> in virtue of their origin.<sup>27</sup>

R. Zutra objected: 'We may heat [an oven] with utensils, but not with fragments of utensils'<sup>28</sup> Now when were these broken? Shall we say that they were broken from the eve of the Festival, then they are simply pieces of wood.<sup>29</sup> Hence it must surely be on the Festival, yet he teaches, 'We may heat with utensils, but not with fragments of utensils'?<sup>30</sup> — Rather if stated, it was thus stated: Rab Judah said in Samuel's name: The controversy is only if they are broken on the Sabbath, one Master holding that they are *mukan*, whilst the other Master holds that they are *nolad*.<sup>31</sup> But [if broken] on Sabbath eve, all hold that they are permitted, since they were *mukan* for work from the day time.<sup>32</sup>

One [Baraita] taught: We may heat with utensils, but not with fragments of utensils; another was

taught: Just as we may heat with utensils, so may we heat with fragments of utensils: whilst a third taught: We may heat neither with utensils nor with fragments of utensils. One agrees with R. Judah, one with R. Simeon, and the last with R. Nehemiah.<sup>33</sup>

R. Nahman said: The bricks that are left over from a building may be handled, since they are fit to sit on.<sup>34</sup> [But] if he places them in rows, then he has certainly set them apart.<sup>35</sup>

R. Nahman said in Samuel's name: A small shard may be moved about in a courtyard, but not in a karmelith.<sup>36</sup> But R. Nahman [giving] his own [view] maintained: Even In a karmelith,<sup>37</sup> but not in the street; whereas Raba said: Even in the street.<sup>38</sup> Now, Raba is consistent with his view. For Raba was walking in the manor of Mahoza,<sup>39</sup> when his shoes become soiled with clay; [so] his attendant came, took a shard, and wiped it off. The Rabbis (his disciples) rebuked him.<sup>40</sup> Said he, It is not enough that they have not learnt — they would even teach! If it were in a courtyard, would it not be fit for covering a utensil? Here too I have a use for it.

Rab Judah said in Samuel's name: The bung of a barrel which is broken in pieces may be handled on the Sabbath. It was taught likewise: If a bung is broken in pieces [both] it and the fragments thereof may be handled on the Sabbath. But one must not trim a fragment thereof to cover a vessel or support the legs of a bed<sup>41</sup> therewith; but if one throws it away on the dung heap, it is forbidden.<sup>42</sup> R. Papa demurred: If so, if one throws away his robe, is that too prohibited?<sup>43</sup> Rather said R. Papa:

---

(1) The palm branch; v. Lev. XXIII, 40.

(2) On Festivals, for only the preparation of food is permitted. Hence the Mishnah stating that this is the only difference, etc., agrees with Beth Shammai.

(3) Therefore the law that produce may be dropped, etc., agrees with Beth Hillel.

(4) Lit., 'hear'.

(5) Carrying out naturally involves handling, and the latter was forbidden on account of the former. — So Rashi in Bez. 37a. which seems the correct interpretation on the present reading. But the reading there, as well as a variant here, is: 'is not handling a (pre)requisite of carrying out'? (v. Rashi and Marginal Gloss.). Hence handling is forbidden because it partakes of the nature of carrying out. Thus when Beth Shammai prohibit carrying out they also prohibit handling.

(6) Just as moving it from the sun to the shade.

(7) Bah. Rashi and Jast. translate: a trap.

(8) A log is used as fuel, which, of course, is forbidden on the Sabbath. Trapping too (according to Rashi's translation) is forbidden.

(9) And therefore he emphasized that it was wanted for a seat.

(10) That he may sit in its place.

(11) Therefore he emphasized the true purpose, so that they might not think that it was moved for that reason alone.

(12) His father at the time of his conception was not a Jew; hence he is called by his mother's name.

(13) Or, bolsters.

(14) In accordance with his view supra a, q.v.

(15) So I do not need these for themselves.

(16) Or, Abaye, supra a.

(17) For clearing the crumbs off the table, which is permitted.

(18) I.e., brooms used for sweeping the floor, which is forbidden.

(19) Permitting this.

(20) None permit this.

(21) Like Rab, the former version of R. Eleazar's view being incorrect.

(22) Lit., 'with them'. (The words are, however, rightly omitted in MS.M.)

(23) I.e., similar to that performed by the whole utensil.

(24) Like the dough kneaded in the trough.

(25) Whatever their present use.

(26) V. Glos.

(27) v. p. 214, n. 5.

(28) On Festivals.

(29) Which may certainly be used.

(30) Which refutes Samuel's view reported by Rab Judah.

(31) Newly created (v. Glos.). As a fragment it has only just come into existence, and therefore must not be used on the Sabbath.

(32) I.e., from before the commencement of the Sabbath they stood to be used as fuel, and so they are regarded as ready for their new function.

(33) (i) R. Judah: both mukzeh and nolad are forbidden, hence the prohibition of fragments. (ii) R. Simeon: mukzeh and nolad are permitted, hence both fragments and vessel are permissible; (iii) R. Nehemiah: a utensil may be handled on the Sabbath or Festival only for its normal function, hence the prohibition of both.

(34) And the last few may possibly be kept for that purpose.

(35) For another building; hence they are mukzeh and must not be handled.

(36) In the former vessels may generally be found for which the shard can be used as a cover, but not in the latter.

(37) Where people sometimes sit down; one can cover saliva with this.

(38) Since it is a utensil in a courtyard, it remains so elsewhere.

(39) V. p. 277, n. 8. and B. B., Sonc. ed., p. 60, n. 4.

(40) Lit., 'lifted their voice against him'.

(41) V. p. 199, n. 2. Here, however, it is probably meant literally.

(42) Because the owner has shown that it has ceased to be a utensil in his eyes.

(43) Surely not!

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 125a

If he threw it away whilst yet day<sup>1</sup> it is forbidden.

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

R. Zera said in Rab's name: Pieces of silk of aprons may not be handled on the Sabbath. Said Abaye: This refers to rags less than three [fingerbreadths] square, which are of no use to rich or poor.<sup>2</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: The fragments of an old oven<sup>3</sup> are like all utensils which may be handled in a courtyard: this is R. Meir's view. R. Judah said: They may not be handled. R. Jose testified in the name of R. Eleazar b. Jacob concerning the fragments of an old oven that they may be handled on the Sabbath, and concerning its lid [of the oven] that it does not require a handle.<sup>4</sup> Wherein do they differ? — Said Abaye: where they perform something in the nature of work; but not in the nature of their own [former] work,<sup>5</sup> R. Judah being consistent with his view, and R. Meir with his.<sup>6</sup> Raba demurred: If so, instead of disputing about the fragments of an oven, let them dispute about the fragments of utensils in general? Rather said Raba: They dispute about the fragments of the following oven. For we learnt: If he sets it [the oven] over the mouth of a pit or a cellar and places a stone there, — R. Judah said: If one can heat it from underneath and it is [thereby] heated above, it is unclean; if not, it is clean. But the Sages maintain: Since it can in any wise be heated, it is unclean.<sup>7</sup> And wherein do they differ? In this verse; Whether oven, or range of pots, it shall be torn down: they are unclean, shall be unclean unto you.<sup>8</sup> R. Judah holds: Where tearing down is wanting it is unclean, whilst where tearing down is not wanting it is not unclean.<sup>9</sup> Whereas the Rabbis hold: 'They shall be unclean unto you' [implies] in all cases.<sup>10</sup> But the Rabbis too, surely it is written, 'it shall be torn down'? — That is [intended] in the opposite direction:<sup>11</sup> for one might argue, Since it is attached to the ground, it is like the very ground itself;<sup>12</sup> therefore it informs us [otherwise].<sup>13</sup> And the other [R. Judah] too, surely 'they shall be unclean unto you' is written? — That [is explained] as Rab Judah's

dictum in Samuel's name. For Rab Judah said in Samuel's name: They differ only in respect of the first firing,<sup>14</sup> but at the second firing,<sup>15</sup> even if it is suspended to a camel's neck.<sup>16</sup> 'Ulla observed: And as for the first firing, according to the Rabbis, even if it is suspended from a camel's neck!<sup>17</sup> R. Ashi demurred: If so, instead of disputing about the fragments of the oven, let them dispute about the oven itself;<sup>18</sup> [for] seeing that the oven itself, according to R. Judah, is not a utensil, need the fragments [be mentioned]? Rather said R. Ashi: In truth it is as we originally stated, and (the controversy is) where it [the fragment] can serve as a [baking] tile,<sup>19</sup> whilst R. Meir argues on R. Judah's opinion. [Thus:] according to my view, even if they [the fragments] can perform something in the nature of [any] work;<sup>20</sup> but even on your view, you must at least agree with me [here] that in such a case, it is its own work. But R. Judah [argues]: It is dissimilar. There it is heated from within, here it is heated from without; there it stands, here it does not stand.

'R. Jose testified in the name of R. Eleazar b. Jacob concerning the fragments of an old oven, that they may be handled on the Sabbath, and concerning its lid, that it does not require a handle.' Rabina said: In accordance with whom do we handle nowadays the oven lids of the town Mehasia<sup>21</sup> which have no handle? In accordance with whom? R. Eleazar b. Jacob.

**MISHNAH. IF A STONE [IS PLACED] IN A PUMPKIN SHELL,<sup>22</sup> AND ONE CAN DRAW [WATER] IN IT AND IT [THE STONE] DOES NOT FALL OUT,<sup>23</sup> ONE MAY DRAW [WATER] IN IT; IF NOT, ONE MAY NOT DRAW WATER IN IT.<sup>24</sup>**

---

(1) I.e., on Friday before the commencement of the Sabbath.

(2) Cf. supra 26b.

(3) I.e., one that has already been fired, so that the clay whereof it is made is hardened and fit for its work.

(4) In order that it shall be permissible to handle it on the Sabbath. There is also an opposing view, v. infra 126b.

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

(6) As expressed in the Mishnah supra 124b.

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

(8) Lev. XI, 35.

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

(10) For the repetition is emphatic.

(11) Sc. it teaches not leniency but greater stringency, as explained.

(12) Which of course, cannot be defiled.

(13) Viz., that even where it shall be 'torn down', as defined in n. 2, is applicable, it is still liable to defilement, and all the more so where it is inapplicable.

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

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

(16) It is unclean, since

(17) Wherever it is, it is unclean. — It is in reference to the fragments of this oven that R. Meir and R. Judah dispute,

seeing that in the first place it was not absolutely completed.

(18) Whether it may be handled on the Sabbath.

(19) Tiles which were heated to bake something placed upon them. Thus it can still be used in a manner akin to its original function, but not altogether so, for originally one baked inside the oven, whereas now the food to be baked must be placed on top.

(20) They may be handled.

(21) V. p. 39, n. 6.

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

(23) Being securely fastened.

(24) The stone is then like any other stone, which may not be handled, and the pumpkin too may not be handled, because it serves as a stand for a forbidden article (cf. supra 117a top).

## **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 125b**

### **IF A [VINE-]BRANCH<sup>1</sup>**

it is already an 'oven' from the first firing. This extended possibility of defilement is taught by the emphatic repetition, 'and it shall be unclean unto you.' IS TIED TO A PITCHER,<sup>2</sup> ONE MAY DRAW [WATER] WITH IT ON THE SABBATH. AS FOR THE STOPPER OF A SKYLIGHT, R. ELIEZER SAID: WHEN IT IS FASTENED<sup>3</sup> AND SUSPENDED,<sup>4</sup> ONE MAY CLOSE [THE SKYLIGHT] WITH IT; IF NOT, ONE MAY NOT CLOSE (THE SKYLIGHT) WITH IT.<sup>5</sup> BUT THE SAGES MAINTAIN: IN BOTH CASES WE MAY CLOSE [THE SKYLIGHT] WITH IT.

GEMARA. We learnt elsewhere: If a stone is on the mouth of a cask (e.g., of wine), one tilts it on a side and it falls off.<sup>6</sup> Rabbah said in R. Ammi's name in R. Johanan's name: They learnt this only if one forgets (it there); but if he places [it there],<sup>7</sup> it [the barrel] becomes a stand for a forbidden article.<sup>8</sup> Whereas it. Joseph said in R. Assi's name in R. Johanan's name: They learnt this only if one forgets [it there]; but if he places [it there], it (the stone) becomes a covering of the barrel.<sup>9</sup> Rabbah said: An objection is raised against my teaching: IF A STONE [IS PLACED] IN A PUMPKIN SHELL, AND ONE CAN DRAW WATER IN IT AND IT DOES NOT FAIL OUT, ONE MAY DRAW WATER IN IT?<sup>10</sup> But it is not [analogous]: there, since it is firmly fastened, it is made as a wall [of the vessel]. R. Joseph said: An objection is also raised against my teaching: IF NOT, ONE MAY NOT DRAW WATER IN IT?<sup>11</sup> But it is not [analogous]: there, since he did not fasten it firmly, he really made it as nought.<sup>12</sup>

Wherein do they differ? One Master (R. Ammi) holds: An act of labour is required;<sup>13</sup> while the other Master [R. Assi] holds: An act of labour is not required. Now, they are consistent with their views. For when R. Dimi came,<sup>14</sup> he said in R. Hanina's name-others state, R. Zera said in R. Hanina's name: Rabbi once went to a certain place and found a course of stones,<sup>15</sup> whereupon he said to his disciples, Go out and intend [them,]<sup>16</sup> so that we can sit upon them to-morrow; but Rabbi did not require them [to perform] an act of labour. But R. Johanan said, Rabbi did require them [to perform] an act of labour. What did he say to them?<sup>17</sup> — R. Ammi said: He said to them, Go out and arrange them in order.<sup>18</sup> R. Assi said: He said to them, 'Go out and scrape them' [free of mortar, etc.].<sup>19</sup> It was stated: R. Jose b. Saul said: It was a pile of beams;<sup>20</sup> R. Johanan b. Saul said: It was a ship's sounding pole.<sup>21</sup> Now he who says [that it was] a sounding pole, all the more so a pile [of beams];<sup>22</sup> but he who says that [it was] a pile, but one is particular about a sounding pole.<sup>23</sup>

IF A VINE-BRANCH IS TIED, etc. Only if it is tied, but not otherwise? Must we say that our Mishnah does not agree with R. Simeon b. Gamaliel? For it was taught: As for the dried branches of a palm tree which one cut down for fuel, and then he changed his mind, [intending them] for sitting [thereon], he must tie them together.<sup>24</sup> R. Simeon b. Gamaliel said: He need not tie them together. — Said R. Shesheth, You may even say [that it agrees with] R. Simeon b. Gamaliel: we treat here of

one [a branch] that is attached to its parent stock.<sup>25</sup> If so, he makes use of what is attached to the soil?<sup>26</sup> — It is below three.<sup>27</sup> R. Ashi said: You may even say that it refers to a detached [branch]: it is a preventive measure, lest he cut (i.e., shorten) it.<sup>28</sup>

AS FOR THE STOPPER OF A SKYLIGHT, etc. Rabbah b. Bar Hanah said in R. Johanan's name: All agree that we may not make for the first time a temporary building on a Festival, whilst on the Sabbath it goes without saying. They differ only in respect of adding [to a building]: R. Eleazar maintaining. We may not add on a Festival, whilst on the Sabbath it goes without saying; whereas the Sages rule: We may add on the Sabbath, whilst it is superfluous to speak of a Festival.

BUT THE SAGES MAINTAIN: IN BOTH CASES WE MAY CLOSE (THE SKYLIGHT) WITH IT. What does 'IN BOTH CASES' mean? — R. Abba said in R. Kahana's name:

- 
- (1) Or, rod.
  - (2) To let it down into the well.
  - (3) By a cord to the wall.
  - (4) In the air, the cord being too short to allow it to reach the ground.
  - (5) For it looks like adding to the building.
  - (6) If he wishes to draw wine, v. infra 142b.
  - (7) Before the Sabbath.
  - (8) Sc. the stone, which may not be handled.
  - (9) Hence the stone itself may be handled and removed, and it is unnecessary to tilt the barrel.
  - (10) Which shows that the stone is now part of the vessel.
  - (11) Which shows that it is not part of the vessel.
  - (12) Since the pumpkin is not fit for drawing water, as the stone will fall out. But here it is enough for his purpose to place the stone upon the barrel, therefore the stone becomes part of the barrel in virtue of that act.
  - (13) For the stone to count as part of the barrel, and mere placing is not an act of labour.
  - (14) V. p. 12, n. 9.
  - (15) Arranged in order, and waiting to be used in building. This renders them mukzeh.
  - (16) Express your intention of sitting on them to-morrow (the Sabbath), so that they may not be mukzeh.
  - (17) In R. Johanan's view.
  - (18) That they may be ready for sitting upon without further handling, R. Ammi holding. as above, that mere disposition does not make them a utensil.
  - (19) But they can be arranged for sitting on the Sabbath itself. Thus these views are consistent with those expressed above.
  - (20) Not stones.
  - (21) With which the depth of the water is sounded.
  - (22) They certainly could have sat upon the latter.
  - (23) Not to use it for anything else, lest it be bent or warped. Therefore it is mukzeh and must not be handled.
  - (24) V. supra 50a.
  - (25) Sc. the vine. Hence if it is not tied to the pitcher before the Sabbath, it remains part of the wine and must not be handled.
  - (26) Even if tied before the Sabbath it is still that and is forbidden.
  - (27) Handbreadths from the ground. Such may be used, v 'Erub. 99b.
  - (28) On the Sabbath, if it is not fastened to the pitcher before. Hence even R. Simeon b. Gamaliel agrees.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 126a

Whether it is fastened or not, providing that it was prepared.<sup>1</sup> Said R. Jeremiah to him, But let the Master say, Whether it is suspended or not, providing that it is fastened;<sup>2</sup> for Rabbah b. Bar Hanah said in R. Johanan's name: Just as there is a controversy here, so is there a controversy in respect of a dragging bolt.<sup>3</sup> For we learnt: With a dragging bolt, one may lock [the door] in the Temple, but not

in the country;<sup>4</sup> but one that is laid apart [on the ground]<sup>5</sup> is forbidden in both places. R. Judah said: That which is laid apart [is permitted] in the Temple; and that which is dragged, in the country. Now it was taught: Which is a dragging bolt wherewith we may close (a door] in the Temple but not in the country? That which is fastened (to the door] and suspended — one end reaching the ground. R. Judah said: Such is permitted even in the country. But which is forbidden in the country? That which is neither fastened nor suspended — but which one removes and places in a corner. Further, R. Joshua b. Abba said in 'Ulla's name: Who is the Tanna of 'a dragging bolt?'<sup>6</sup> It is R. Eleazar!<sup>7</sup> Said he to him, I hold with the following Tanna. For it was taught: If a private individual prepares<sup>8</sup> a cane for opening and shutting [a door] therewith: if it is tied and suspended to the door, he may open and shut [it] therewith; if it is not tied and suspended may not open and shut [it] therewith. R. Simeon b. Gamaliel ruled: If it is prepared<sup>9</sup> even if it is not fastened.<sup>10</sup>

R. Judah b. Shilath said in R. Assi's name in R. Johanan's name: The halachah is as R. Simeon b. Gamaliel. Now, did R. Johanan say thus? Surely we learnt: All lids of vessels

(1) For this purpose before the Sabbath.

(2) Before the Sabbath, i.e., explain the Mishnah stringently, instead of leniently.

(3) Lit., 'a bolt that is dragged'. I.e., a door-bolt, fastened to the door, but one end thereof drags on the floor.

(4) 'Country' is employed technically to denote all places except the Temple. — Since it is fastened to the door, it is as though built thereto, and therefore the prohibition of handling it is only a Rabbinical one, which was imposed in the country but not in the Temple.

(5) It is not fastened at all, but when removed from the sockets it is simply placed on the ground.

(6) Requiring both that it be fastened and suspended.

(7) Whereas R. Judah will agree with the Rabbis. From this passage we see that all agree that it must be tied.

(8) I.e., sets aside.

(9) I.e., since it has been devoted to this purpose.

(10) It may be used for opening and shutting. R. Abba rules in accordance with this.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 126b

which have a handle on the Sabbath. Whereon R. Judah b. Shila said in R. Assi's name in R. Johanan's name: Providing that they have the character of utensils.<sup>1</sup> And should you answer, Here too [it means] where it ranks as a utensil,<sup>2</sup> — does then R. Simeon b. Gamaliel require it to have the character of a utensil? Surely it was taught: As for the dried branches of a palm tree which one cut down for fuel and then changed his mind, [intending them for sitting thereon], he must tie them together.<sup>3</sup> R. Simeon b. Gamaliel said: He need not tie them together!<sup>4</sup> — R. Johanan agrees with him in one<sup>5</sup> and disagrees with him in the other.<sup>6</sup> R. Isaac the smith<sup>7</sup> lectured at the entrance of the Resh Galutha:<sup>8</sup> The halachah is as R. Eliezer. R. Amram objected: And from their words we learn that we may close (a skylight], measure [a mikweh], and tie [a temporary knot] on the Sabbath!<sup>9</sup> — Said Abaye to him, What is your view: because it is taught anonymously?<sup>10</sup> [But the Mishnah concerning] a dragging bolt is also anonymous!<sup>11</sup> — Yet even so an actual incident is weightier.<sup>12</sup>

MISHNAH. ALL LIDS OF UTENSILS WHICH HAVE A HANDLE MAY BE HANDLED ON THE SABBATH. SAID R. JOSE, WHEN IS THAT SAID? IN THE CASE OF LIDS OF GROUND [BUILDINGS],<sup>13</sup> BUT THE LIDS OF UTENSILS MAY IN ANY CASE BE HANDLED ON THE SABBATH.

GEMARA. R. Judah b. Shila said in R. Assi's name in R. Johanan's name: Provided that they have the character of a utensil. All agree: Covers of ground [buildings may be handled] only if they have a handle but not otherwise; covers of utensils, even if they have no handle. Where do they differ? In respect of utensils joined to the ground: one Master holds: We forbid (them] preventively,<sup>14</sup> while the other Master holds, We do not forbid preventively. Another version: Where do they differ? In

respect of an oven cover:<sup>15</sup> one Master likens it to the cover of a ground [building], while the other Master likens it to the cover of utensils.

## CHAPTER XVIII

MISHNAH. ONE MAY CLEAR AWAY EVEN FOUR OR FIVE BASKETS OF STRAW OR PRODUCE [GRAIN] TO MAKE ROOM FOR GUESTS OR ON ACCOUNT OF THE NEGLECT OF THE BETH HAMIDRASH,<sup>16</sup> BUT NOT THE STORE.<sup>17</sup> ONE MAY CLEAR AWAY CLEAN TERUMAH, DEM'AI,<sup>18</sup> THE FIRST TITHE WHOSE TERUMAH HAS BEEN SEPARATED,<sup>19</sup> REDEEMED SECOND TITHE AND HEKDESH,<sup>20</sup> AND DRY LUPINES, BECAUSE IT IS FOOD FOR GOATS.<sup>21</sup> BUT [ONE MAY] NOT [CLEAR AWAY] TEBEL,<sup>18</sup> THE FIRST TITHE WHEREOF TERUMAH HAS NOT BEEN TAKEN, UNREDEEMED SECOND TITHE OR HEKDESH, LOF<sup>22</sup> OR MUSTARD. R. SIMEON B. GAMALIEL PERMITS [IT] IN THE CASE OF LOF, BECAUSE IT IS FOOD FOR RAVENS.<sup>23</sup> AS FOR BUNDLES OF STRAW,<sup>24</sup> TWIGS, OR YOUNG SHOOTS, IF THEY WERE PREPARED AS ANIMAL FODDER, THEY MAY BE MOVED; IF NOT, THEY MAY NOT BE MOVED.<sup>25</sup>

GEMARA. Seeing that five may be cleared away, need four be stated? — Said R. Hisda: [It means] four out of five.<sup>26</sup> Some there are who state, Four of a small store,<sup>27</sup> and five of a large store. And what does BUT NOT THE STORE mean?<sup>28</sup> That one must not commence [dealing] with a store for the first time;<sup>29</sup> and which [Tanna] rules [thus]? It is R. Judah, who accepts [the interdict of] mukzeh. But Samuel said: [It means] four or five

- 
- (1) I.e., the lids themselves must be fit for use as vessels. But how can a cane rank as a utensil?
  - (2) E.g., if the cane may be used for stirring olives in the vat.
  - (3) V. p. 226, n. 1.
  - (4) They may be handled without tying, though they are certainly not utensils.
  - (5) That if it is prepared it need not be tied.
  - (6) Holding that they must have the character of a utensil.
  - (7) Many of the Rabbis were tradesmen or workers; e.g., R. Johanan the cobbler; R. Papa, who was a brewer; Hillel at one time a wood-cutter.
  - (8) V. p. 217, 11. 7.
  - (9) V. Mishnah infra 157a. The reference there is to a cloth that is not fastened and suspended, and yet we may close a skylight with it.
  - (10) You assume that that proves the halachah is so, for otherwise you could simply answer that it represents the Rabbis' view only and is not a final ruling.
  - (11) And there R. Eliezer's view is stated.
  - (12) In the Mishnah infra 157 it is not merely a theoretical ruling but bears on actual practice. Therefore one may assume that it states the final ruling, and this refutes R. Isaac.
  - (13) E.g., the lid or cover of a pit built in the ground. When they have a handle they are obviously not part of the pit and are meant to be put on and taken off. But otherwise they seem to be there permanently: hence placing them there is like building, and removing them is like demolishing.
  - (14) Lest they be confused with the lid of ground. buildings.
  - (15) V. p. 620, n. 8 for its construction.
  - (16) Caused by lack of room for the disciples.
  - (17) Explained infra.
  - (18) V. Glos.
  - (19) The first tithe belonged to the Levite; a tenth thereof, called terumah ('septs ration'), was given to the priest.
  - (20) The second tithe was to be eaten by an Israelite owner in Jerusalem. Both it and hekdesch, q.v. Glos., could be redeemed, whereby they became like ordinary produce, save in a few respects, and then consumed. (Hekdesch, if an animal dedicated as a sacrifice, might be redeemed only if it received a blemish.)
  - (21) Var lec.: for the poor.

- (22) Jast.: a plant similar to colocasia, with edible leaves and root, and bearing beans. It is classified with onions and garlic.
- (23) Which some wealthy people bred.
- (24) Or, stubble.
- (25) This is the reason of the others too which may not be moved, viz., because they cannot be used even as animal fodder.
- (26) If the entire store consists of five, only four may be removed, but not all, lest depressions in the ground are revealed which may be levelled on the Sabbath.
- (27) Var. lec. omit: 'Some there are . . . small store'.
- (28) It cannot mean that the whole store must not be cleared away, since on the present interpretation that is already implied in the first clause.
- (29) If he had not already started using it for food, either for himself or for his animals, before the Sabbath, it is mukzeh and must not be touched.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 127a

just as people speak; yet if one desires even more may be cleared away. And what does BUT NOT THE STORE mean? That one must not complete[ly remove] the whole of it, lest he come to level up depressions;<sup>1</sup> but one may indeed commence therewith.<sup>2</sup> And who [rules thus]? It is R. Simeon, who rejects [the interdict of] mukzeh.

Our Rabbis taught: One must not commence with a store for the first time, but he may make a path through it to enter and go out. 'He may make a path'! but surely you say, 'One must not commence'? — This is its meaning: one may make a path through it with his feet as he enters and goes out.<sup>3</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: If produce is heaped together [for storage] and one commenced [using] it on the eve of the Sabbath, he may take supplies from it on the Sabbath; if not, he may not take supplies from it on the Sabbath: this is R. Simeon's view; but R. Aha permits it. Whither does this tend!<sup>4</sup> — Rather say: this is R. Aha's view; but R. Simeon permits it.

A Tanna taught: What is the standard quantity for produce that is heaped together? — A lethek.<sup>5</sup> R. Nehumi b. Zechariah asked Abaye: What is the standard quantity for produce that is heaped together? Said he to him, Surely it was said: The standard quantity for produce that is heaped together is a lethek.

The scholars asked: These four or five baskets that are stated, [does it mean] only in four or five baskets, but not more,<sup>6</sup> which shows that it is better to minimize one's walking; or perhaps it is better to minimize the burden?<sup>7</sup> Come and hear: For one [Baraita] taught: One may clear away even four or five tubs of pitchers of wine and oil; whereas another was taught: In ten or fifteen. Surely they differ in this, viz., one Master holds: It is better to minimize the walking; while the other Master holds: It is better to reduce the burden? — No: All hold that it is better to reduce the walking: do you think that ten or fifteen refers to 'tubs'? [No]; it refers to the pitchers, yet there is no contradiction: here [in the first the reference is] where they can be carried [only] singly in a tub;<sup>8</sup> whereas there, where they can be carried in twos, and there, where they can be carried in threes,<sup>9</sup> of the size of the jugs of Harpania.<sup>10</sup>

The scholars asked: These four or five that are stated, [does it mean] even if he has more guests; or perhaps it all depends on the [number of] guests? And should you say that it all depends on the number of guests, can one person clear [them] away for all of them, or perhaps each man must do so for himself? — Come and hear: For Rabbah said in R. Hiyya's name: Rabbi once went to a certain place; seeing that the place was too cramped for the disciples, he went out to a field and found it full of sheaves, whereupon Rabbi cleared the whole field of the sheaves. While R. Joseph related in R.

Oshaia's name: R. Hiyya once went to a certain place; seeing that the place was too cramped for the disciples, he went out to a field and found it full of sheaves, whereupon R. Hiyya cleared the whole field of the sheaves.<sup>11</sup> This proves that it all depends on the [number of] guests. But still the question remains, Can one person clear [them] away for all, or perhaps each man must do so for himself? — Come and hear: ‘And Rabbi cleared the sheaves.’ Then on your view, did Rabbi personally clear [them]?<sup>12</sup> But he gave orders that it [the field] be cleared, yet after all each [acted] for himself.<sup>13</sup>

TO MAKE ROOM FOR THE GUESTS, etc. R. Johanan said: Hospitality to wayfarers<sup>14</sup> is as ‘great’ as early attendance at the Beth Hamidrash, since he [the Tanna] states, TO MAKE ROOM FOR GUESTS OR ON ACCOUNT OF THE NEGLECT OF THE BETH HAMIDRASH. R. Dimi of Nehardea said: It is ‘greater’ than early attendance at the Beth Hamidrash, because he states, TO MAKE ROOM FOR GUESTS, and then, AND ON ACCOUNT OF THE NEGLECT OF THE BETH HAMIDRASH. Rab Judah said in Rab's name: Hospitality to wayfarers is greater than welcoming the presence of the Shechinah, for it is written, And he said, My lord, if now I have found favour in thy sight, pass not away, etc.<sup>15</sup> R. Eleazar said: Come and observe how the conduct of the Holy One, blessed be He, is not like that of mortals. The conduct of mortals [is such that] an inferior person cannot say to a great[er] man, Wait for me until I come to you; whereas in the case of the Holy One, blessed be He, it is written, and he said, My Lord, if now I have found, etc.

R. Judah b. Shila said in R. Assi's name in R. Johanan's name: There are six things, the fruit of which man eats in this world, while the principal remains for him for the world to come, viz.: Hospitality to wayfarers, visiting the sick, meditation in prayer, early attendance at the Beth Hamidrash, rearing one's sons to the study of the Torah, and judging one's neighbour in the scale of merit.<sup>16</sup> But that is not so? For we learnt: These are the things which man performs and enjoys their fruits in this world, while the principal remains for him for the world to come, viz.: honouring one's parents, the practice of loving deeds,<sup>17</sup> and making peace between man and his fellow, while the study of the Torah surpasses them all:<sup>18</sup> [this implies], these only, but none others?

---

(1) V. p. 629, n. 11.

(2) I.e., the reverse of n. 3.

(3) This is not handling.

(4) Surely it should be reversed, since R. Simeon always rejects mukzeh.

(5) Half a kor=fifteen se'ahs. But less does not constitute a store, and the prohibition of mukzeh does not apply to it in any case.

(6) I.e., must they actually be carried away thus, but not broken up into smaller quantities and then removed?

(7) Hence they may certainly be broken up into smaller quantities.

(8) Being too large to be carried more than one at a time.

(9) Which gives ten or fifteen pitchers in five piles.

(10) **סְרָרִים**, jugs enclosed in wicker-work. Harpania was a rich agricultural town of Mesene, south of Babylon, famous for its wicker-work manufactured from the fibre of palm leaves; v. Obermeyer, p. 200.

(11) To make room for the disciples.

(12) Surely not.

(13) Thus the question remains unanswered.

(14) The word means both guests and wayfarers.

(15) Gen. XVIII, 3; he thus left God, as it were, to attend to the wants of the three wayfarers. [On this interpretation he was speaking to God, and begged Him to remain whilst he saw to his guests v. Shebu. 35b.]

(16) I.e., seeking a favourable interpretation of his actions, even when they look suspicious.

(17) Not merely alms-giving.

(18) Not because knowledge in itself is a great virtue, but because it is the foundation and condition of real piety; cf. Ab. II, 6; also, ‘Learning is great, because it leads to (good) deeds’.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 127b

— These too are included in the practice of loving deeds. Another version: these are included in those.<sup>1</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: He who judges his neighbour in the scale of merit is himself judged favourably. Thus a story is told of a certain man who descended from Upper Galilee and was engaged by an individual in the South for three years. On the eve of the Day of Atonement<sup>2</sup> he requested him, 'Give me my wages that I may go and support my wife and children.' 'I have no money,' answered he. 'Give me produce,' he demanded; 'I have none,' he replied. 'Give me land.' — 'I have none.' 'Give me cattle.' — 'I have none. 'Give me pillows and bedding.' — 'I have none.' [So] he slung his things behind him and went home with a sorrowful heart.<sup>3</sup> After the Festival his employer took his wages in his hand together with three laden asses, one bearing food, another drink, and the third various sweetmeats, and went to his house. After they had eaten and drunk, he gave him his wages. Said he to him, 'When you asked me, "Give me my wages," and I answered you, "I have no money," of what did you suspect me?' 'I thought, Perhaps you came across cheap merchandise and had purchased it therewith.' 'And when you requested me, "Give me cattle," and I answered, "I have no cattle," of what did you suspect me?' 'I thought, they may be hired to others.' 'When you asked me, "Give me land,' and I told you, "I have no land," of what did you suspect me?' 'I thought, perhaps it is leased to others.' 'And when I told you, "I have no produce," of what did you suspect me?' 'I thought, Perhaps they are not tithed.' 'And when I told you, "I have no pillows or bedding," of what did you suspect me?' 'I thought, perhaps he has sanctified all his property to Heaven.' 'By the [Temple] service!' exclaimed he, 'it was even so; I vowed away all my property because of my son Hyrcanus, who would not occupy himself with the Torah, but when I went to my companions in the South they absolved me of all my vows. And as for you, just as you judged me favourably, so may the Omnipresent judge you favourably.'

Our Rabbis taught: It happened that a certain pious man<sup>4</sup> ransomed an Israelite maiden [from captivity]; at the inn he made her lie at his feet. On the morrow he went down, had a ritual bath, and learnt with his disciples. Said he to them, 'When I made her lie at my feet, of what did you suspect me?' 'We thought, perhaps there is a disciple amongst us who[se character] is not clearly known<sup>5</sup> to our Master.'<sup>6</sup> 'When I descended and had a ritual bath, of what did you suspect me?' 'We thought, perhaps through the fatigue of the journey the Master was visited by nocturnal pollution.' 'By the [Temple] Service!' exclaimed he to them, 'it was even so. And just as you judged me favourably, so may the Omnipresent judge you favourably.'

Our Rabbis taught: The scholars were once in need of something from a noblewoman where all the great men of Rome were to be found. Said they, 'Who will go?' 'I will go,' replied R. Joshua. So R. Joshua and his disciples went. When he reached the door of her house, he removed his tefillin<sup>7</sup> at a distance of four cubits, entered, and shut the door in front of them. After he came out he descended, had a ritual bath, and learnt with his disciples. Said he to them, 'When I removed my tefillin, of what did you suspect me?' 'We thought, our Master reasons, "Let not sacred words enter a place of uncleanness".' 'When I shut [the door], of what did you suspect me?' 'We thought, perhaps he has [to discuss] an affair of State with her.' 'When I descended and had a ritual bath, of what did you suspect me?' 'We thought, perhaps some spittle spurted from her mouth upon the Rabbi's garments.'<sup>8</sup> 'By the [Temple] Service!' exclaimed he to them, 'it was even so; and just as you judged me favourably, so may the Omnipresent judge you favourably.'

WE MAY CLEAR AWAY CLEAN TERUMAH, etc. But that is obvious?-It is necessary [to teach it] only where it is lying in the hand of an Israelite; you might say, Since It Is of no use<sup>9</sup> for him, it is forbidden [to handle it]; he [the Tanna] informs us therefore [that] since it is fit for a priest it is permitted.

DEM'AI, etc. But dem'ai is not fit for him? — Since if he desired he could renounce [ownership of] his property and become a poor man, whereby it would be fit for him, it is fit for him now too. For we learnt: The poor may be fed with dem'ai and billeted soldiers may be given dem'ai. And R. Huna said, It was taught: Beth Shammai maintain: The poor may not be given dem'ai as food, nor billeted soldiers; but Beth Hillel rule: The poor may be given dem'ai as food, and [likewise] billeted soldiers<sup>10</sup>.

AND THE FIRST TITHE WHOSE TERUMAH HAS BEEN SEPARATED. But that is obvious? — It is necessary [to teach it] only where he anticipated [the separation of] the first tithe in the ears, and separated terumah of tithe but not the great terumah.<sup>11</sup> And this is as the following dictum of R. Abbahu in the name of Resh Lakish: First tithe which one anticipated in the ears is exempt from the great terumah, for it is said, then ye shall offer up an heave-offering of it for the Lord, a tithe of the tithe:<sup>12</sup> I ordered thee [to offer] a tithe of the tithe, but not the great terumah plus the terumah of the tithe of the tithe. R. Papa said to Abaye: If so, even if he anticipates it in the stack,<sup>13</sup> he should be exempt? — For your sake Scripture writes, out of all your gifts ye shall offer every heave-offering of the Lord.<sup>14</sup> And what [reason] do you see [to interpret thus]?<sup>15</sup> -The One has become corn [dagan], while the other has not become corn.<sup>16</sup>

AND THE SECOND TITHE, etc. But that is obvious? -It is necessary [to teach it] only where the principal has been given but not the fifth:<sup>17</sup> thus he informs us that the fifth is not indispensable.<sup>18</sup>

AND DRY LUPINES, etc. Only dry, but not moist. What is the reason? Since it is bitter, she [the goat] will not eat it.

---

(1) Hospitality and visiting the sick belong to the practice of loving deeds; early attendance at the Beth Hamidrash and rearing one's children to the study of the Torah are included in the study of the Torah; while judging one's neighbour favourably enables peace to be made between a man and his fellow and between a husband and wife, as each can be persuaded to take a charitable view of the other's actions. As for meditation in prayer, Rashi includes it in the practice of loving deeds — to ones own soul — as it is written, the man of love doeth good to his own soul (Prov. XI, 17). Maharsha includes it in peacemaking between God and man.

(2) Alfasi and Asheri read: Festival.

(3) Lit., 'with blasting of spirit'.

(4) **חֵטְא אֵתָא**, the phrase generally designates either R. Judah b. Baba or R. Judah b. ila'i (Rashi).

(5) Lit., 'tested', 'examined'.

(6) So you could not trust him.

(7) Which were then worn during the day.

(8) Which by rabbinical law affects levitical purity; cf. supra 15b, 17b.

(9) Lit., 'not fit'.

(10) V. Dem. III, I.

(11) The great terumah is a portion of the produce, unspecified by Scriptural law, which the Israelite must give to the priests; for terumah of the tithe, v. n. on Mishnah. The great terumah was to be separated first and then first tithe. But here the order was reversed, and the Israelite separated the tithe whilst the grain was yet in the ears.

(12) Num. XVIII, 26.

(13) I.e., when it is no longer in the ears but has been piled up in stacks.

(14) Num. XVIII, 29; i.e., all is an extension, and shows that the offering is due even in such a case. 'For your sake' or, 'concerning you' — to refute this possibility.

(15) To apply the limitation of the first verse to the one case and the extension if the second to the other- perhaps it should be reversed.

(16) The priestly due, i.e., the great terumah, is 'the first-fruits of thy corn' (Deut. XVIII, 4). Hence once it is piled up as corn it is due, and one cannot evade his obligations by reversing the order of the gifts.

(17) When one redeemed the second tithe he had to add a fifth of its value.

(18) To the validity of the redemption, and the redeemed produce may be consumed anywhere, even though the fifth has

not been added.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 128a

BUT NOT TEBEL, etc. That is obvious? — It is necessary [to teach it] only of tebel made so by Rabbinical law, e.g., if it was sown in an unperforated pot.<sup>1</sup>

NOR THE FIRST TITHE, etc. That is obvious? — It is necessary [to teach it] only where it had been anticipated in the pile, the tithe having been separated but not the great terumah. You might argue as R. Papa proposed to Abaye:<sup>2</sup> hence he [the Tanna] informs us [that it is] as Abaye answered him.

NOR THE SECOND TITHE, etc. That is obvious?—It is necessary [to teach it] only where they have been redeemed, but not in accordance with their laws; [i.e.,] the [second] tithe was redeemed by uncoined metal,<sup>3</sup> for the Divine Law states, And thou shalt bind up [we-zarta] the money in thine hand,<sup>4</sup> [implying], that which bears a figure [zurah];<sup>5</sup> [and] hekdesch which was secularized by means of land,<sup>6</sup> for the Divine law states, Then he shall give the money and it shall be assured to him.<sup>7</sup>

NOR LOF. Our Rabbis taught: We may handle hazab,<sup>8</sup> because it is food for gazelles, and mustard, because it is food for doves. R. Simeon b. Gamaliel said: We may also handle fragments of glass, because it is food for ostriches. Said R. Nathan to him: If so, let bundles of twigs be handled, because they are food for elephants. And R. Simeon b. Gamaliel?<sup>9</sup> Ostriches are common, [whereas] elephants are rare. Amemar observed: provided he has ostriches. R. Ashi said to Amemar: Then when R. Nathan said to R. Simeon b. Gamaliel, 'let bundles of dried branches be handled, because they are food for elephants', — if one has elephants, why not? But [he means,] they are fit for [elephants]; so here too they are fit for [ostriches].<sup>10</sup>

Abaye said: R. Simeon b. Gamaliel, R. Simeon, R. Ishmael, and R. Akiba, all hold that all Israel are royal children. 'R. Simeon R. Gamaliel', as stated.<sup>11</sup> 'R. Simeon': for we learnt: Royal children may anoint their wounds with oil, since it is their practice to anoint themselves thus on weekdays. R. Simeon said: All Israel are royal children. 'R. Ishmael and R. Akiba': for it was taught: If one is a debtor for a thousand zuz, and wears a robe a hundred manehs in value, he is stripped thereof and robed with a garment that is fitting for him. It was taught in the name of R. Ishmael, and it was taught in the name of R. Akiba: All Israel are worthy of that robe.

BUNDLES OF STRAW, TWIGS, etc. Our Rabbis taught: Bundles of straw, bundles of branches, and bundles of young shoots,<sup>12</sup> if one prepared them as animal fodder, may be handled; if not, they may not be handled. R. Simeon b. Gamaliel said: Bundles which can be taken up with one hand may be handled; with two hands, may not be handled. As for bundles of si'ah,<sup>13</sup> hyssop and koranith:<sup>14</sup> if they were brought in for fuel, one must not draw on them [for food] on the Sabbath; [if brought in] as animal fodder, he may draw on them on the Sabbath; and he may break [it] with his hand and eat [thereof], provided that he does not break it with a utensil. And he may crush it and eat, provided that he does not crush a large quantity with a utensil: the words of R. Judah. But the Sages maintain: He may crush [it] with the tips of his fingers and eat, provided, however, that he does not crush a large quantity with his hands in the [same] way as he does on weekdays; the same applies to ammitha, the same applies to higgam [rue], and the same applies to other kinds of spices. What is ammitha? Ninya.<sup>15</sup> [What is] si'ah? — Said Rab Judah: Si'ah is zithre;<sup>16</sup> ezob is abratha [hyssop];<sup>17</sup> koranith is what is called koranitha. But there was a certain man who asked, 'Who wants koranitha,' and it transpired [that he meant] thyme? — Rather si'ah is zithre, ezob is abratha, and koranitha is hashe [thyme].

It was stated: Salted meat may be handled on the Sabbath; unsalted<sup>18</sup> meat, — R. Huna says: It

may be handled; R. Hisda rules: It may not be handled. 'R. Huna says: It may be handled'? But R. Huna was Rab's disciple, and Rab agrees with R. Judah who accepts [the prohibition of] mukzeh?<sup>19</sup> -In [the interdict of] mukzeh in respect of eating he agrees with R. Judah;<sup>20</sup> in [the interdict] of mukzeh as regards handling he agrees with R. Simeon.<sup>21</sup>

'R. Hisda rules: It may not be handled.' But R. Isaac b. Ammi visited R. Hisda's house and he saw a [slaughtered] duck being moved from the sun into the shade, and R. Hisda observed, I see here a financial loss.'<sup>22</sup> — A duck is different, because it is fit as raw meat.

Our Rabbis taught: Salted fish may be handled; unsalted fish may not be handled;<sup>23</sup> meat, whether unsalted or salted, may be handled; [and this is taught anonymously as R. Simeon].<sup>24</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: Bones may be handled because they are food for dogs;

---

(1) Cf. supra 95a Mishnah. By Scriptural law it is not tebel at all, and one would think that the produce might therefore be handled.

(2) That it is exempt; supra 127b bottom.

(3) Asimon. V. B.M. 47b for the meaning of the term.

(4) Deut. XIV, 25.

(5) The image stamped on a coin. This connects zarta with zurah.

(6) I.e., land was given in order to redeem it.

(7) I.e., it can be redeemed by money, but not by land. Actually there is no such verse, but v. B.M., Sonc. ed., 321, n. 1.

(8) Jast.: a shrubby plant, probably cistus.

(9) How does he answer this?

(10) And they may be handled even if one has no ostriches.

(11) He permits lof to be handled because it is food for ravens, which only wealthy people — who are the same as princes — kept.

(12) Bah on the basis of Tur O.H. 308, 28 omits the last-mentioned here, though retaining it in the Mishnah.

(13) Jast.: a plant classified with hyssop. *Satureia Thymbra* (savory).

(14) Jast.: thyme or organum.

(15) Jast.: Bishop's weed. Rashi: mint.

(16) *Satureia*; v. n. 1.

(17) Used as a remedy for indigestion, v. supra 109b.

(18) Lit., 'unsavoury'.

(19) Which applies to unsalted meat, since it is not fit for food.

(20) That which is normally unfit for food may not be eaten, even if its owner wishes.

(21) That it is permitted.

(22) If you leave it in the sun. Thus they moved it at his orders.

(23) Because it cannot be eaten, nor will it be given to dogs, as one does not give to dogs what can be made fit for man.

(24) Hence raw meat is permitted. Rashal, however, deletes the bracketed passage; v. Tosaf.

## **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 128b**

putrid meat, because it is food for beasts; uncovered water,<sup>1</sup> because it is fit for a cat. R. Simeon b. Gamaliel said: It may not be kept at all, because of the danger.<sup>2</sup>

MISHNAH. A BASKET MAY BE OVERTURNED BEFORE FLEDGLINGS, FOR THEM TO ASCEND OR DESCEND.<sup>3</sup> IF A FOWL RUNS AWAY [FROM THE HOUSE], SHE IS PUSHED [WITH THE HANDS] UNTIL SHE RE-ENTERS. CALVES AND FOALS MAY BE MADE TO WALK, AND A WOMAN MAY MAKE HER SON WALK.<sup>4</sup> R. JUDAH SAID: WHEN IS THAT? IF HE LIFTS ONE [FOOT] AND PLACES [ANOTHER] DOWN; BUT IF HE DRAGS THEM IT IS FORBIDDEN.<sup>5</sup>

GEMARA. Rab Judah said in Rab's name: If an animal falls into a dyke, one brings pillows and bedding and places [them] under it, and if it ascends it ascends. An objection is raised: If an animal falls into a dyke, provisions are made for it where it lies so that it should not perish. Thus, only provisions, but not pillows and bedding? — There is no difficulty: here it means where provisions are possible; there, where provisions are impossible. If provisions are possible, well and good;<sup>6</sup> but if not, one brings pillows and bedding and places them under it. But he robs a utensil of its readiness [for use]?<sup>7</sup> — [The avoidance of] suffering of dumb animals is a Biblical [law], so the Biblical law comes and supersedes the [interdict] of the Rabbis.<sup>8</sup>

IF A FOWL RUNS AWAY. We may only push [it], but not make it walk. We have here learnt what our Rabbis taught: An animal, beast, or bird may be made to walk in a courtyard, but not a fowl. Why not a fowl? — Said Abaye, Because she raises herself.<sup>9</sup>

One [Baraitha] taught: An animal, beast, and bird may be made to walk in a courtyard, but not in the street; a woman may lead her son in the street, and in the courtyard it goes without saying. Another taught: An animal, beast, and bird may not be carried<sup>10</sup> in a courtyard, but we may push them that they should enter. Now this is self-contradictory. You say, We may not carry, which implies that we may certainly make them walk; then you say, we may only push but not lead? — Said Abaye: The second clause refers to a fowl.

Abaye said: When one kills a fowl he should [either] press its legs on the ground or else lift them up,<sup>11</sup> lest it places its claws on the ground and tears its organs loose.<sup>12</sup>

MISHNAH. ONE MAY NOT DELIVER AN ANIMAL [IN GIVING BIRTH] ON A FESTIVAL, BUT ONE MAY ASSIST IT. WE MAY DELIVER A WOMAN ON THE SABBATH, SUMMON A MIDWIFE FOR HER FROM PLACE TO PLACE, DESECRATE THE SABBATH ON HER ACCOUNT, AND TIE UP THE NAVEL-STRING. R. JOSE SAID: ONE MAY CUT [IT] TOO. AND ALL THE REQUIREMENTS OF CIRCUMCISION MAY BE DONE ON THE SABBATH.

GEMARA. How may we assist? Rab Judah said: The new-born [calf, lamb, etc.] is held so that it should not fall on the earth. R. Nahman said: The flesh is compressed in order that the young should come out. It was taught in accordance with Rab Judah. How do we assist? We may hold the young so that it should not fall on the ground, blow into its nostrils,<sup>13</sup> and put the teat into its mouth that it should suck. R. Simeon b. Gamaliel said: We stimulate pity<sup>14</sup> to a clean animal<sup>15</sup> on a Festival. What was done? — Said Abaye: A lump of salt was brought and placed in its womb so that it [the mother] might remember its travails<sup>16</sup> and have pity upon it; and we sprinkle the water of the after-birth<sup>17</sup> upon the newly-born [animal] so that its mother might smell it and have pity upon it. Yet only [in the case of] a clean [animal], but not an unclean one. What is the reason? An unclean animal does not spurn its young, and if it does spurn it, it does not take it back.<sup>18</sup>

ONE MAY DELIVER A WOMAN, etc. Consider: He [the Tanna] teaches, ONE MAY DELIVER A WOMAN AND SUMMON A MIDWIFE FOR HER FROM PLACE TO PLACE, then what does AND DESECRATE THE SABBATH ON HER ACCOUNT add? — It adds the following taught by the Rabbis: If she needs a lamp, her neighbour may kindle a lamp for her. And if she needs oil, her neighbour brings her oil<sup>19</sup> in her hand;<sup>20</sup> but if that in her hand is insufficient, she brings it in her hair; and if that in her hair is insufficient, she brings it to her in a vessel.

The Master said: 'If she needs a lamp, her neighbour may kindle a lamp for her.' That is obvious? — This is necessary [to be taught] only in the case of a blind [woman]: you might argue, Since she cannot see it, it is forbidden; hence he informs us that we tranquillize her mind, [as] she reasons, if there is anything [required] my friend will see it and do it for me.

‘If she needs oil, etc.’ [But] deduce it on the grounds of wringing out?<sup>21</sup> — Rabbah and R. Joseph both answer: [The interdict of] wringing out does not apply to hair. R. Ashi said: You may even say that wringing out does apply to hair: she brings it to her in a vessel by means of her hair,<sup>22</sup> [because] as much as we can vary it we do so.<sup>23</sup>

Rab Judah said in Samuel's name: If a woman is in confinement, as long as the uterus is open, whether she states, ‘I need it,’ or ‘I do not need it,’ we must desecrate the Sabbath on her account. If the uterus is closed, whether she says,

- 
- (1) V. p. 533, n. II.
  - (2) To a human being who may drink it.
  - (3) Into or from the hen-coop.
  - (4) The verb refers to the short hop-like steps made by a child when he is just learning to walk.
  - (5) As the mother in effect carries him. The reference is to a public domain.
  - (6) Lit., ‘yes’.
  - (7) Because once he places the bedding under the animal, he may no longer remove it on Sabbath, v. supra 43a.
  - (8) The prohibition of depriving a utensil on a sabbath of its readiness for use, with the result that one carries it. This is forbidden as mukzeh. The broad humaneness of this is striking, particularly when it is remembered that it antedates by many centuries any similar view elsewhere. Cf. supra 117b, p. 577, n. 6.
  - (9) But ducks when held by their wings actually walk.
  - (10) Lit., ‘you may not remove’ (their feet from the ground simultaneously).
  - (11) So that they cannot touch the ground at all.
  - (12) Viz., the windpipe and the gullet. If these are torn loose before being cut the animal or bird is unfit for food.
  - (13) To clear them of their mucus, etc.
  - (14) [I.e., arouses the maternal instinct of the animal for its young. Tosef. reads: ‘pity in’].
  - (15) I.e., one permitted as food.
  - (16) In giving birth.
  - (17) Water in which the placenta was soaked.
  - (18) Lit., ‘bring it near’ — in spite of these expedients.
  - (19) Through the street.
  - (20) But not in a vessel, if it can be avoided.
  - (21) I.e., if she brings it in her hair she must then wring it out, which is just as much forbidden as carrying it in a vessel. Since this is so, why not carry it ordinarily?
  - (22) The vessel is attached to her hair.
  - (23) When the Sabbath must be desecrated, we do it in as unusual a manner as possible.

## **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 129a**

‘I need it’ or ‘I do not need it,’ we may not desecrate the Sabbath for her:<sup>1</sup> that is how R. Ashi recited it. Mar Zutra recited it thus: Rab Judah said in Samuel's name: If a woman is in confinement, as long as the uterus is open, whether she says, ‘I need it’ or ‘I do not need it,’ we desecrate the Sabbath for her. If the uterus is closed, if she says, ‘I need it,’ we desecrate the Sabbath for her; if she does not say, ‘I need it,’ we do not desecrate the Sabbath for her.<sup>2</sup> Rabina asked Meremar: Mar Zutra recited it in the direction of leniency, [while] R. Ashi recited it in the direction of stringency; which is the law? — The law is as Mar Zutra, replied he: where [a matter of] life is in doubt we are lenient.

From when is the opening of the uterus? — Abaye said: From when she sits on the seat of travail. R. Huna son of R. Joshua said: From when the blood slowly flows down; others state, From when her friends carry her by her arms.<sup>3</sup> For how long is the opening of the uterus? — Abaye said: Three days: Raba said in Rab Judah's name: Seven; others maintain: Thirty. The scholars of Nehardea said:

A lying-in woman [has three periods: from] three [days after confinement], seven [days], and thirty [days]. From three [days], whether she says, 'I need it' or she says, 'I do not need it,'<sup>4</sup> we desecrate the Sabbath for her. [From] seven [days], if she says 'I need it,' we desecrate the Sabbath for her; if she says, 'I do not need it,' we do not desecrate the Sabbath for her. [From] thirty days, even if she says, 'I need it,' we may not desecrate the Sabbath for her,<sup>5</sup> yet we may do so by means of a Gentile,<sup>6</sup> as R. 'Ulla the son of R. Ilai, who said: All the requirements of an invalid may be done by means of a Gentile on the Sabbath, and as R. Hamnuna, who said: In a matter entailing no danger [to life], one bids a Gentile and he does it.

Rab Judah said in Samuel's name: For a woman in confinement [the period is] thirty days. In respect of what law? The scholars of Nehardea said: In respect of a ritual bath.<sup>7</sup> Raba observed: We said this only if her husband is not with her;<sup>8</sup> but if her husband is with her, he makes her warm. Even as R. Hisda's daughter performed tebillah within thirty days in her husband's absence,<sup>9</sup> caught a chill, and was carried in a bed to Raba at Pumbeditha.

Rab Judah said in Samuel's name: We may make a fire for a lying-in woman on the Sabbath [in the winter].<sup>10</sup> Now it was understood from him, only for a lying-in woman, but not for an invalid; only in winter, but not in summer. But that is not so: there is no difference between a lying-in woman and any [other] invalid, and summer and winter are alike. [This follows] since it was stated, R. Hiyya b. Abin said in Samuel's name: If one lets blood and catches a chill, a fire is made for him even on the Tammuz [summer] solstice.<sup>11</sup> A teak chair was broken up for Samuel;<sup>12</sup> a table [made] of juniper-wood was broken up for Rab Judah. A footstool was broken up for Rabbah, whereupon Abaye said to Rabbah, But you are infringing, thou shalt not destroy?<sup>13</sup> 'Thou shalt not destroy' in respect of my own body is more important to me, he retorted.

Rab Judah said in Rab's name: One should always sell [even] the beams of his house and buy shoes for his feet. If one has let blood and has nothing to eat, let him sell the shoes from off his feet and provide the requirements of a meal therewith. What are the requirements of a meal? — Rab said: Meat; while Samuel said: Wine. Rab said meat: life for life. While Samuel said, Wine: red [wine] to replace red [blood].

(Mnemonic: SHenimsar.)<sup>14</sup> For Samuel on the day he was bled<sup>15</sup> a dish of pieces of meat was prepared; R. Johanan drank until the smell [of the wine] issued from his ears; R. Nahman drank until his milt swam [in wine]; R. Joseph drank until it [the smell] issued from the puncture of bleeding.<sup>16</sup> Raba sought Wine of a [vine] that had had three [changes of] foliage.<sup>17</sup>

R. Nahman b. Isaac said to his disciples: I beg of you, tell your wives on the day of blood-letting, Nahman is visiting us.<sup>18</sup> Now, all artifices are forbidden, save the following article, which is permitted. Viz., if one is bled and cannot [buy wine],<sup>19</sup> let him take a bad zuz<sup>20</sup> and go to seven shops until he has tasted as much as a rebi'ith.<sup>21</sup> But if not,<sup>22</sup> let him eat seven black dates, rub his temples with oil, and sleep in the sun. Ablat<sup>23</sup> found Samuel sleeping in the sun. Said he to him, O Jewish Sage! can that which is injurious be beneficial? It is a day of bleeding, replied he.<sup>24</sup> Yet it is not so, but there is a day when the sun is beneficial for the whole year, [viz.,] the day of the Tammuz [summer]<sup>25</sup> solstice, and he said to himself, I will not reveal it to him.<sup>26</sup>

(Mnemonic: Sparingly, wind, taste, tarry.) Rab and Samuel both Say: If one makes light of the meal after bleeding his food will be made light of by Heaven, for they Say; He has no compassion for his own life, shall I have compassion upon him! Rab and Samuel both say: He who is bled, let him, not sit where a wind can enfold [him], lest the cupper drained him [of blood] and reduced it<sup>27</sup> to [just] a rebi'ith,<sup>28</sup> and the wind come and drain him [still further], and thus he is in danger. Samuel was accustomed to be bled in a house [whose wall consisted] of seven whole bricks,<sup>29</sup> and a half brick [in thickness]. One day he bled and felt himself [weak]; he examined [the wall] and found a

half-brick missing.

Rab and Samuel both say: He who is bled must [first] partake of something and then go out; for if he does not eat anything, if he meets a corpse his face will turn green; if he meets a homicide he will die; and if he meets

- 
- (1) As there is no danger of life. Asheri, however, reads: If she says, 'I need it', we desecrate (the Sabbath); if she does not say, 'I need it', we do not desecrate.
- (2) Asheri reads: If she says, 'I do not need it', we do not desecrate (the Sabbath); if she does not say, 'I do not need it', we do desecrate.
- (3) I.e., when she cannot walk.
- (4) Var. lec.: or she does not say, 'I need it'; similarly infra.
- (5) For she certainly does not need it and is in no danger.
- (6) Lit., 'Syrian'.
- (7) Which she must not take until thirty days for fear of a cold.
- (8) After the ritual bath, which she takes in order to eat terumah, etc.
- (9) Lit., 'not in her husband's presence'.
- (10) Lit., 'in the rainy season'. This is bracketed in the text.
- (11) Tammuz is the fourth month of the year, corresponding to about July.
- (12) For a fire, other wood being unavailable.
- (13) Deut. XX, 19. q.v.; this is understood as a general prohibition of wasteful destruction of any sort.
- (14) V. p. 110, n. 1. SH=SHemuel (Samuel); N=R. Johanan; M=R. Nahman; S=R. Joseph; R=Raba.
- (15) Lit., 'when he did the thing'.
- (16) I.e., the hole made in his flesh when he was bled. Jast. s.v. **כּוּסִילָתָא** translates: until the puncture was healed up.
- (17) I.e., wine in its third year.
- (18) That they may prepare substantial meals!
- (19) Having no money.
- (20) I.e., a worn-out one which is not accepted as current coin.
- (21) A quarter of a log. Wine was tasted before buying; at each shop he would taste the wine and then proffer the coin, which, of course, would be refused.
- (22) He does not even possess such a coin.
- (23) A Persian sage and friend of Samuel, v. A.Z. 30a.
- (24) And I require heat.
- (25) Var. lec. Tebeth (winter).
- (26) Samuel possessed medical knowledge and did not wish to reveal trade secrets.
- (27) Lit., 'set it'.
- (28) Which was held to be the minimum quantity of blood which can sustain life.
- (29) A whole brick is three handbreadths,

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 129b

a swine,<sup>1</sup> it [the meeting] is harmful in respect of something else.<sup>2</sup>

Rab and Samuel both say: One who is bled should tarry awhile and then rise, for a Master said: In five cases one is nearer to death than to life. And these are they: When one eats and [immediately] rises, drinks and rises, sleeps and rises, lets blood and rises, and cohabits and rises.

Samuel said: The correct interval for blood-letting is every thirty days; in middle age<sup>3</sup> one should decrease [the frequency];<sup>4</sup> at a [more] advanced age<sup>5</sup> he should again decrease [the frequency]. Samuel also said: The correct time for bloodletting is on a Sunday Wednesday and Friday, but not on Monday or Thursday, because a Master said: He who possesses ancestral merit may let blood on Monday and Thursday, because the Heavenly Court and the human court are alike then.<sup>6</sup> Why not on

Tuesday? Because the planet Mars rules at even-numbered hours of the day.<sup>7</sup> But on Friday too it rules at even-numbered hours? Since the multitude are accustomed to it,<sup>8</sup> 'the Lord preserveth the simple.'<sup>9</sup> Samuel said: A Wednesday<sup>10</sup> which is the fourth [of the month], a Wednesday which is the fourteenth, a Wednesday which is the twenty-fourth a Wednesday which is not followed by four [days]<sup>11</sup> — [all] are dangerous.<sup>12</sup> The first day of the month and the second [cause] weakness; the third is dangerous. The eve of a Festival [causes] weakness; the eve of Pentecost is dangerous, and the Rabbis laid an interdict upon the eve of every Festival on account of the Festival of Pentecost, when there issues a wind called Taboah,<sup>13</sup> and had not the Israelites accepted the Torah it would absolutely have killed them.<sup>14</sup>

Samuel said: If one eats a grain of wheat and [then] lets blood, he has bled in respect of that grain only.<sup>15</sup> Yet that is only as a remedy,<sup>16</sup> but if it is to ease one,<sup>17</sup> it does ease.<sup>18</sup> When one is bled, drinking [is permissible] immediately; eating until half a mil.<sup>19</sup> The scholars asked: [Does this mean], immediate drinking is beneficial, but after that it is injurious; or Perhaps [after that] it is neither harmful nor beneficial? — The question stands over. The scholars asked: Is eating beneficial only until half a mil, but before or after it is harmful; or perhaps it is [then] neither harmful nor beneficial? The question stands over.

Rab announced: A hundred gourds for one zuz, a hundred heads for one zuz, a hundred lips for nothing.<sup>20</sup> R. Joseph said: When we were at R. Huna's academy, on a day that the scholars took a holiday they would say, 'This is a day of lips,' but I did not know what they meant.

WE TIE UP THE NAVEL-STRING. Our Rabbis taught: We tie up the navel-string. R. Jose said: We cut [it] too; and we hide the after-birth, so that the infant may be kept warm. R. Simeon b. Gamaliel said: princesses hide [it] in bowls of oil, wealthy women in wool fleeces, and poor women in soft rags.

R. Nahman said in Rabbah b. Abbuha's name in Rab's name: The halachah is as R. Jose. R. Nahman also said in Rabbah b. Abbuha's name in Rab's name: The Sages agree with R. Jose in the case of the navel-string of twins, that we cut them. What is the reason? Because they pull upon each other.<sup>21</sup>

R. Nahman also said in Rabbah b. Abbuha's name in Rab's name: All that is mentioned in the chapter of rebuke<sup>22</sup> is done for a lying-in woman on the Sabbath. As it is said, 'And as for thy nativity, in the day thou wast born thy navel was not cut, neither wast thou washed in water to cleanse thee' thou wast not salted at all, nor swaddled at all.<sup>23</sup> 'And as for thy nativity, in the day thou wast born': hence an infant may be delivered on the Sabbath; 'thy navel was not cut': hence the navel-string is cut on the Sabbath; 'neither wast thou washed in water to cleanse thee': hence the infant is washed on the Sabbath; 'thou wast not salted at all': hence the infant is salted on the Sabbath; 'nor swaddled at all': hence the infant is swaddled on the Sabbath.<sup>24</sup> [

---

(1) Lit., 'something else'.

(2) Viz., leprosy, which this may cause.

(3) Lit., "at the middle stages", viz., from forty onwards (Rashi).

(4) The body then begins to lose heat, and frequent bleeding may be injurious.

(5) Rashi: from the age of sixty.

(6) The court used to meet on Mondays and Thursdays, v. B.K. 82a. One's transgressions are punished in a time of natural risk. Cf. supra 32a.

(7) Jast. Ma'adim lit., means the reddener. The hours as well as the months were thought to stand under the influence of planets which moulded their nature. The planet Mars represented war and pestilence and retribution, whilst the even-numbered hours of the day were regarded as particularly susceptible to disaster. This double combination was therefore very dangerous, and bloodletting might have serious results.

- (8) Sc. bleeding on Friday.
- (9) Ps. CXVI, 6.
- (10) Lit., 'fourth' day of the week.
- (11) In the same month (Rashi).
- (12) For bleeding.
- (13) Lit., 'slaughter'.
- (14) Lit., 'their flesh and blood.'
- (15) I.e., bleeding immediately after a meal serves only to lighten one of that meal, but has no wider effects.
- (16) If it is done as a remedy it is ineffective.
- (17) E.g., if one suffers from high blood pressure.
- (18) Even if performed immediately after a meal.
- (19) I.e., as long as it takes to walk that distance-about nine minutes; v. supra 34b, 35a.
- (20) Rashi: gourds and animal-heads are but slightly beneficial, and they are worth having only when a hundred can be bought for one zuz; but the lips of animals are quite worthless. Tosaf., reading with R. Han. קרני instead of קרי translates: a hundred (surgeons') horns (i.e., bleedings) for one zuz, a hundred heads (i.e., hair cuttings) for one zuz, a hundred lips (trimmings of moustaches) for nothing, as this was free if done at the same time as the bleeding or hair cutting. Thus 'a day of lips' became a proverbial description of a day without profit.
- (21) Which endangers their lives.
- (22) Wherein Ezekiel rebukes the Jews; ch. XVI.
- (23) Ezek. XVI, 4.
- (24) no note.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 130a

### CHAPTER XIX

MISHNAH. R. ELIEZER SAID: IF ONE DID NOT BRING AN INSTRUMENT ON THE EVE OF THE SABBATH,<sup>1</sup> HE MUST BRING IT ON THE SABBATH UNCOVERED;<sup>2</sup> BUT IN [TIMES OF] DANGER<sup>3</sup> HE HIDES IT ON THE TESTIMONY OF WITNESSES. R. ELIEZER SAID FURTHER: ONE MAY CUT TIMBER TO MAKE CHARCOAL FOR MANUFACTURING IRON.<sup>4</sup> R. AKIBA STATED A GENERAL PRINCIPLE: ANY [MANNER OF] WORK WHICH COULD BE PERFORMED ON SABBATH EVE DOES NOT SUPERSEDE THE SABBATH; BUT THAT WHICH COULD NOT BE PERFORMED ON SABBATH EVE DOES SUPERSEDE THE SABBATH.

GEMARA. The scholars asked: Is R. Eliezer's reason<sup>5</sup> out of love for the precept<sup>6</sup> or perhaps it is because of suspicions?<sup>7</sup> What is the practical difference? Whether it may be brought covered on the testimony of witnesses. If you say it is out of love for the precept, it must be uncovered and not hidden. But if you say it is because of suspicions it is well even if hidden: what then? It was stated, R. Levi said: R. Eliezer ruled thus only out of love for the precept. It was taught likewise: He must bring it uncovered, and he must not bring it covered: this is R. Eliezer's opinion.<sup>8</sup> R. Ashi said: Our Mishnah too proves this, because it states, BUT IN TIMES OF DANGER HE HIDES IT ON THE TESTIMONY OF WITNESSES; thus in times of danger only, but not when there is no danger. This proves that it is out of love for the precept: this proves it.

Another [Baraita] taught: He brings it uncovered, but he must not bring it covered: this is R. Eliezer's view. R. Judah said in R. Eliezer's name: In times of danger it was the practice to bring it hidden on the testimony of witnesses.<sup>9</sup> The scholars asked: The witnesses which he mentions, [does it mean] he and another one, or perhaps he and another two?- Come and hear: BUT IN [TIMES OF] DANGER HE HIDES IT ON THE TESTIMONY OF WITNESSES: if you agree to say he and two [others], it is well; but if you say he and another, what witnesses [are there]?<sup>10</sup> — Such as are eligible to testify elsewhere.<sup>11</sup>

R. ELIEZER SAID FURTHER [etc.]. Our Rabbis taught: In R. Eliezer's locality they used to cut timber to make charcoal for making iron on the Sabbath. In the locality of R. Jose the Galilean they used to eat flesh of fowl with milk. Levi visited the home of Joseph the fowler [and] was offered the head of a peacock in milk, [which] he did not eat. When he came before Rabbi he asked him, Why did you not place them under the ban?<sup>12</sup> It was the locality of R. Judah b. Bathyra, replied he, and I thought, Perhaps he has lectured to them in accordance with R. Jose the Galilean. For we learnt: R. Jose the Galilean said: It is said, Ye shall not eat any nebelah,<sup>13</sup> and it is said, Thou shalt not seethe a kid in its mother's milk:<sup>14</sup> [this teaches,] that which is forbidden on the score of nebelah may not be seethed in milk. Now since a fowl is prohibited when nebelah, you might think that one must not seethe it in milk; therefore it is stated, 'in its mother's milk', hence a fowl is excluded, since it has no mother's milk.

R. Isaac said: There was one town in Palestine where they followed R. Eliezer,<sup>15</sup> and they died there at the [proper] time,<sup>16</sup> Moreover, the wicked State<sup>17</sup> once promulgated a decree against Israel concerning circumcision,<sup>18</sup> yet did not decree [it] against that town.

It was taught, R. Simeon b. Gamaliel said: Every precept which they accepted with joy, e.g., circumcision, as it is written, I rejoice at thy word, as one that findeth great spoil,<sup>19</sup> they still observe with joy. While every precept which they accepted with displeasure,<sup>20</sup> e.g., the forbidden degrees of consanguinity, as it is written, And Moses heard the people weeping throughout their families,<sup>21</sup> [i.e.,] on account of the affairs of their families,<sup>22</sup> they still perform them with strife, for there is no marriage settlement which does not contain a quarrel.<sup>23</sup>

It was taught, R. Simeon b. Eleazar said: Every precept for which Israel submitted to death at the time of the royal decree, e.g., idolatry and circumcision,<sup>24</sup> is still held firmly in their minds. Whereas every precept for which Israel did not submit to death at the time of the royal decree, e.g., tefillin, is still weak in their hands.<sup>25</sup> For R. Jannai said: Tefillin demand a pure body, like Elisha-the-man-of-the-wings. What does this mean? — Abaye said: That one must not pass wind while wearing them; Raba said: That one must not sleep in them. And why is he called 'the man-of-the-wings'? Because the wicked State once proclaimed a decree against Israel that whoever donned tefillin should have his brains pierced through; yet Elisha put them on and went out into the streets. A quaestor saw him: he fled before him, and the latter gave pursuit. As he overtook him, he [Elisha] removed them from his head and held them in his hand, 'What is that in your hand?' he demanded, 'The wings of a dove,' was his reply. He stretched out his hand and the wings of a dove were found therein. Hence he is called 'Elisha-the-man-of-the-wings.' And why did he tell him the wings of a dove rather than that of other birds? Because the Congregation of Israel is likened to a dove, as it is said, as the wings of a dove covered with silver, and her pinions with yellow gold:<sup>26</sup> just as a dove is protected by its wings, so with the Israelites, their precepts protect them.<sup>27</sup>

R. Abba b. R. adda said in R. Isaac's name: they once forgot to bring a knife on Sabbath eve, so they brought it on the Sabbath through roofs and courtyards,<sup>28</sup>

---

(1) A knife for circumcision.

(2) That all may see it.

(3) When circumcision is forbidden by the State, as during the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes before the Maccabean revolt; v. 1 Macc. I, 48, 60, 11, 46. It was again forbidden during the Hadrianic persecution; cf. Mek. Yithro, Ba-Hodesh, VI; Graetz, Geschichte IV, 154.

(4) For a circumcision knife. Thus R. Eliezer permits not only circumcision but even its preparatory adjuncts, though these could have been prepared before the Sabbath.

(5) For requiring the knife to be brought uncovered.

(6) One must show how precious is circumcision that he even desecrates the Sabbath on its account.

- (7) That would otherwise attach to the bringer, that he was unlawfully desecrating the Sabbath.
- (8) The emphatic repetition shows that it must not be hidden on any account.
- (9) 'It was the practice' implies that this is not a mere theoretical ruling but an actual account of what happened in the past. As R. Eliezer died before the Hadrianic wars, this must refer to the days of the persecution by Antiochus. — Weiss, Dor, II, p. 131. n. I.
- (10) There is only one, as obviously he cannot be counted.
- (11) In truth it may be he and another, nevertheless there are two who know the purpose of his carrying. and they are referred to as witnesses, since two in general can testify. Yet two independent witnesses may not be required, since there is no actual lawsuit.
- (12) For infringing the dietary laws.
- (13) Deut. XIV, 21.
- (14) Ibid. 22 — these laws are stated successively.
- (15) In respect of circumcision.
- (16) Never prematurely.
- (17) Rome.
- (18) Forbidding it; v. p. 649, n. 3.
- (19) Ps. CXIX, 162. This is understood to refer to circumcision, which is a single 'word', i.e., command, which preceded the bulk of Mosaic legislation (this dating back to Abraham, Gen. XVII, 10), and which the Jew, in virtue of being circumcised, ceaselessly performs.
- (20) Lit., 'quarrelling'.
- (21) Num. XI, 10.
- (22) viz., because they were now interdicted in marriage.
- (23) Lit., 'in which they (the parties concerned) throw no discord'.
- (24) Cf. p. 649, n. 3. Antiochus demanded idol worship too; later, Caligula made a similar demand; v. Graetz, History (Eng. trans.) Vol. II, pp. 188 seqq.; cf. also Weiss, Dor, II, p. 5.
- (25) V. Weiss, op. cit., p. 134.
- (26) Ps. LXVIII, 14.
- (27) Cf. also supra 49a and notes a.l.
- (28) For which no 'erub (q.v. Glos) had been provided. It is normally forbidden to carry through such by Rabbinical law.

### **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 130b**

[this being] against the will of R. Eliezer. R. Joseph demurred: [You say] 'against the will of R. Eliezer'! on the contrary, it is R. Eliezer' who permits it even through the street;<sup>1</sup> but only with the consent of the Rabbis, who forbid [it to be carried] through the street yet permit it through roofs, courtyards, and enclosures,<sup>2</sup> — yet is this permitted? Surely it was taught: Just as one may not bring it through the street, so may one not bring it through roofs, through enclosures, or through courtyards? — Said R. Ashi: It was not with the consent of R. Eliezer and his opponent[s], but with the consent of R. Simeon. For we learnt, R. Simeon said: Roofs, enclosures and courtyards are all one domain<sup>3</sup> in respect of utensils which spent the Sabbath therein,<sup>4</sup> but not in respect of utensils which rested in the house.<sup>5</sup>

R. Zera asked R. Assi: In the case of an alley in which they [its residents] have not become partners,<sup>6</sup> what about carrying in the whole of it?<sup>7</sup> do we say it is like a courtyard: just as a courtyard, even if an 'erub has not been made, it is permitted to carry in the whole of it,<sup>8</sup> so this too, though they have not become partners in it,<sup>9</sup> it is permitted to carry in the whole of it; or perhaps it is unlike a courtyard; for a courtyard has four walls [partitions], whereas this has not four walls; alternatively, a courtyard has tenants,<sup>10</sup> whereas this has no tenants? He was silent and said nothing to him. On a subsequent occasion he [R. Zera] found him [R. Assi] sitting and stating: 'R. Simeon b. Lakish said in the name of R. Judah the prince: They once forgot to bring a knife on Sabbath eve, so they brought it on the Sabbath. Now this matter was difficult for the Sages [to understand]: how could they abandon the opinion of the Sages and act as R. Eliezer: firstly, since R. Eliezer was [a

follower] of Beth Shammai;<sup>11</sup> and further, [where an individual and many [are in dispute], the halachah is as the many? Whereupon R. Oshaia said: I asked R. Judah the circumciser, and he told me, It was an alley wherein they [its residents] had not become partners, and they brought it [the knife] from one end to the other. Said he to him: Do you then hold that in the case of an alley in which they had not become partners, it is permitted to carry in the whole of it? Yes, he replied.' Said he [R. Zera] to him [R. Assi], But I once asked [it of] you and you did not answer me: perhaps in the rapid course [of your review] your tradition sped [back] to you?<sup>12</sup> Yes, he replied; in the course of my review my tradition sped [back] to me.

It was stated, R. Zera said in Rab's name: In the case of an alley in which no partnership had been made, one may not carry therein save within four cubits. Abaye observed, R. Zera stated this law but did not explain it, until Rabbah b. Abbuha came and explained it. For R. Nahman said in Rabbah b. Abbuha's name in Rab's name: In the case of an alley in which no partnership has been made, if the courtyards<sup>13</sup> are combined with the houses,<sup>14</sup> one may not carry therein [the alley] save within four cubits; [but] if the courtyards are not combined with the houses, one may carry over the whole of it.<sup>15</sup> R. Hanina Hoza'ah<sup>16</sup> said to Rabbah: Why does it differ when the courtyards are combined with the houses? [presumably] because the courtyards have been transformed<sup>17</sup> and are become houses,<sup>18</sup> Rab being consistent with his view; for Rab said: An alley does not become permitted [for carrying] through a stake and a beam unless

---

(1) It is a general principle (infra 133a) that where a positive command and a negative command are in question, both should be fulfilled wherever possible; hence it might be argued that R. Eliezer too agrees that it should not be carried through the street, since there is an alternative (Tosaf.). Yet it may be that since R. Eliezer's ruling is largely in order to emphasize the great esteem in which the precept is held (supra a), the Talmud felt that he would require it to be carried through the streets.

(2) Karpifoth; v. supra 7a.

(3) Carrying from one to another is permitted.

(4) I.e., which were there from the beginning of the Sabbath, v. 'Er. 91a.

(5) I.e., which were in the house at the beginning of the Sabbath. — Here the knife belonged to the former category (Tosaf.).

(6) By means of an 'erub; v. supra 23a.

(7) Sc. utensils which were there at the commencement of the Sabbath.

(8) Not from a house into the courtyard or from one courtyard into another, but in that courtyard itself.

(9) This is the technical term in respect of an alley, whereby it all ranks as a single and private domain for its residents.

(10) I.e., the residents of the houses which open into it put it to private use.

(11) So Rashi and Tosaf. on the strength of a statement in J. Sheb. IX, end; this does not mean that he actually belonged to the School of Shammai, but generally adopted their views (v. Weiss, Dor, II, p. 83, n. 2), which were always disregarded in favour of Beth Hillel's. Rashi suggests another meaning: he was under a ban (v. B.M. 59b).

(12) I.e., you recalled it. [Aliter: 'In the rapid course (of your study) your tradition escaped you', i.e., R. Oshaia's statement. V. Strashun].

(13) That open into the alley.

(14) Which give on the courtyards. I.e., all the houses served by the same courtyard are combined by means of an 'erub, so that they may carry to and fro between the houses and the courtyard belonging to same; but the courtyards themselves have not been made common partners in the alley.

(15) Sc. utensils which were in the alley at the beginning of the Sabbath.

(16) Of Be Hozae. V. p. 234, n. 3.

(17) Lit., 'torn away' from their original designation.

(18) I.e., they are now part of the houses and not courtyards at all.

## **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 131a**

houses and courtyards<sup>1</sup> open into it, whereas here we have houses but not courtyards?<sup>2</sup> Then even if

they are not combined, let us regard these houses as though closed [up],<sup>3</sup> so we have courtyards but not houses? — They can all renounce<sup>4</sup> their rights in favour of one.<sup>5</sup> But even so, we have a house, but not houses?<sup>6</sup> — It is possible that from morning until midday [they renounce their rights] in favour of one, and from midday until evening in favour of another.<sup>7</sup> But even so, when there is one there is not the other? — Rather said R. Ashi: What makes the courtyards interdicted [in respect of the alley]? [Of course] the houses; and these are non-existent.<sup>8</sup>

R. Hiyya b. Abba said in R. Johanan's name: Not in respect of everything did R. Eliezer rule that the preliminary preparations of a precept<sup>9</sup> supersede the Sabbath, for lo! the two loaves<sup>10</sup> are an obligation of the day,<sup>11</sup> yet R. Eliezer did not learn them<sup>12</sup> from aught but a *gezerah shawah*.<sup>13</sup> For it was taught, R. Eliezer said: Whence do we know that the preliminaries of the two loaves supersede the Sabbath? 'Bringing' is stated in connection with the 'omer,<sup>14</sup> and 'bringing' is stated in connection with the two loaves:<sup>15</sup> just as with the 'bringing' stated in connection with the 'omer, its preliminaries<sup>16</sup> supersede the Sabbath, so with the 'bringing' stated in connection with the two loaves their preliminaries supersede the Sabbath. These must be free,<sup>17</sup> for if they are not free one can refute [this analogy]: as for the 'omer, [its preliminaries supersede the Sabbath] because if one finds it [already] cut,<sup>18</sup> he must cut [other sheaves]; will you [then] say [the same] in the case of the two loaves, seeing that if one finds [the wheat therefore] cut he does not cut [any more]? in truth they are indeed free. [For] consider: it is written, then ye shall bring the sheaf of the first-fruits of your harvest unto the priest:<sup>19</sup> what is the purpose of 'from the day that ye brought'? Infer from it that it is in order to be free. Yet it is still free on one side only, while we know R. Eliezer to hold that where it is free on one side [only], we deduce, but refute? — 'Ye shall bring' is an extension.<sup>20</sup>

What is it to exclude?<sup>21</sup> Shall we say that it is to exclude the *lulab*,<sup>22</sup> surely it was taught: The *lulab* and all its preliminaries supersede the Sabbath: this is R. Eliezer's view! Again, if it is to exclude *sukkah*,<sup>23</sup> — surely it was taught: The *sukkah* and all its preliminaries supersede the Sabbath: this is R. Eliezer's view! Again, if it is to exclude unleavened bread, — surely it was taught: Unleavened bread and all its preliminaries supersede the Sabbath: this is R. Eliezer's view! If, on the other hand, it is to exclude the *shofar*,<sup>24</sup> surely it was taught: The *shofar* and all its preliminaries supersede the Sabbath: this is R. Eliezer's view! — Said R. Adda b. Ahabah: It is to exclude fringes for one's garment and *mezuzah* for one's door.<sup>25</sup> It was taught likewise: And they agree that if one inserts fringes in his garment or affixes a *mezuzah* to his door,<sup>26</sup> he is culpable. What is the reason? R. Joseph said: Because no [definite] time is appointed for them. Said Abaye to him, On the contrary, since no time is appointed for them,

---

(1) I.e., two courtyards with two houses opening into each. V. 'Er. 5a and 73b.

(2) And for this reason when the courtyards are combined with the houses it is not permissible to carry save within four cubits.

(3) Since one cannot carry from the houses into the alley on account of the intervening courtyards. [The courtyards were in front of the houses.]

(4) Lit., 'annul'.

(5) The tenants of all the houses save one can renounce their rights in the courtyard in his favour; the courtyard is then his, and he may carry from his house into it.

(6) Whereas Rab needs at least two houses, v. p. 654, n.8.

(7) Thus we have houses.

(8) Rab holds ('Er. 74a) that a roof, courtyards, enclosures, and the alley are all one domain, and carrying is permitted from one to another, provided, however, that the houses are not combined with the courtyards, so that no utensils belonging to the houses are to be found in the courtyards which might then be carried into the alley. Hence the same applies to carrying in the alley itself: for if there are no houses at all a formal partnership is unnecessary, and carrying in the alley is permitted, just as from the alley into the courtyard. Since the houses are not combined with the courtyards and no utensils may be moved from the former into the latter, for all practical purposes the houses are non-existent: therefore one may carry over the whole of the alley itself.

- (9) As distinct from the precept itself.
- (10) Which are offered on the Feast of Weeks, v. Lev. XXIII, 17.
- (11) Sc. the Feast of Weeks, and must not be postponed for the next day.
- (12) That their baking supersedes the Sabbath; not the baking, but the offering 'unto the Lord' is the actual precept, the former being merely a necessary preparation.
- (13) V. Glos. But if he held that all preparations supersede the Sabbath, they would not require the *gezerah shawah* in this particular case.
- (14) V. Glos.
- (15) Ibid. vv. 15, 17.
- (16) Viz., the reaping, grinding. and sifting; Men. 72a.
- (17) I.e., from the day that ye brought (v. 15) and 'ye shall bring' (v. 17) must have no other purpose than this *gezerah shawah*. There are three views on this matter: (i) Both parts of the *gezerah shawah* must be free, otherwise it can be refuted if they are dissimilar in other respects; (ii) Only one part must be free; and (iii) Even if both parts are required for another teaching too, the *gezerah shawah* cannot be refuted.
- (18) But not for the express purpose of fulfilling the precept.
- (19) Lev. XXIII, 10.
- (20) Since Scripture could write, and ye shall offer a new meal-offering unto the Lord out of your habitations etc. The extension embraces the preliminaries of bringing, and intimates that these supersede the Sabbath.
- (21) R. Johanan's statement that R. Eliezer did not rule that the preliminaries of all precepts etc.
- (22) V. Glos. and Lev. XXIII, 40.
- (23) V. Glos. and ibid. v. 42.
- (24) V. Glos. and ibid. v. 24.
- (25) These must not be inserted or affixed on the Sabbath.
- (26) On the Sabbath,

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 131b

every moment<sup>1</sup> is the [proper] time for them? — Rather said R. Nahman b. Isaac others state, R. Huna son of R. Joshua: Because it is in one's power to renounce their ownership.<sup>2</sup>

The Master said: 'The lulab and all its preliminaries supersede the Sabbath: this is R. Eliezer's view.' Whence does R. Eliezer know this? If from the 'omer and the two loaves, [that may be] because they are requirements of the Most High?<sup>3</sup> — Rather Scripture saith, [And ye shall take ye] on the [first] day [...branches of palm trees, etc.]:<sup>4</sup> 'on the day' [intimating,] even on the Sabbath.<sup>5</sup> Now in respect of which law?<sup>6</sup> Shall we say, in respect of handling?<sup>7</sup> Is a verse necessary to authorize handling?<sup>8</sup> Hence it must be in respect of its preliminaries<sup>9</sup>. And the Rabbis?<sup>10</sup> That is required [to teach], by day,<sup>11</sup> but not by night. Then R. Eliezer: whence does he [learn] 'by day but not by night'? He deduces it from, and ye shall rejoice before the Lord your God seven days:<sup>12</sup> days only, not nights. And the Rabbis?<sup>13</sup> — It is necessary: you might argue, Let us learn [the meaning of] seven day's from the seven days of sukkah.- just as there 'days' [means] and even nights,<sup>14</sup> so here too 'days', and even nights: hence it teaches us [otherwise]. Then let the Divine Law state it<sup>15</sup> in the case of lulab, and these [others]<sup>16</sup> could be adduced and learnt therefrom?<sup>17</sup> — Because one could refute [the analogy]: as for lulab, [its preliminaries supersede the Sabbath] because it requires four species.<sup>18</sup> 'The sukkah and all its preliminaries supersede the Sabbath: this is R. Eliezer's view.' Whence does R. Eliezer learn this? If from the 'omer and the two loaves, — [there it may be] because they are requirements of the Most High; if from lulab, — [that may be] because it requires four species! Rather [the scope of] seven days' is deduced from the 'seven days' of lulab: just as there its preliminaries supersede the Sabbath, so here too its preliminaries supersede the Sabbath.<sup>19</sup> Then let the Divine Law write it in connection with sukkah, and these [others] could be adduced and learnt therefrom? — Because one could refute [the analogy]: as for sukkah, that is because it [the precept] is binding by night just as by day.

‘Unleavened bread and all its preliminaries supersede the Sabbath: this is R. Eliezer's view.’ Whence does R. Eliezer know this? If from the ‘omer and the two loaves, — [there it may be] because they are requirements of the Most High? If from lulab, because it requires four species? If from sukkah, — because it is binding by night just as by day? Rather the meaning of ‘the fifteenth [day]’ is learnt from the Festival of Tabernacles:<sup>20</sup> just as there its preliminaries supersede the Sabbath, so here too its preliminaries supersede the Sabbath. Then let the Divine Law State it in connection with unleavened bread, and these [others] could be adduced and learnt therefrom? — Because one could refute [the analogy]: as for unleavened bread, that is because it is obligatory upon women just as upon men.<sup>21</sup> ‘The shofar and all its preliminaries supersede the Sabbath: this is R. Eliezer's view., Whence does R. Eliezer know this? If from the ‘omer and the two loaves, — because they are requirements of the Most-High? If from lulab, — because it requires four species? If from sukkah, — because it is binding by night just as by day? if from unleavened bread, — because it is obligatory upon women just as upon men? — Rather Scripture saith, It is in day of blowing of trumpets unto you:<sup>22</sup> [it must be blown] by day, even on the Sabbath. And in respect of what?<sup>23</sup> Shall we say in respect of blowing [the shofar], — but the School of Samuel<sup>24</sup> taught: Ye shall do no servile work:<sup>25</sup> the blowing of the shofar’ and the removal of bread [from an oven] are excluded as being an art, not work. Hence [it must be] in respect of [its] preliminaries. And the<sup>26</sup> Rabbis? — That is required [to teach], by day but not by night. Then R. Eliezer, whence does he learn, by day but not by night? — He deduces it from, in the day of atonement shall ye send abroad the trumpet throughout all your land,<sup>27</sup> and these<sup>28</sup> are learnt from each other.<sup>29</sup> Now, let the Divine Law state it in connection with shofar, and these [others] can come and be learnt therefrom? One cannot learn from the blowing of the shofar on New Year, because it brings the remembrance of Israel to their Father in Heaven.<sup>30</sup> One cannot learn from the blowing of the shofar on the day of atonement [either], because a Master said: When the Beth din blew the shofar, slaves departed to their homes and estates reverted to their [original] owners.<sup>31</sup>

Circumcision and all its preliminaries supersede the Sabbath: this is R. Eliezer's view. Whence does R. Eliezer learn this? If he learns [it] from all [the others, the objection is] as we stated.<sup>32</sup> Moreover, as for those,

- 
- (1) Lit., ‘hour’.
  - (2) Thus, when he comes to do it on the Sabbath, he could renounce ownership of the garment or the house, in which case these precepts are no longer incumbent on him.
  - (3) I.e., they are a direct offering.
  - (4) Lev. XXIII, 40.
  - (5) For ‘on the first’ suffices: hence ‘day’ teaches that the ceremony must be performed whatever the day.
  - (6) Is this intimation necessary?
  - (7) Permitting the handling of the lulab on the Sabbath.
  - (8) Surely not, for the interdict of handling is only Rabbinical.
  - (9) E.g., carrying the lulab through the streets, which would otherwise be Biblically forbidden.
  - (10) How do they interpret the superfluous ‘day’?
  - (11) The lulab precept has to be performed by day.
  - (12) Ibid.
  - (13) Do they not admit that it can be deduced from this latter verse?
  - (14) This is deduced in Suk. 43a.
  - (15) This law that the preliminaries supersede the Sabbath.
  - (16) Sc. the ‘omer and the two loaves.
  - (17) That there too it is thus: why are separate verses required?
  - (18) Vis., those enumerated in Lev. XXIII, 40. Hence it is important that even its preliminaries supersede the Sabbath.
  - (19) Since this analogy is based on a gezerah shawah, it cannot be refuted as before, when the suggested analogy was based purely on logical grounds. (Rashi).
  - (20) Lev. XXIII, vv. 6 and 39.

- (21) They too must partake thereof; v. Pes. 43b. But the precepts of lulab and sukkah are not incumbent upon women.
- (22) Num. XXIX, 1.
- (23) Does 'day' extend the law even to the Sabbath.
- (24) This is rather unusual. Generally we have 'the School of R. Ishmael', and the present passage is so quoted supra 117b in cur. edd. R. Han. however, reads 'the School of Samuel' there too, and it is likewise so in R.H. 29b in cur. edd. Weiss, Dor, III, p. 169 maintains that the reference is to a collection of Baraitas compiled by Samuel. It may also be observed that the verse quoted here is not the same as that quoted supra in cur. edd., though Tosaf.'s reading is identical in both places. It is barely possible that two different Baraitas are referred to, both making the same deduction but from different verses.
- (25) Lev. XXIII, 25.
- (26) Hence no verse is required to teach that it is permitted.
- (27) Ibid. XXV, 9.
- (28) Sc. the blowing of the shofar on New Year and on the day of atonement.
- (29) As shown in R.H. 33b.
- (30) Hence it is so important that even its preliminaries supersede the Sabbath. But the same may not apply to other precepts.
- (31) In accordance with Lev. XXV, 10. Hence this too was of particularly great importance.
- (32) Each differs in some respect.

### Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 132a

[they may supersede the Sabbath] because if their time passes they are annulled!<sup>1</sup> Rather this is R. Eliezer's reason: Because Scripture saith, and in the eighth day the flesh of his foreskin shall be circumcised,<sup>2</sup> [implying] even on the Sabbath.<sup>3</sup> Then let the Divine Law write it in connection with circumcision, and these [others] can come to be deduced thence? Because one can refute [the analogy]: as for circumcision, that is because thirteen covenants were made in connection therewith.<sup>4</sup>

Now, the Rabbis disagree with R. Eliezer only in respect of the preliminaries of circumcision; but as for circumcision itself, all hold that it supersedes the Sabbath: whence do we know it? Said 'Ulla, It is a traditional law;<sup>5</sup> and thus did R. Isaac say, It is a traditional law.

An objection is raised: How do we know that the saving of life supersedes the Sabbath? R. Eleazar b. 'Azariah said: If circumcision, which is [performed on but] one of the limbs of man, supersedes the Sabbath, the saving of life, a *minori*, must supersede the Sabbath. Now if you think that it is a traditional law, can one argue a *minori* from a traditional law? Surely it was taught, R. Eleazar said to him: Akiba! [That] a bone [of a corpse] the size of a barley grain defiles<sup>6</sup> is a traditional law, whereas [that] a quarter [log] of blood [of a corpse] defies is [deduced by you] a *minori*,<sup>7</sup> and we do not argue a *minori* from a traditional law! — Rather said R. Eleazar: We learn 'a sign' [written in connection with circumcision from] 'a sign' [written in connection with the Sabbath].<sup>8</sup> If so, let Tefillin, in connection with which 'sign'<sup>9</sup> is written, supersede the Sabbath?<sup>10</sup> — Rather 'covenant' is learnt from, 'covenant'.<sup>11</sup> Then let [the circumcision of] an adult, in connection with whom 'covenant' is written,<sup>12</sup> supersede the Sabbath?<sup>13</sup> — Rather 'generations' is learnt from 'generations'.<sup>14</sup> Then let fringes, in connection with which 'generations' is written,<sup>15</sup> supersede the Sabbath?<sup>16</sup> Rather said R. Nahman b. Isaac: We learn 'sign,' 'covenant' and 'generations' from 'sign,' 'covenant' and 'generations,' thus excluding the others in connection with each of which only one is written.

R. Johanan said: Scripture saith, in the [eighth] day, 'in the day' [implying] even on the Sabbath.<sup>17</sup> Resh Lakish objected to R. Johanan: If so, those who lack atonement,<sup>18</sup> in connection with whom 'in the day' is written,<sup>19</sup> do they too supersede the Sabbath?<sup>20</sup> — That is required [for teaching], by day but not by night.<sup>21</sup> But this too<sup>22</sup> is required [for teaching], by day but not by night? That is deduced from, and he that is eight days old.<sup>23</sup> But this too can be derived from, in the day that he commanded

[the children of Israel to offer their oblations, etc.]?<sup>24</sup> — Though it may be derived from, in the day that he commanded, [etc.], yet it [the other verse] is necessary: you might argue, Since the Merciful One had compassion upon him, [permitting him] to bring [a lesser sacrifice] in poverty, he may bring [it] at night too: hence we are informed [otherwise]. Rabina demurred: If so,<sup>25</sup> let a zar and an onen<sup>26</sup> be eligible for them?<sup>27</sup> Surely Scripture brought him back.<sup>28</sup>

R. Aha b. Jacob said, Scripture saith, ‘the eighth’, [intimating] the eighth, even if it is the Sabbath. But this ‘eighth’ is required to exclude the seventh?—That follows from, ‘and the that is eight days old’. Yet they are still required, one to exclude the seventh and the other to exclude the ninth, for if [we deduced] from one [verse only] I might say, only the seventh is excluded, since its time [for circumcision] has not [yet] arrived, but from the eighth onward that is the [right] time? Hence it is clear [that it must be explained] as R. Johanan.

It was taught in accordance with R. Johanan and not as R. Aha b. Jacob: ‘[And in] the eighth [day the flesh of his foreskin] shall be circumcised’: even on the Sabbath. Then to what do I apply, every one that profaneth it shall surely be put to death?<sup>29</sup> To labours other than circumcision. Yet perhaps it is not so, but [it includes] even circumcision, whilst to what do I apply ‘in the eighth... shall be circumcised’: [To all days] except the Sabbath? Therefore ‘in the day’ is stated, [teaching], even on the Sabbath.

Raba observed: Why was this Tanna content at first, and what was his difficulty eventually?<sup>30</sup> — He argues thus: ‘[in] the eighth shall be circumcised’: even on the Sabbath. Then to what do I apply, every one that profaneth it shall be put to death?’ To labours other than circumcision, but circumcision supersedes it. What is the reason? It [follows] a minori. If leprosy, which suspends the sacrificial service,<sup>31</sup>

---

(1) They must be performed at a certain time or not at all. But circumcision, though obligatory for the eighth day from birth, can and must be performed afterwards if not done then.

(2) Lev. XII, 3.

(3) It cannot be to teach that circumcision itself is performed on the Sabbath, because as stated infra that is already known by tradition, hence it must refer to its preliminaries.

(4) In the passage enjoining circumcision upon Abraham and his descendants (Gen. XVII) ‘covenant’ is mentioned thirteen times, which shows its great importance.

(5) Rashi: Received from Moses on Sinai.

(6) A nazirite by its touch, and he must commence again (cf. Num, VI, 9-12).

(7) R. Akiba deduced a minori from the former that if a nazirite is under the same covering as a quarter log of blood taken from a corpse he is defiled, just as in the first case; v. Naz. 57a.

(8) Circumcision: and it shall be a sign of a covenant betwixt me and you (Gen. XVII, 11); Sabbath: for it is a sign between me and you (Ex. XXXI, 13). Since both are so designated, it follows that the former must be performed even on the latter.

(9) Deut. VI, 8: And thou shalt bind them for a sign upon thine hand.

(10) [Probably, one should be permitted to carry them on him in the street on the Sabbath].

(11) V. n. 2 for circumcision; Sabbath: therefore the children of Israel shall keep the Sabbath...for a perpetual covenant (Ex. XXXI, 16).

(12) Gen, XVII, 14: And the uncircumcised male who is not circumcised in the flesh of his foreskin...hath broken my covenant. In Kid. 29a this is referred to an adult whom his father had omitted to circumcise, and it throws the obligation upon himself.

(13) Whereas it is stated infra that it supersedes the Sabbath only when performed on the eighth day.

(14) Sabbath: to observe the Sabbath throughout their generations (Ex. XXXI, 16); circumcision: every male throughout your generations (Gen. XVII, 12).

(15) Num. XV 38: bid them...make them fringes...throughout their generations.

(16) I.e., let it be permitted to insert them in garments on the Sabbath.

(17) This is according to the Rabbis. R. Eliezer, as stated supra, utilizes this in respect of the preliminaries. Hence he holds that circumcision itself is a traditional law, whilst he learns that life saving is permitted from a Scriptural verse (Yoma 85b).

(18) This is the technical designation of all unclean persons who must offer a sacrifice as part of their purification rites, viz., a zab and a zabah, a leper, and a woman after childbirth.

(19) E.g., this shall be the law of the leper in the day of his cleansing (Lev. XIV, 2); similarly the rest.

(20) They are surely not permitted to bring their offerings on the Sabbath, for only public sacrifices were permitted on them.

(21) Sacrifices may not be offered up at night.

(22) 'Day' written in connection with circumcision.

(23) Gen. XVII. 12.

(24) Lev. VII, 38.

(25) That the leniency shown in poverty might be regarded as permitting other things which normally invalidate the sacrifice.

(26) V. Glos. for both.

(27) Sc. to offer these sacrifices. A zar may kill the sacrifice, but cannot perform any of the other services in connection therewith.

(28) In fact we see that this leniency was not extended to permission to offer at night: thus in all other respects the poor are governed by the same rules as the rich.

(29) Ex. XXXI, 14.

(30) Why does he assume at first that the eighth naturally supersedes the Sabbath, whereas subsequently he finds a difficulty in this assumption and proposes to reverse it?

(31) It is stated infra b that one may not cut away a leprous bright spot in order to be clean, and this holds good even on Passover: individuals may not do so in order to bring the Passover sacrifice, nor may Priests to enable them to perform the sacrificial service.

## **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 132b**

whilst the sacrificial service supersedes the Sabbath,<sup>1</sup> yet circumcision supersedes it:<sup>2</sup> then the Sabbath, which is superseded by the sacrificial service, surely circumcision supersedes it. And what is the 'or perhaps it is not so' which he states? — He then argues [thus]: yet whence [does it follow] that leprosy is more stringent? Perhaps the Sabbath is more stringent, since there are many penalties and injunctions in connection therewith. Further, whence [does it follow] that it<sup>3</sup> is because leprosy is more stringent, perhaps it is because the man is not fit;<sup>4</sup> whilst to what do I apply, 'in the eighth... shall be circumcised', [to all days] except the Sabbath? Therefore 'in the day' is stated, teaching, even on the Sabbath.

Our Rabbis taught: Circumcision supersedes leprosy, whether [performed] at its [proper] time<sup>5</sup> or not at its [proper] time; it supersedes Festivals only [when performed] at its [proper] time. How do we know this? — Because our Rabbis taught: 'The flesh of his foreskin shall be circumcised', even if a bahereth<sup>6</sup> is there it must be cut off. Then to what do I apply, 'Take heed in the plague of leprosy'<sup>7</sup>? To other places, but excluding the foreskin. Or perhaps it is not so, but [it includes] even the foreskin, while how do I apply, 'the flesh of his foreskin shall be circumcised', when it does not contain a bahereth! Therefore 'flesh' is stated, intimating even when a bahereth is there. Raba observed: This Tanna, why was he content at first, and what was his difficulty eventually? He argues thus: 'The flesh of his foreskin shall be circumcised': even if a bahereth is there. Then to what do I apply: 'Take heed in the plague of leprosy'? To other places, excluding the foreskin, yet circumcision supersedes leprosy. What is the reason? Because it is inferred a minori: if circumcision supersedes the Sabbath, which is stringent, how much more so leprosy. And what is the 'or perhaps it is not so' which he states? He then argues: how do we know that the Sabbath is more stringent: perhaps leprosy is more stringent, since it supersedes the sacrificial service, while the sacrificial service supersedes the Sabbath? Therefore flesh is stated, intimating, even when a bahereth is there.

Another version: circumcision supersedes leprosy: what is the reason? Because a positive command<sup>8</sup> comes and supersedes a negative command.<sup>9</sup> Then what is the 'or is it not so' which he states? He then argues: Perhaps we rule that a positive command comes and supersedes a negative command [only in the case of] a negative command by itself but this is a positive command plus a negative command.<sup>10</sup> Then how do I apply, the flesh of his foreskin shall be circumcised? When it does not contain a bahereth. Therefore flesh is stated, intimating, even when a bahereth is there.

Now, this is well of an adult, in connection with whom 'flesh' is written; of an infant too 'flesh is written; but whence do we know one of intermediate age?<sup>11</sup> Said Abaye, It is inferred from the other two combined:<sup>12</sup> it cannot be inferred from an adult [alone], Since there is the penalty of kareth<sup>13</sup> [in his case]; it cannot be inferred from an infant [eight days old], since [there] it is circumcision at the proper time. The feature common to both is that they must be circumcised and they supersede leprosy: so all who must be circumcised supersede leprosy.

Raba said: [That] circumcision at the proper time supersedes [leprosy] requires no verse, [for] it is inferred a minori: If it supersedes the Sabbath, which is [more] stringent, how much more so leprosy! Said R. Safra to Raba: How do you know that the Sabbath is [more] stringent, perhaps leprosy is [more] stringent, seeing that it supersedes the sacrificial service, whilst the sacrificial service supersedes the Sabbath? — There it is not because leprosy is more stringent but because the person is unfit. Why so? Let him cut off the bahereth and perform the service? — He [still] lacks tebillah. This is well of unclean eruptions! what can be said of clean eruptions?<sup>14</sup> — Rather R. Ashi said: Where do we rule that a positive command comes and supersedes a negative one? E.g., circumcision in [the place of] leprosy, or fringes and kil'ayim,<sup>15</sup> where at the very moment that the negative injunction is disregarded<sup>16</sup> the positive command is fulfilled;<sup>17</sup> but here at the moment that the negative injunction is disregarded the positive command is not fulfilled.<sup>18</sup>

Now, this [discussion] of Raba and R. Safra

---

(1) Public sacrifices being brought thereon.

(2) The injunction not to cut away a leprous bright spot is disregarded when it is on the foreskin which is to be circumcised.

(3) Sc. the reason that the sacrificial service does not supersede leprosy.

(4) For, as stated infra, even if the bright spot is cut away he is still unfit to offer the Passover sacrifice until he performs tebillah and the sun sets.

(5) The eighth day from birth.

(6) A bright, snow-white v. Neg. I, 1 spot on the skin, which is a symptom of leprosy (Lev. Xli, 2 seq.).

(7) Deut, XXIV, 8; this is interpreted as an injunction against cutting away a leprous bright spot, etc,

(8) To circumcise

(9) Not to cut the bahereth away.

(10) Negative: Take heed in the plague of leprosy, 'Take heed' always being so regarded; positive: that thou observe diligently, etc.

(11) The following three passages are applied to three different cases of circumcision: (i) And the uncircumcised male who is not circumcised in the flesh of his foreskin, that soul shall be cut off from his people (Gen. XVII, 14) — this applies to an adult whom his father did not circumcise as an infant. (ii) And in the eighth day the flesh of his foreskin shall be circumcised (Lev. XII, 3) this is a command to the father of the child. (iii) Every male among you shall be circumcised (Gen. XVII, 10) — this is a general command, e.g., to the Beth din, for a child to be circumcised after his eighth day if not circumcised at the proper time. Now, 'flesh' is written in (i) and (ii), but not in (iii), which refers to a child of intermediate age, i.e., between eight days and thirteen years and a day, when he becomes an adult.

(12) Lit., 'from between them'.

(13) V. Glos.

(14) E.g., where the leprosy covers the whole skin (v. Lev. XII, 12f). Even then it must not be cut away and supersedes the sacrificial service.

(15) V. Glos. and Deut. XXII, 11f: Thou shalt not wear a mingled stuff, wool and linen together. Thou shalt make thee fringes upon the four borders of thy vesture. The juxtaposition of these two laws is interpreted as showing that the former is suspended in the case of fringes, and the garment may be of linen while the fringes are of wool.

(16) Lit., 'uprooted'.

(17) I.e., the latter is fulfilled through the disregard of the former.

(18) The cutting away of the bahereth itself is not a fulfilment of the command to offer a Passover sacrifice, but merely preliminary thereto, so that the fact that leprosy supersedes the sacrificial service is no mark of the stringency of leprosy.

### **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 133a**

is [a controversy between] Tannaim. For it was taught: 'Flesh', and even if a bahereth is there, 'it shall be circumcised': the words of R. Josiah. R. Jonathan said: This is unnecessary: if it supersedes the Sabbath [which is more] Stringent, how much more so leprosy.<sup>1</sup>

The Master said: "'Flesh", and even if a bahereth is there, "it shall be circumcised": the words of R. Josiah.' Why is a verse required for this: it is an unintentional act,<sup>2</sup> and an unintentional act is permitted? — Said Abaye, This is only necessary according to R. Judah, who maintains: An unintentional act is forbidden. Raba said, You may even say [according to] R. Simeon: R. Simeon admits in the case of 'cut off his head but let him not die.'<sup>3</sup> Now, does not Abaye accept this reasoning? Surely Abaye and Raba both said, R. Simeon admits in the case of, 'cut off his head but let him not die'? — After hearing it from Raba he accepted its logic.

Others recite this [dictum] of Abaye and Raba in reference to the following: Take heed in the plague of leprosy, that thou observe diligently, to do [etc.]:<sup>4</sup> 'to do' thou art forbidden,<sup>5</sup> but thou mayest effect it by means of bast on the foot or a pole on the shoulder, and if it goes it goes.<sup>6</sup> But what need of a verse for this: it is an unintentional act, and an unintentional act is permitted? — Said Abaye: It is only necessary according to R. Judah, who maintained: An unintentional act is forbidden. But Raba said: You may even say [that it agrees with] R. Simeon, yet R. Simeon admits in the case of 'cut off his head but let him not die.' Now, does not Abaye accept this reasoning? Surely Abaye and Raba both said, R. Simeon admits in the case of 'cut off his head but let him not die'? After hearing it from Raba, he accepted its logic.

Now Abaye on R. Simeon's view,<sup>7</sup> how does he utilize this [word] 'flesh'? — Said R. Amram: As referring to one who asserts that it is his intention to cut off his bahereth.<sup>8</sup> That is well of an adult: what can be said of an infant?<sup>9</sup> Said R. Mesharsheya: It refers to the infant's father who asserts that it is his [specific] intention to cut off his son's bahereth. Then if there is another,<sup>10</sup> let another perform it; for R. Simeon b. Lakish said: Wherever you find a positive command and a negative command [in opposition], if you can fulfil both of them, it is preferable;<sup>11</sup> but if not, let the positive command come and supersede the negative command?<sup>12</sup> — This is where there is no stranger.

The Master said, 'It supersedes Festivals only [when performed] at its [proper] time.' Hezekiah said, and the School of Hezekiah taught likewise: And ye shall let nothing of it remain until the morning [but that which remaineth of it] until the morning [ye shall burn with fire]:<sup>13</sup> now [the second] until the morning need not be stated: What then is the teaching of, until the morning? Scripture comes to appoint the second morning for its burning. Abaye said: Scripture saith, the burnt-offering of the Sabbath [shall be burnt] on its Sabbath,<sup>14</sup> but not the burnt-offering of weekdays on the Sabbath, nor the burnt-offering of weekdays on Festivals. Raba said: Scripture saith, [no manner of work shall be done in them save that which every man must eat], that only may be done of you:<sup>15</sup> 'that', but not its preliminaries; 'only', but not circumcision out of its proper time, which might [otherwise] be inferred a minori. R. Ashi said: [On the seventh day is a Sabbath of] holy rest [shabbathon]<sup>16</sup> is an affirmative precept, thus there is an affirmative and a negative precept in respect of Festivals, and an affirmative precept cannot supersede a negative plus an affirmative

precept.<sup>17</sup>

R. AKIBA STATED A GENERAL PRINCIPLE, etc. Rab Judah said in Rab's name: The halachah is as R. Akiba. And we learnt similarly in respect to the Passover sacrifice: R. Akiba stated a general principle: Any labour which can be performed on the eve of the Sabbath does not supersede the Sabbath; slaughtering [the Passover sacrifice], which can not be done on the eve of the Sabbath,<sup>18</sup> supersedes the Sabbath; and Rab Judah said in Rab's name: The halachah is as R. Akiba. And these are necessary. For if he informed us [of the halachah] in connection with circumcision, — It is only there that the preparatory requirements which could be done the previous day do not supersede the Sabbath, since there is no kareth,<sup>19</sup> but as for the Passover sacrifice, where there is kareth,<sup>20</sup> you might argue, Let them [the preliminaries] supersede the Sabbath. And if he told us [the halachah] about the Passover sacrifice, — that is because thirteen covenants were not made in connection therewith; but as for circumcision, seeing that thirteen covenants were made in connection therewith<sup>21</sup> I would say, Let them [the preliminaries] supersede the Sabbath — Thus they are necessary.<sup>22</sup>

MISHNAH. WE PERFORM ALL THE REQUIREMENTS OF CIRCUMCISION ON THE SABBATH. WE CIRCUMCISE,<sup>23</sup> UNCOVER [THE CORONA],<sup>24</sup> SUCK [THE WOUND],<sup>25</sup> AND PLACE A COMPRESS AND CUMMIN UPON IT.<sup>26</sup> IF ONE DID NOT CRUSH [THE CUMMIN] ON THE EVE OF THE SABBATH, HE MUST CHEW [IT] WITH HIS TEETH AND APPLY [IT TO THE WOUND]; IF HE DID NOT BEAT UP WINE AND OIL ON THE EVE OF THE SABBATH,<sup>27</sup> EACH MUST BE APPLIED SEPARATELY. WE MAY NOT MAKE A HALUK<sup>28</sup> FOR IT IN THE FIRST PLACE, BUT MUST WRAP A RAG ABOUT IT. IF THIS WAS NOT PREPARED FROM THE EVE OF THE SABBATH, ONE WINDS IT ABOUT HIS FINGER<sup>29</sup> AND BRINGS IT, AND EVEN THROUGH ANOTHER COURTYARD.

---

(1) Thus R. Josiah learns that circumcision at the proper time supersedes leprosy from 'flesh', whilst the same for circumcision after the eighth day must be inferred from the common feature (v. supra 132b), this agreeing with R. Safra's rejection of Raba's argument. Whereas R. Jonathan infers the former a minori, so that 'flesh' may be applied to the other case, as Raba.

(2) Sc. the cutting away of the bahereth.

(3) V. p. 357, n. 8.

(4) Deut. XXIV, 8.

(5) Lit., 'thou mayest not do'. I.e., one may not intentionally cut off a bahereth.

(6) I.e., one need not refrain from wearing a tight shoe of bast or carrying a heavy burden on his shoulder, though these may remove the bahereth.

(7) Before he accepted Raba's dictum.

(8) In order to be rendered clean. Yet even so it is permitted for the sake of circumcision.

(9) Eight days old. He has no intention, yet 'flesh' is written in his case too (v. supra 132b, p. 665 n. 1).

(10) Available to perform the circumcision — the prohibition concerning the bahereth will not apply to him, since he has no interest in the child's ritual cleanness.

(11) Thus, if a stranger performs it, the positive command of circumcision is fulfilled without violating the injunction of leprosy, since the stranger has no such intention.

(12) And thus the question remains: what need is there for the word 'flesh' in the case of the infant?

(13) Ex. XII, 10.

(14) Num. XXVIII, 10.

(15) Ex. XII, 16.

(16) Lev. XXIII, 3.

(17) V. supra 24b and 25a for notes. From all the foregoing we see that labour which can be done on weekdays or which belongs primarily to weekdays does not supersede Festivals even in the fulfilment of a precept, and the same applies here.

(18) If the fourteenth of Nisan falls on the Sabbath.

- (19) When circumcision is postponed.  
 (20) For not offering it.  
 (21) V. supra 132a top.  
 (22) V. Pes. 66a.  
 (23) Cut off the foreskin.  
 (24) Peri'ah. By splitting the the membrane and pulling it down.  
 (25) Mezizah. Nowadays the suction is accomplished by means of a glass cylinder.  
 (26) To make the wound heal.  
 (27) This too was applied to the wound.  
 (28) A kind of shirt-shaped bandage placed over the membrum and tied at the corona, to prevent the flesh from growing back and recovering the membrum.  
 (29) As though it were a garment, so that it shall not be carried just like on weekdays.

### **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 133b**

GEMARA. Consider: He [the Tanna] states them all [separately]: what is ALL THE REQUIREMENTS OF CIRCUMCISION to include? — It is to include that which our Rabbis taught: He who circumcises,<sup>1</sup> as long as he is engaged in the circumcision, he returns both for the shreds [of the corona] which invalidate the circumcision and for those which do not invalidate the circumcision.<sup>2</sup> Once he has withdrawn,<sup>3</sup> he returns on account of the shreds which invalidate the circumcision, but not for the shreds which do not invalidate the circumcision.

Who teaches: Once he has withdrawn, he must not return? Said Rabbah b. Bar Hanah in R. Johanan's name: It is R. Ishmael the son of R. Johanan b. Berokah. For it was taught: If the fourteenth [of Nisan] falls on the Sabbath, the passover sacrifice is flayed as far as the breast: this is the view of R. Ishmael the son of R. Johanan b. Berokah. But the Sages maintain: We flay the whole of it.<sup>4</sup> But how so? R. Johanan may rule [thus] only there, because we do not require [the application of the verse,] This is my God, and I will adorn him,<sup>5</sup> but here that we require, 'This is my God, and I will adorn him',<sup>6</sup> that indeed is so!<sup>7</sup> (For it was taught: This is my God, and I will adorn him: [i.e.,] adorn thyself before Him in [the fulfilment of] precepts. [Thus:] make a beautiful sukkah in His honour,<sup>8</sup> a beautiful lulab, a beautiful shofar, beautiful fringes, and a beautiful Scroll of the Law, and write it with fine ink, a fine reed [-pen], and a skilled penman, and wrap it about with beautiful silks. Abba Saul interpreted, and I will be like him:<sup>9</sup> be thou like Him: just as He is gracious and compassionate, so be thou gracious and compassionate.) — Rather said R. Ashi, Which [Tanna] is this? It is R. Jose. For we learnt: Whether it is clearly visible or it is not clearly visible,<sup>10</sup> the Sabbath is desecrated on its account.<sup>11</sup> R. Jose ruled: If it is clearly visible, they must not desecrate the Sabbath for it.<sup>12</sup> But how so? Perhaps R. Jose rules [thus] only there, because the Sabbath was not given to be superseded,<sup>13</sup> but here that the Sabbath was given to be superseded,<sup>14</sup> it indeed is so?<sup>15</sup> — Rather said the scholars of Nehardea: It is the Rabbis who disagree with R. Jose. For we learnt: Four priests entered:<sup>16</sup> two held two courses [of loaves] in their hands, and two held two censers;<sup>17</sup> and four preceded them, two in order to remove the two courses,<sup>18</sup> and two to remove the two censers. Those who brought in [the new loaves and frankincense] stood in the north facing the south,<sup>19</sup> while those who carried [them] out stood in the south facing the north:<sup>20</sup> these withdrew [the old] and these laid down [the new], the handbreadth of one at the side of the handbreadth of the other,<sup>21</sup> because it is said, [And thou shalt set upon the table shewbread] before me always.<sup>22</sup> R. Jose said: Even if these remove and the other replace [it later], that too constitutes 'always'.<sup>23</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: The membrum must be trimmed,<sup>24</sup> and if one does not trim it, he is punished with kareth. Who? R. Kahana said: The surgeon.<sup>25</sup> R. Papa demurred 'The surgeon'! he can say to them, 'I have performed half of the precept: do you perform half of the precept.'<sup>26</sup> Rather said R. Papa: An adult.<sup>27</sup> R. Ashi demurred: Of an adult it is explicitly stated, and the uncircumcised male who is not circumcised in the flesh of his foreskin, [that soul shall be cut off from his people]?<sup>28</sup>

Rather said R. Ashi: In truth it means the surgeon: e.g., if he came at twilight on the Sabbath, and they warned him, 'you have no time,'<sup>29</sup> but he insisted, 'I have time : So he performed it but had not time [to complete it]. Thus the net result is<sup>30</sup> that he [merely] made a wound,<sup>31</sup> hence he is punished with kareth.<sup>32</sup>

WE SUCK OUT, etc. R. Papa said: If a surgeon does not suck [the WOUND], it is dangerous and he is dismissed. It is obvious? Since we desecrate the Sabbath for it, it is dangerous?<sup>33</sup> — You might say that this blood is stored up, therefore he informs us that it is the result of a wound, and it is like a bandage and cummin: just as when one does not apply a bandage and cummin there is danger, so here too if one does not do it there is danger.<sup>34</sup>

WE PLACE A COMPRESS UPON IT. Abaye said: Mother told me,<sup>35</sup> A salve [compress] for all pains [is made of] seven parts of fat and one of wax. Raba said: Wax and resin<sup>36</sup> Raba taught this publicly at Mahoza, [whereupon] the family of Benjamin the doctor tore up their [bandage] cloths.<sup>37</sup> Said he to them. Yet I have left you one [cure unrevealed]. For Samuel said: He who washes his face and does not dry it well, scabs will break out on him.

---

(1) On the Sabbath.

(2) This is what the Mishnah includes.

(3) From circumcising, thinking it finished.

(4) v. Supra 116b. When one reaches the breast he temporarily ceases flaying in order to remove the fats; this cessation is analogous to withdrawing in the case of circumcision, and R. Ishmael rules that he must not return to complete the flaying.

(5) Ex. XV, 2. Or perhaps, and I will adorn myself for His sake. Once the fats are removed for sacrificial purposes there is no adornment of the precept in trimming the flesh and making it look presentable.

(6) The cutting away even of the shreds which does not invalidate circumcision is nevertheless an adornment thereof

(7) And may be permitted even by R. Ishmael.

(8) Lit., 'before Him'.

(9) Reading **אני והוא** as a combination **אני והוא** I and He (have to act alike).

(10) Viz., the crescent of the New Moon, which had to be seen and attested by two witnesses before the Beth din could sanctify the beginning of the month, v. R.H. 21b.

(11) By the two witnesses appointed to look out for it. They must come to the Beth din to testify, even if it is the Sabbath and they are without the tehum (q.v. Glos.), though since it is clearly visible the Beth din is in any case aware of its presence.

(12) Because it is unnecessary. The same applies to the shreds which do not invalidate the circumcision.

(13) From the very outset there was no need to desecrate the Sabbath, since the new moon is clearly visible to all.

(14) On account of the circumcision.

(15) That one must cut away all shreds.

(16) The Temple on the Sabbath to set the shewbread.

(17) Of frankincense for the loaves, v. Lev. XXIV, 7.

(18) Of the previous week's loaves.

(19) Because the Table was placed east to west, and the priests stood at its side facing its breadths.

(20) I.e., opposite the other priests across the Table.

(21) I.e., the withdrawing and the replacing were almost simultaneous.

(22) Ex. XXV, 30.

(23) I.e., 'always' merely indicates that a night must not pass without shewbread lying upon the table. But the Rabbis hold that an interval would mark a new placing, not a continuation of the old, and so 'always' would be unfulfilled. Similarly, when one withdraws from circumcision, to return for the shreds is a new act, hence not permitted unless these invalidate circumcision.

(24) I.e., the shreds which invalidate the circumcision must be removed; this appears to be the interpretation of Rashi and R. Han. Jast.: (One may) trim the preputium by splitting and drawing it upwards so as to form a pouch around the denuded cone. v. R. Han. second interpretation.

- (25) Because he violated the Sabbath without completely fulfilling the precept. On this interpretation the reference is to the Sabbath.
- (26) I.e., his labour was certainly permitted as far as it went.
- (27) It refers to an adult who circumcises himself on weekdays, and he is punished by kareth because he remains uncircumcised on account of these shreds.
- (28) Gen. XVII, 14; v. p. 665, n. 1. Why then state it here?
- (29) To perform the whole (if the circumcision before the day ends).
- (30) Lit., 'it is found'.
- (31) It is not regarded as circumcision.
- (32) Because he had no right even to start.
- (33) Otherwise it would not be permitted, as it is not actually part of circumcision.
- (34) If the blood were held to be stored up in a separate receptacle, as it were, there would be no desecration of the Sabbath in sucking it out, and therefore the fact that it is done on the Sabbath would not prove that its omission is dangerous. But since it comes out as a result of a wound, i.e., the pressing causes a wound and thus forces out the blood, it is permitted only because its omission is dangerous.
- (35) She was really his foster-mother, v. Kid. 31b.
- (36) רִישׁוֹנָא is a commentator's Gloss; v. Jast.
- (37) They had not more need for them, the secret now being known to all. The phrase may also mean: they tore their garments (in despair and vexation).

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 134a

What is his remedy? Let him wash it well in beet juice.<sup>1</sup>

IF ONE DID NOT CRUSH [IT] ON THE EVE OF THE SABBATH. Our Rabbis taught: The things which may not be done for circumcision on the Sabbath may be done on Festivals: cummin may be crushed, and wine and oil may be beaten up together on its account. Abaye asked R. Joseph: Wherein does [the powdering of] cummin on Festivals differ? [presumably] because it can be used in a dish?<sup>2</sup> then wine and oil too are fit for an invalid on the Sabbath? For it was taught: One may not beat up wine and oil for an invalid on the Sabbath. R. Simeon b. Eleazar said in R. Meir's name: One may indeed beat up wine and oil. R. Simeon b. Eleazar related, R. Meir was once suffering internally,<sup>3</sup> and we wished to beat up wine and oil for him, but he would not permit us. Said we to him, Your words shall be made void in your own lifetime! Though I rule thus, he replied, yet my colleagues rule otherwise, [and] have never<sup>4</sup> presumed to disregard the words of my colleagues. Now he was stringent in respect to himself, but for all others it is permitted? — There it need not be well beaten, whereas here it needs to be well beaten. Then let us do likewise here too and not mix it well? — That is what he teaches, EACH MUST BE PLACED SEPARATELY.<sup>5</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: One may not strain mustard grain through its own strainer,<sup>6</sup> nor sweeten it with a glowing coal.<sup>7</sup> Abaye asked R. Joseph: Wherein does it differ from what we learnt: An egg may be passed through a mustard strainer?<sup>8</sup> There it does not look like selecting,<sup>9</sup> whereas here it looks like selecting,<sup>10</sup> he replied. 'Nor sweeten it with a glowing coal'. But surely it was taught, One may sweeten it with a glowing coal? — There is no difficulty: one refers to a metal coal, the other to a wood coal.<sup>11</sup> Abaye asked R. Joseph: Wherein does it differ from [roasting] meat on coals?<sup>12</sup> — There it is impossible,<sup>13</sup> whereas here it is possible.<sup>14</sup> Abaye asked R. Joseph: What about cheese-making?<sup>15</sup> — It is forbidden, answered he. Wherein does it differ from kneading [dough]? — There it is impossible, here it is possible, replied he.<sup>16</sup> But the people of Nehardea say: Freshly-made<sup>17</sup> cheese is palatable? — They mean this: even freshly-made cheese is palatable.<sup>18</sup>

ONE MAY NOT MAKE A HALUK FOR IT, etc. Abaye said, Mother told me: The side-selvedge of an infant's haluk should be uppermost,<sup>19</sup> lest a thread thereof stick and he [the infant] may become privily mutilated.<sup>20</sup> Abaye's mother used to make a lining<sup>21</sup> for half [the haluk].<sup>22</sup>

Abaye said: If there is no haluk for an infant, a hemmed rag should be brought, and the hem tied round at the bottom<sup>23</sup> and doubled over at the top.<sup>24</sup>

Abaye also said: Mother told me, An infant whose anus is not visible should be rubbed with oil and stood in the sun, and where it shows transparent it should be torn crosswise with a barley grain, but not with a metal instrument, because that causes inflammation.

Abaye also said: Mother told me, If an infant cannot suck, his lips are cold. What is the remedy? A vessel of burning coals should be brought and held near his nostrils, so as to heat it; then he will suck.

Abaye also said: Mother told me, If an infant does not breathe,<sup>25</sup> he should be fanned with a fan, and he will breathe.

Abaye also said: Mother told me, If an infant cannot breathe easily,<sup>26</sup> his mother's after-birth should be brought and rubbed over him, [and] he will breathe easily.

Abaye also said: Mother told me, If an infant is too thin, his mother's after-birth should be brought and rubbed over him from its narrow end to its wide end;<sup>27</sup> if he is too fat, [it should be rubbed] from the wide to the narrow end.

Abaye also said: Mother told me, If an infant is too red, so that the blood is not yet absorbed in him,<sup>28</sup> we must wait until his blood is absorbed and then circumcise him. If he is green, so that he is deficient in blood,<sup>29</sup> we must wait until he is full-blooded and then circumcise him. For it was taught, R. Nathan said: I once visited the Sea-towns,<sup>30</sup> and a woman came before me who had circumcised her first son and he had died and her second son and he had died; the third she brought before me. Seeing that he was [too] red I said to her, Wait until his blood is absorbed. So she waited until his blood was absorbed and [then] circumcised him and he lived; and they called him Nathan the Babylonian after my name. On another occasion I visited the Province of Cappadocia,<sup>31</sup> and a woman came before me who had circumcised her first son and he had died and her second son and he had died; the third she brought before me. Seeing that he was green, I examined him and saw no covenant blood<sup>32</sup> in him. I said to her, Wait until he is full-blooded; she waited and [then] circumcised him and he lived, and they called him Nathan the Babylonian, after my name.

---

(1) Or, water in which vegetables were thoroughly boiled.

(2) Hence since it is permitted for this purpose, it is permitted for circumcision too.

(3) Lit., 'in his bowels'.

(4) Lit., 'throughout my days'.

(5) Which means that they may be poured together but not mixed well.

(6) On Festivals.

(7) The meat made the mustard more palatable.

(8) To render the egg clear.

(9) Because all of it passes through.

(10) Because some of the inferior grains remain on top. — Nevertheless it is not actual selecting, because even they are fit for use (Tosaf.).

(11) The latter is forbidden, as it is extinguished in the process, which is prohibited on Festivals.

(12) Though this puts them out.

(13) That the meat should be roasted before the Festival and be just as tasty.

(14) The mustard grains could have been sweetened the previous day.

(15) On Festivals.

(16) V.p. 673, nn. 12,13.

- (17) Lit., 'of the (same) day'.
- (18) But It is still more so when it is made the previous day.
- (19) I.e., not facing the flesh.
- (20) When the haluk is pulled away.
- (21) Lit., 'covering'.
- (22) I.e., she left the seam or selvedge on the inner side, but lined it half way down, so that it should not touch the membrum.
- (23) Of the membrum, so as not to touch the wound.
- (24) Thus the edge is on the outside.
- (25) I.e., gives no signs of life (Rashi and Jast.). 'Ar.: does not urinate.
- (26) Rashi. Jast.: cry.
- (27) Starting with the former and continuing until the latter. — This is symbolical: even so should the infant progress (Rashi).
- (28) Into his limbs, but it is still so the under-surface of the skin. This makes circumcision dangerous.
- (29) Lit., the blood has not yet fallen into him'.
- (30) Tyre, etc.
- (31) A district of Asia Minor.
- (32) The blood which circumcision causes to flow is so designated. Thus circumcision would be physically dangerous, and furthermore even if performed it would be inadequate, as covenant blood is required.

### **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 134b**

MISHNAH. WE MAY BATHE THE INFANT BOTH BEFORE AND AFTER THE CIRCUMCISION, AND SPRINKLE [WARM WATER] OVER HIM BY HAND BUT NOT WITH A VESSEL. R. ELEAZAR B. 'AZARIAH SAID: WE MAY BATHE AN INFANT ON THE THIRD DAY [OF CIRCUMCISION] WHICH FALLS ON THE SABBATH, BECAUSE IT IS SAID, AND IT CAME TO PASS ON THE THIRD DAY, WHEN THEY WERE SORE.<sup>1</sup> AS FOR ONE WHO IS DOUBTFUL,<sup>2</sup> AND AN HERMAPHRODITE, WE MAY NOT DESECRATE THE SABBATH ON THEIR ACCOUNT; BUT R. JUDAH PERMITS [IT] IN THE CASE OF AN HERMAPHRODITE.

GEMARA. But you say in the first clause, WE MAY BATHE?<sup>3</sup> — Rab Judah and Rabbah b. Abbuha both said: He [the Tanna] teaches how [it is to be done]. [Thus:] WE MAY BATHE THE INFANT BOTH BEFORE AND AFTER THE CIRCUMCISION. How? WE SPRINKLE [WARM WATER] OVER HIM BY HAND, BUT NOT WITH A VESSEL. Raba objected: But he states, WE MAY BATHE?<sup>4</sup> Rather said Raba, He teaches thus: WE MAY BATHE THE INFANT BOTH BEFORE AND AFTER CIRCUMCISION on the first day in the normal manner; but on the third day which falls on the Sabbath, WE SPRINKLE [WARM WATER] OVER HIM BY HAND BUT NOT WITH A VESSEL. R. ELEAZAR B. AZARIAH SAID: WE MAY BATHE AN INFANT ON THE THIRD DAY WHICH FALLS ON THE SABBATH, BECAUSE IT IS SAID, AND IT CAME TO PASS ON THE THIRD DAY, WHEN THEY WERE SORE. It was taught in accordance with Raba: We may bathe the infant before and after the circumcision on the first day in the normal manner, but on the third day which falls on the Sabbath we besprinkle him by hand. R. Eleazar b. 'Azariah said: We may bathe an infant on the third day which falls on the Sabbath, and though there is no proof, there is an allusion thereto, for it is said, 'And it came to pass on the third day, when they were sore'. And when they sprinkle, they sprinkle neither with a glass nor with a dish nor with a vessel, but only by hand — this agrees with the first Tanna. Why [does he say,] though there is no proof, there is an allusion thereto?<sup>5</sup> Because an adult's flesh does not heal quickly, whereas an infant's does.<sup>6</sup>

A certain [person] came before Raba, [and] he gave him a ruling in accordance with his view.<sup>7</sup> [Then] Raba fell ill. Said he: What business did I have with the interpretation of the older scholars?<sup>8</sup>

[Thereupon] the Rabbis said to Raba: But it was taught in accordance with the Master? Our Mishnah supports them, he replied. How so? Since it states, R. ELEAZAR B. 'AZARIAH SAID: WE MAY BATHE THE INFANT ON THE THIRD DAY WHICH FALLS ON THE SABBATH. It is well if you assume that the first Tanna means [that] we may [merely] sprinkle: hence R. Eleazar b. 'Azariah says to him, We may bathe. But if you explain that the first Tanna means, We may bathe on the first day and sprinkle on the third day, then [instead of] this [statement], R. ELEAZAR B. AZARIAH SAID: WE MAY SPRINKLE, 'WE MAY ALSO SPRINKLE [ON THE THIRD DAY]' is required.

When R. Dimi came,<sup>9</sup> he said in R. Eleazar's name: The halachah is as R. Eleazar b. 'Azariah. In the West [Palestine] they pondered thereon: is the bathing of the whole body [permitted], or [only] the bathing of the membrum? Said one of the Rabbis, named R. Jacob, it is logical [that it means] the bathing of the whole body. For should you think, the bathing of the membrum, is this worse [less important] than hot water on a wound? For Rab said, One does not withhold hot water and oil from a wound on the Sabbath.<sup>10</sup> R. Joseph demurred: And do you not admit a distinction between hot water heated on the Sabbath and hot water heated on the eve of the Sabbath?<sup>11</sup> To this R. Dimi demurred: And whence [does it follow] that they differ here in respect of hot water heated on the Sabbath? Perhaps they differ in respect of hot water heated on the eve of the Sabbath? — Said Abaye, I wanted to answer him, but R. Joseph anticipated [me] and answered him: Because it is a danger for him.<sup>12</sup> It was stated likewise: When Rabin came,<sup>13</sup> he said in R. Abbahu's name in R. Eleazar's name — others state, R. Abbahu said in R. Johanan's name: The halachah is as R. Eleazar b. 'Azariah in respect of both hot water heated on the Sabbath and hot water heated on the eve of the Sabbath, whether for the bathing of the whole body or for the bathing of the membrum, because it is dangerous for him.

[To turn to] the main text: 'Rab said: One does not withhold hot water and oil from a wound on the Sabbath. But Samuel said: One must place it outside the wound, and it flows down on to the wound'. An objection is raised: One may not put oil and hot water on a rag to apply it to a wound on the Sabbath? — There it is on account of wringing out.<sup>14</sup> Come and hear: One may not pour hot water and oil on a rag which is on a wound on the Sabbath? — There too it is because of wringing out. It was taught in accordance with Samuel: One may not apply hot water and oil to a wound on the Sabbath, but one may put it outside the wound, and it flows down on to the wound.

Our Rabbis taught: One may apply dry wadding or a dry sponge to a wound<sup>15</sup> but not a dry reed or dry rags [of cloth]. [The rulings on] rags are contradictory?<sup>16</sup> There is no difficulty: the one treats of new [rags];<sup>17</sup> the other of old.<sup>18</sup> Abaye observed: This proves that rags heal.

ONE WHO IS DOUBTFUL, AND AN HERMAPHRODITE, etc. Our Rabbis taught, [And in the eighth day the flesh of] his foreskin [shall be circumcised]:<sup>19</sup> 'his foreskin', [the foreskin of] one who is certain<sup>20</sup> supersedes the Sabbath,

---

(1) Gen. XXXIV, 25. This shows that the third day is a dangerous period, and therefore the infant may be bathed even on the Sabbath.

(2) One who is born prematurely, and he may be an eight months' child. The Rabbis held that such could not possibly live, and therefore the Sabbath might not be violated for his circumcision.

(3) Which implies in the normal manner, sc. in a bath.

(4) Sprinkling is not bathing.

(5) Surely this is a proof that the third day is dangerous.

(6) The verse quoted, q.v., treats of the former.

(7) Permitting the infant to be bathed on the first day, which was a Sabbath, in the usual way.

(8) Sc. Rab Judah and Rabbah b. Abbuha. I.e., 'why did I interfere and disregard it?' He regarded his illness as a punishment.

(9) V.p. 12, n. 9.

- (10) Whereas according to the present interpretation the first Tanna permits even sprinkling on the first day only, but not on the third.
- (11) Rab refers to the latter, while R. Joseph assumed that the Mishnah refers to the former.
- (12) Hence the Mishnah must certainly refer to water heated on the Sabbath.
- (13) V.p. 12, n. 9.
- (14) One may pour too much on the rag and then wring it out, which is forbidden.
- (15) These are not intended for healing but merely as a protection.
- (16) A dry rag too is a fragment, and it is permitted.
- (17) These heal and are forbidden.
- (18) Which do not heal (Rashi). 11. Han. reverses it.
- (19) Lev. XII, 3; 'day' includes the Sabbath, supra 132a.
- (20) I.e., who is certainly subject to the obligation.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 135a

but [of] one in doubt does not supersede the Sabbath; 'his foreskin' [of] one who is certain supersedes the Sabbath, but an hermaphrodite does not supersede the Sabbath. R. Judah maintained: An hermaphrodite supersedes the Sabbath and there is the penalty of kareth. 'His foreskin': [of] one who is certain supersedes the Sabbath, but [of] one born at twilight<sup>1</sup> does not supersede the Sabbath; his foreskin: one who is certain supersedes the Sabbath, but one who is born circumcised does not supersede the Sabbath, for Beth Shammai maintain: One must cause a few drops of the covenant blood to flow from him, while Beth Hillel rule: It is unnecessary. R. Simeon b. Eleazar said: Beth Shammai and Beth Hillel did not differ concerning him who is born circumcised that you must cause a few drops of the covenant blood to flow from him, because it is a suppressed foreskin:<sup>2</sup> about what do they differ? about a proselyte who was converted when [already] circumcised: there Beth Shammai maintain: One must cause a few drops of the covenant blood to flow from him; whereas Beth Hillel rule: One need not cause a few drops of the covenant blood to flow from him.

The Master said: 'But [of] one that is doubtful does not supersede the Sabbath.' What does this include?<sup>3</sup> — It includes the following which was taught by our Rabbis: For a seven-months' infant<sup>4</sup> one may desecrate the Sabbath, but for an eight-months' infant one may not desecrate the Sabbath.<sup>5</sup> For one in doubt whether the is a seven-months' or an eight-months' infant, one may not desecrate the Sabbath. An eight-months' infant is like a stone and may not be handled, but his mother bends [over] and suckles him because of the danger.<sup>6</sup>

It was stated: Rab said: The halachah is as the first Tanna;<sup>7</sup> while Samuel said: The halachah is as R. Simeon b. Eleazar. A circumcised child was born to R. Adda b. Ahabah. He took him to thirteen circumcisers,<sup>8</sup> until he mutilated him privily.<sup>9</sup> I deserve it for transgressing Rab's [ruling], said he. Said R. Nahman to him, And did you not violate Samuel's [ruling]? Samuel ruled this only of weekdays, but did he rule this of the Sabbath? — He [R. Adda b. Ahabah] held that it is definitely a suppressed foreskin.<sup>10</sup> For it was stated: Rabbah said: We suspect that it may be a suppressed foreskin;<sup>11</sup> R. Joseph said: It is certainly a suppressed foreskin.

R. Joseph said: Whence do I know it? Because it was taught, R. Eliezer ha-Kappar said: Beth Shammai and Beth Hillel do not disagree concerning him who is born circumcised, that one must cause a few drops of the covenant blood to flow from him. Concerning what do they differ? As to whether the Sabbath is desecrated on his account: Beth Shammai maintain, We desecrate the Sabbath on his account; while Beth Hillel rule: We must not desecrate the Sabbath on his account. Does it then not follow that the first Tanna holds, We desecrate the Sabbath for him?<sup>12</sup> But perhaps the first Tanna maintains that all agree that we may not desecrate the Sabbath for him? — If so, R. Eliezer ha-Kappar comes to teach us Beth Shammai's view!<sup>13</sup> But perhaps he means this: Beth Shammai and Beth Hillel did not disagree in this matter!<sup>14</sup> R. Assi said: He whose mother is defiled

through confinement must be circumcised at eight [days], but he whose mother is not defiled through confinement<sup>15</sup> is not circumcised on the eighth day,<sup>16</sup> because it is said, If a woman conceive seed, and bear a man child, then she shall be unclean, etc. . . And in the eighth day the flesh of his foreskin shall be circumcised.<sup>17</sup> Said Abaye to him, Let the early generations<sup>18</sup> prove [the reverse], where the mother was not defiled through confinement,<sup>19</sup> yet circumcision was of the eighth day!<sup>20</sup> — The Torah was given, replied he,

- 
- (1) On Friday, and it is not known whether it was then Friday or the Sabbath.
  - (2) I.e., the foreskin which seems absent is pressed to the membrum.
  - (3) For the various cases of doubt are enumerated in detail.
  - (4) I.e., one born after seven months of pregnancy.
  - (5) The Rabbis held that such could not possibly live; hence there is no point in desecrating the Sabbath by circumcising him.
  - (6) To herself, if she is not eased of her milk.
  - (7) Who taught that Beth Shammai and Beth Hillel disagree about a child who is born circumcised; the halachah then naturally being as Beth Hillel.
  - (8) That they might cause a few drops of the covenant blood to flow. It was the Sabbath, and they all refused.
  - (9) Eventually he performed the operation himself unskillfully, with that result.
  - (10) There is no element of doubt at all, and therefore it must be done even on the Sabbath.
  - (11) It is only because of this doubt that some drops of blood must be made to flow.
  - (12) Even in Beth Hillel's opinion. Hence Beth Hillel must hold that it is certainly a suppressed foreskin.
  - (13) Surely that is of no interest, since the halacha is as Beth Hillel.
  - (14) Thus: the first Tanna maintains that Beth Shammai and Beth Hillel agree that we may not desecrate the Sabbath; hence their controversy must refer to weekdays, Beth Hillel holding that no blood-flow at all is required, whereupon R. Eleazar ha-Kappar stated that this is incorrect, there being no dispute in respect to weekdays, for even Beth Hillel necessitate a blood-flow, and they differ only in respect of the Sabbath. On this interpretation he informs us of Beth Hillel's view in respect to weekdays.
  - (15) E.g., if the child is not born in the usual manner but extracted through the cesarean section; or if a Gentile woman gives birth and becomes a proselyte the following day.
  - (16) But immediately.
  - (17) Lev. XII, 2f. Thus the two are interdependent.
  - (18) Viz., those preceding the giving of the Torah.
  - (19) The law of defilement being as yet non-existent.
  - (20) In accordance with God's command to Abraham; v. Gen. XVII, 12.

### **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 135b**

and then a new law was decreed.<sup>1</sup> But that is not so? for it was stated: If one is extracted through the cesarean section, or has two foreskins,<sup>2</sup> — R. Huna and R. Hiyya b. Rab [differ thereon]: one maintains, We desecrate the Sabbath for them; whilst the other holds, We do not desecrate the Sabbath for them. Thus, they differ only concerning the desecration of the Sabbath for them, but we certainly circumcise them on the eighth day? — One is dependent on the other.<sup>3</sup>

This is a controversy of Tannaim: [For it was taught], There is [a slave] born in his [master's] house who is circumcised on the first [day], and there is one born in his [master's] house who is circumcised on the eighth [day]; there is [a slave] bought with money who is circumcised on the first [day], and there is [a slave] bought with money who is circumcised on the eighth day. 'There is [a slave] bought with money who is circumcised on the first [day], and there is [a slave] bought with money who is circumcised on the eighth day.' How so? If one purchases a pregnant female slave and then she gives birth, that [the infant] is an acquired slave who is circumcised at eight days — If one purchases a female slave together with her infant child, that is a slave bought with money who is circumcised on the first day.<sup>4</sup> 'And there is [a slave] born in [his] master's house who is circumcised

on the eighth day' — How so? If one purchases a female slave and she conceives in his house and gives birth, that is [a slave] born in his [master's] house who is circumcised at eight days. R — Hama said:<sup>5</sup> If she gives birth and then has a ritual bath,<sup>6</sup> that is [a slave] born in his [master's] house who is circumcised on the first day; if she has a ritual bath and then gives birth, that is [a slave] born in his [master's] house who is circumcised at eight days. But the first Tanna allows no distinction between one who [first] has a ritual bath and then gives birth and one who gives birth and then has a ritual bath, so that though his mother is not defiled through her confinement he is circumcised on the eighth day.<sup>7</sup> Raba said:<sup>8</sup> As for R. Hama, it is well: we find [a slave] born in his [master's] house who is circumcised on the first day, and one who is circumcised on the eighth day; one bought with money who is circumcised on the first day, and one bought with money who is circumcised on the eighth day. [Thus:] if she gives birth and then has a ritual bath, that is [a slave] born in his [master's] house who is circumcised on the first day; if she has a ritual bath and then gives birth, that is [a slave] born in the house who is circumcised on the eighth [day].<sup>9</sup> 'One bought with money who is circumcised on the eighth [day]': e.g., if one purchases a pregnant female slave and she has a ritual bath and then gives birth; 'one bought with money who is circumcised on the first day': e.g., where one buys a [pregnant] female slave and another buys her unborn child.<sup>10</sup> But according to the first Tanna, as for all [others] it is well: they are conceivable.<sup>11</sup> But how can [a slave] born in the house be found who is circumcised on the first day?<sup>12</sup> — Said R. Jeremiah: In the case of one who buys a female slave for her unborn child.<sup>13</sup> This is satisfactory on the view that a title to the usufruct is not as a title to the principal; but on the view that a title to the usufruct is as a title to the principal, what can be said?<sup>14</sup> — Said R. Mesharsheya: [It is possible] where one buys a female slave on condition that he will not subject her to a ritual bath.<sup>15</sup>

It was taught, R. Simeon b. Gamaliel said: Any human being who lives<sup>16</sup> thirty days is not a nefel,<sup>17</sup> because it is said, And those that are to be redeemed of them from a month old shalt thou redeem.<sup>18</sup> An animal [which lives] eight days is not a nefel, for it is said, and from the eighth day and henceforth it shall be accepted for an oblation, etc.<sup>19</sup> This implies that if it [an infant] does not last [so long], it is doubtful;

(1) Viz., that the two are interdependent.

(2) Two skins on top of each other. Or, two separate membra.

(3) The infant who must be circumcised on the eighth day must be circumcised even on the Sabbath, since that is deduced from (eighth) day (supra 132a) ; but where the eighth day is necessary the Sabbath may not be desecrated.

(4) Of purchase, even if he is not eight days old yet.

(5) [Probably R. Hama the father of R. Oshaia, v. Hyman, Toledoth II p. 456].

(6) By this rite she enters the Jewish household as slave, becoming liable to all duties enjoined upon a Jewish woman. V. next note.

(7) These laws centre on Gen. XVII, 12, 13: And he that is eight days old shall be circumcised among you, every male throughout your generations, he that is born in the house, or bought with money of any stranger, which is not of thy seed (v. 12). He that is born in thy house, and he that is bought with thy money, must needs be circumcised (v. 13). Whereas v. 12 specifies circumcision for the eighth day, v. 13 does not, which implies at the earliest possible moment. Now it is logical that v. 12 refers to a slave who is as like as possible to a full Jew, that being the implication of 'among you', intimating those that are similar to you. viz., one born in his master's house after he was purchased. i.e., his mother was bearing him when she was bought; whilst v. 13 applies to a slave who is unlike a full Jew, vi., he was already born before he was bought. R. Hama draws this distinction: If his mother has a ritual bath, whereby she formally becomes a Jewish-owned slave in that she is bound to observe all the laws incumbent upon Jewesses in general, so that her confinement renders her unclean just like a Jewess, and then she gives birth, the infant is circumcised on the eighth day. But otherwise the infant is not like a Jewish-born child, and is circumcised on the first day. But the first Tanna ignores this distinction: thus R. Assi's ruling is a matter of controversy between the first Tanna and R. Hama.

(8) Maharam deletes this.

(9) Both of these refer to a slave who conceived in her master's house, so that the infant is not 'bought with money'.

(10) Since the latter does not own the mother, the child is not like a Jewish-born infant, and therefore he is circumcised

on the first day.

(11) As already stated supra.

(12) Since he rejects the distinction based on when the mother had her ritual bath, one born in the house is certainly similar to a Jew.

(13) Even if he buys her from a Jew, and she has already had her ritual bath and is subject to the uncleanness of confinement, the child is nevertheless unlike a Jewish child, since his owner has no share in the mother.

(14) V. B.B. 136a; the mother is the principal, while the child is the usufruct. On the latter view he is like a Jewish-born child

(15) There her child is certainly unlike a Jewish-born one.

(16) Lit., 'tarries'.

(17) A nonviable, premature birth.

(18) Num. XVIII, 16. Since he must then be redeemed, it follows that he is viable.

(19) Lev. XXII, 27.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 136a

how then can we circumcise him?<sup>1</sup> — Said R. Adda b. Ahabah: We circumcise him in either case: if he is viable, he is rightly circumcised; whilst if not, one [merely] cuts flesh.<sup>2</sup> Then as to what was taught, If there is doubt whether he is a seven-months' [infant] or an eight-months', we must not desecrate the Sabbath on his account:<sup>3</sup> why so? let us circumcise him in either case: if he is viable, he is rightly circumcised; if not, you [merely] cut flesh? — Mar the son of Rabina said: R. Nehumi b. Zechariah and I explained it: We do indeed circumcise him; this [teaching] is required only in respect of the preliminaries of circumcision, this being in accordance with R. Eliezer.<sup>4</sup>

Abaye said, This is dependent on Tannaim:<sup>5</sup> And if any beast, of which ye may eat, die: [he that toucheth the carcase thereof shall be unclean until the even];<sup>6</sup> this is to include an eight-months' [animal],<sup>7</sup> [teaching] that shechitah<sup>8</sup> does not render it clean.<sup>9</sup> R. Jose son of R. Judah and R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon maintain: It is shechitah does render it clean. Surely they differ in this: one Master holds, It is a living creature;<sup>10</sup> whilst the other Master holds, It is [technically] dead? — Said Raba: If so, instead of disputing on the matter of uncleanness and cleanness, let them dispute on the question of consumption.' — Rather [say then] all hold that it is [technically] dead, but R. Jose son of R. Judah and R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon argue, it is as a terefah:<sup>11</sup> a terefah, though indeed it is dead, does not shechitah render it clean?<sup>12</sup> So here too it is not different. But the Rabbis [reason]: it is unlike a terefah, for a terefah had a period of fitness,<sup>13</sup> whereas this one enjoyed no period of fitness. And should you object, what can be said about a terefah from birth?<sup>14</sup> There shechitah is efficacious for its kind, whereas here shechitah is not efficacious for its kind.<sup>15</sup>

The scholars asked: Do the Rabbis disagree with R. Simeon b. Gamaliel<sup>16</sup> or not?<sup>17</sup> Should you answer [that] they differ, is the halachah as he or not? — Come and hear: If a calf is born on a festival, one may slaughter it on a festival!<sup>18</sup> — What case do we treat of here? Where we know for certain that its months [of bearing] were complete.<sup>19</sup> Come and hear: And they agree that if it is born together with its blemish, it is mukan!<sup>20</sup> Here too [it is said] where its months [of bearing] were complete. Come and hear: For Rab Judah said in Samuel's name: The halachah, is as R. Simeon b. Gamaliel. 'The halachah [is thus]' implies that they [the Rabbis] disagree.<sup>21</sup> This proves it.

Abaye said: If it falls from a roof or is devoured by a lion, all hold that it was viable.<sup>22</sup> When do they differ? if it yawns and dies.<sup>23</sup> One Master holds: It was viable; whilst the other Master holds: it was [technically] dead. What is the practical difference? Whether it frees the mother from Levirate marriage.<sup>24</sup>

'If it falls from a roof or is devoured by a lion, all hold that it was viable.' But surely R. Papa and R. Huna the son of R. Joshua visited the house of R. Iddi b. Abin's son, who prepared a third-born

calf<sup>25</sup> for them on its seventh day [from birth], whereupon they said to him, 'Had you waited with it until evening<sup>26</sup> we would have eaten thereof: now we will not eat thereof'!<sup>27</sup> — Rather [say thus:] If it yawns and dies, all agree that it was dead [non-viable]; they differ where it falls from a roof or is devoured by a lion, one Master holding that it was viable; the other Master, that it was dead.<sup>28</sup>

A child was born to the son of R. Dimi b. Joseph, [and] it died within thirty days. [Thereupon] he sat and mourned for it.<sup>29</sup> Said his father to him, 'Do you wish to eat dainties?'<sup>30</sup> 'I know for certain that its months [of pregnancy] were complete.' R. Ashi visited R. Kahana: a mishap befell him within the thirty days.<sup>31</sup> Seeing him sitting and mourning for it, he said to him, 'Does the Master not agree with what Rab Judah said in Samuel's name: The halachah is as R. Simeon b. Gamaliel?' — 'I know for certain that its months were complete,' replied he.

It was stated: If it died within thirty days,<sup>32</sup> and she [the mother] arose and was betrothed,<sup>33</sup> — Rabina said in Raba's name:

- 
- (1) On the eighth day which falls on the Sabbath, seeing that he may be non-viable, in which case there is really no obligation to circumcise him at all,
  - (2) Which cannot be regarded as the inflicting of a wound (this is the form of labour to which circumcision belongs), since the infant is already as dead.
  - (3) V. supra 135a.
  - (4) Supra 130a; but here the Sabbath may not be violated for the preliminaries.
  - (5) Sc. whether a non-viable infant is so completely regarded as dead that the infliction of a wound on it is merely flesh cutting.
  - (6) Lev. XI, 39.
  - (7) I.e., a calf born in, the eighth month of bearing instead of in the usual ninth.
  - (8) V. Glos.
  - (9) For even if ritually slaughtered, it may not be eaten, since it was non-viable (v. p. 679, n. 5; the same applies to animals), and therefore it is the same as though it had died of itself.
  - (10) Therefore shechitah renders it clean, just as in the case of any other animal that is permitted as food. (12) According to the first Tanna shechitah should make it fit for food, but not according to the others.
  - (11) An animal suffering with some disease or illness on account of which it may not be eaten after shechitah. It too is regarded as technically dead.
  - (12) This is deduced by the Rabbis from the present verse.
  - (13) Before it contracted that disease.
  - (14) Lit., 'the womb'.
  - (15) An animal born at nine months belongs to the species where shechitah counts, though this particular one is an exception. But no eight-months' animal is rendered fit for food by shechitah.
  - (16) Supra 135b bottom,
  - (17) The question is whether they permit a young animal to be eaten before it is eight days old.
  - (18) Though it is only one day old.
  - (19) Then it is definitely viable.
  - (20) V. Glos. The reference is to a firstling born blemished on a festival. A firstling might not be eaten before it received a blemish and we are taught there that this animal is *mukan* and may be eaten on the day of its birth. V. Bez. 26b.
  - (21) Cf. supra 106b.
  - (22) I.e., if the infant dies through an external cause before thirty, days, we assume that it was viable. Hence if he was an only child and survived his father, no matter by how short a time, his mother is free from Levirate marriage (v. Deut. XXV, 5), since his father did have a son. Similarly in the case of an animal, if slaughtered before it is eight days old it may be eaten, because we assume that it was viable,
  - (23) I.e., it dies naturally within thirty days, having shown very little vitality.
  - (24) V.p. 685, n. 12.
  - (25) I.e., the third which its mother had calved. Aliter: (a) a third-grown calf; (b) a calf in its third year.
  - (26) When it would have been eight days old.

- (27) Though it was slaughtered.
- (28) Hence the attitude of R. Papa and R. Huna b. R. Joshua.
- (29) I.e., he performed the ritual mourning rites which are obligatory upon a bereaved father.
- (30) Lit., 'throat-tickers'; Jast.: Which friends send to mourners — i.e., you should not mourn for him, seeing that he was non-viable.
- (31) I.e., his child died within thirty days from birth.
- (32) V. supra n. 13; the same case is referred to here.
- (33) At a later date, thinking that the child had freed her from the levirate obligation.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 136b

If she is an Israelite's wife,<sup>1</sup> she must perform halizah;<sup>2</sup> but if she is a priest's wife,<sup>3</sup> she does not perform halizah.<sup>4</sup> But R. Sherabia<sup>5</sup> ruled in Raba's name: Both the one and the other must perform halizah. Rabina said to R. Sherabia: In the evening Raba did rule thus, but the [following] morning he retracted.<sup>6</sup> You would permit her,<sup>7</sup> he retorted: would that you permitted forbidden fat!

R. JUDAH PERMITS, etc. R. Shizbi said in R. Hisda's name: Not in respect of everything did R. Judah rule [that] an hermaphrodite is a male; for if you do say thus, in the case of vows of valuation<sup>8</sup> let him be subject to valuation — And how do we know that he is not subject to 'valuation'? Because it was taught: '[And thy estimation shall be of] the male [from twenty years old, etc.]:<sup>9</sup> but not a tumtum<sup>10</sup> or an hermaphrodite. You might think that he does not come within the valuation of a man, yet he does come within the valuation of a woman; therefore it is stated, . . . the male . . . and if it be a female:<sup>11</sup> a certain male, a certain female, but not a tumtum or a hermaphrodite'. —

- 
- (1) I.e., if her second husband is an Israelite, i.e., not a priest, and may marry a haluzah (q.v. Glos.). — Betrothal was the first stage of marriage, and binding like marriage; v. Kid., Sonc. ed., p. 1, n. 9.
- (2) V. Glos.: for the child may have been non-viable.
- (3) Who may not marry a haluzah.
- (4) But may assume that her child was viable, relying on the majority of births, and therefore she has no levirate obligation.
- (5) In Yeb. 36b the reading is: R. Mesharsheya.
- (6) Ruling that she need not perform halizah if she is a priest's wife.
- (7) Without halizah, thus disregarding the view of R. Simeon b. Gamaliel.
- (8) 'Arakin, — vows whereby one offers his own or another person's 'valuation,' to the Temple. The valuations were fixed and dependent on the age and sex of the person concerned, v. Lev. XXVII, 1ff
- (9) Lev. XXVII, 3.
- (10) One whose genitals are hidden or undeveloped, so that his sex is doubtful. In Bek. 42a the Talmud deletes 'tumtum' from this passage.
- (11) Ibid. 4.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 137a

And an anonymous [statement in the] Sifra<sup>1</sup> is according to R. Judah.<sup>2</sup> R. Nahman b. Isaac said: We too learnt likewise: All are eligible to sanctify,<sup>3</sup> save a deaf-mute, an imbecile, and a minor. R. Judah admits a minor, but invalidates a woman and an hermaphrodite. This proves it — And why is circumcision different?<sup>4</sup> Because it is written, every male among you shall be circumcised.<sup>5</sup> MISHNAH. IF A MAN HAS TWO INFANTS, ONE FOR CIRCUMCISION AFTER THE SABBATH AND THE OTHER FOR CIRCUMCISION ON THE SABBATH, AND HE ERRS<sup>6</sup> AND CIRCUMCISES THE ONE BELONGING TO AFTER THE SABBATH ON THE SABBATH, HE IS CULPABLE.<sup>7</sup> [IF HE HAS] ONE FOR CIRCUMCISION ON THE EVE OF THE SABBATH AND ANOTHER FOR CIRCUMCISION ON THE SABBATH, AND HE ERRS AND CIRCUMCISES THE ONE BELONGING TO THE EVE OF THE SABBATH ON THE SABBATH, — R. ELIEZER HOLDS [HIM] LIABLE TO A SIN-OFFERING;<sup>8</sup> BUT R. JOSHUA EXEMPTS [HIM].<sup>9</sup>

GEMARA. R. Huna recited: He is culpable;<sup>10</sup> Rab Judah recited: He is not culpable. ‘R. Huna recited: He is culpable’; because it was taught, R. Simeon b. Eleazar said: R. Eliezer and R. Joshua did not differ concerning a man who has two infants, one for circumcision on the Sabbath and another for circumcision after the Sabbath, and he errs and circumcises the one belonging to after the Sabbath on the Sabbath, that he is culpable. About what do they disagree? About him, who has two infants, one for circumcision on the eve of the Sabbath and another for circumcision on the Sabbath, and he errs and circumcises the one belonging to the eve of the Sabbath on the Sabbath, R. Eliezer declaring [him] liable to a sin-offering, while R. Joshua exempts [him]. Now, both learn it from nought but idolatry:<sup>11</sup> R. Eliezer holds, it is like idolatry: just as idolatry, the Divine Law decreed, Do not engage [therein], and if one engages [therein] he is culpable, so here too it is not different. But R. Joshua [argues]: there there is no precept [fulfilled], whereas here there is a precept. ‘Rab Judah recited; He is not culpable.’ For it was taught, R. Meir said: R. Eliezer and R. Joshua did not differ concerning a man who has two infants, one for circumcision on the eve of the Sabbath and another for circumcision on the Sabbath, and he errs and circumcises the one belonging to the eve of the Sabbath on the Sabbath, that he is not culpable. About what do they disagree? About him who has two infants, one for circumcision after the Sabbath and another for circumcision on the Sabbath, and he errs and circumcises the one belonging to after the Sabbath on the Sabbath, R. Eliezer declaring [him] liable to a sin-offering, while R. Joshua exempts him. Now, both learn it from nought save idolatry: R. Eliezer holds, It is like idolatry: just as idolatry, the Divine Law decreed, Do not engage [therein], and if one engages [therein] he is culpable, so here too it is not different — But R. Joshua [argues:] There he is not preoccupied with a precept, whereas here he is preoccupied with a precept.<sup>12</sup>

R. Hiyya taught, R. Meir used to say: R. Eliezer and R. Joshua did not differ concerning him who has two infants, one for circumcision on the eve of the Sabbath and one for circumcision on the Sabbath, and he errs and circumcises the one belonging to the eve of the Sabbath on the Sabbath, that he is culpable. About what, do they disagree? About a man who has two infants, one for circumcision after the Sabbath and another for circumcision on the Sabbath, and he errs and circumcises the one belonging to after the Sabbath on the Sabbath, R. Eliezer declaring [him] liable to a sin-offering, while R. Joshua exempts him. Now if R. Joshua exempts him, in the second clause, though he does not fulfil a precept, shall he declare him culpable in the first clause, where he does fulfil a Precept!<sup>13</sup> The School of R. Jannai said: The first clause is, e.g., where the [infant] belonging to the Sabbath was previously circumcised on the eve of the Sabbath, so that the Sabbath does not stand to be superseded;<sup>14</sup> but in the second clause the Sabbath stands to be superseded. Said R. Ashi to R. Kahana: [But] in the first clause too the Sabbath stands to be superseded in connection with infants in general? — Nevertheless as far as this man [is concerned] it does not stand to be superseded.

MISHNAH. AN INFANT IS TO BE CIRCUMCISED ON THE EIGHTH, NINTH, TENTH, ELEVENTH, AND TWELFTH [DAYS], NEITHER EARLIER NOR LATER. HOW SO? IN THE NORMAL COURSE, IT IS ON THE EIGHTH; IF HE IS BORN AT TWILIGHT, ON THE NINTH;<sup>15</sup> AT TWILIGHT ON SABBATH EVE, ON THE TENTH;<sup>16</sup> IF A FESTIVAL FOLLOWS THE SABBATH, ON THE ELEVENTH;<sup>17</sup> IF THE TWO DAYS OF NEW YEAR [FOLLOW THE SABBATH, ON THE TWELFTH.<sup>18</sup> AN INFANT WHO IS ILL IS NOT CIRCUMCISED UNTIL HE RECOVERS.

GEMARA. Samuel said: When his temperature subsides [to normal], we allow him full seven days for his [complete] recovery. The scholars asked: Do we require twenty-four hours' days?<sup>19</sup> Come and hear: For Luda taught: The day of his recovery is like the day of his birth. Surely that means, just as with the day of his birth, we do not require a twenty-four hours' day,<sup>20</sup> so with the day of his recovery, we do not require a twenty-four hours' day? — No: the day of his recovery is stronger than the day of his birth, for whereas with the day of his birth we do not require a twenty-four hours' day, with the day of his recovery we do require a twenty-four hours' day.

MISHNAH. THESE ARE THE SHREDS WHICH INVALIDATE CIRCUMCISION: FLESH THAT COVERS THE GREATER PART OF THE CORONA; AND HE MUST NOT PARTAKE OF TERUMAH.<sup>21</sup> AND IF HE IS FLESHY,<sup>22</sup> HE MUST REPAIR IT FOR APPEARANCES SAKE.

---

(1) The halachah midrash on Leviticus, in which this passage occurs.

(2) This principle was laid down by R. Johanan; v. Sanh., Sonc. ed., p. 567, n. 1. — Thus R. Judah does not regard him as a male in this respect.

(3) The waters of lustration by placing the ashes therein; v. Num. XIX, 17.

(4) That an hermaphrodite is considered a male.

(5) Gen. X VII, 10: 'every' is an extension, and teaches the inclusion of an hermaphrodite.

(6) Lit., 'forgets'.

(7) For unwittingly desecrating the Sabbath. For since circumcision is obligatory from the eighth day only, this is not circumcision, but the mere inflicting of a wound, which entails culpability.

(8) For though he has actually fulfilled a precept, nevertheless circumcision after the proper time does not supersede the Sabbath.

(9) He erred through the fulfilment of a precept, viz., because he was occupied with the circumcision of the second, which actually was to be done that day; he also did fulfil a precept by circumcising the first, and R. Joshua holds that in such a case one is not culpable.

(10) In the first clause of the Mishnah, as our text.

(11) The obligations to all sin-offerings are learnt from the unwitting offence of idolatry, which serves as a model; v. Num. XV. 29-30 (v. 30 is understood to refer to deliberate idolatry, and shows that the preceding verses refer to all unwitting offences which are similar thereto).

(12) He is anxious to carry out the obligation which rests on him, and this preoccupation excuses his error. Rab Judah accordingly reads the Mishnah quite differently, and in accordance with the present view.

(13) Surely not, v. p. 688, n. 4.

(14) There is no infant left for whom the Sabbath must be violated. There was therefore no preoccupation with a precept and the error consequently was inexcusable, hence he is culpable.

(15) As it may have been night already, and circumcision must not take place before the eighth.

(16) Sc. the following Sunday week.

(17) The following Monday week.

(18) In Palestine all Festivals are of one day's duration, in accordance with Scripture, save New Year, which is of two days. — In the last three cases the infant cannot be circumcised on the following Friday, in case it is the seventh day, nor on the Sabbath or Festival, in case Friday was the eighth day, and circumcision after its proper time does not supersede them.

(19) Lit., 'from time to time'. Must we wait seven whole days to the hour, or can we circumcise any time on the seventh day?

(20) E.g., we do not wait eight full days to the hour for a normal circumcision, but perform it any time on the eighth day.

(21) If he is a priest and was thus inadequately circumcised, v. Yeb. 70a.

(22) So that though the circumcision was correctly performed the foreskin nevertheless looks as though it was uncircumcised.

## **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 137b**

IF ONE CIRCUMCISES BUT DOES NOT UNCOVER THE CIRCUMCISION,<sup>1</sup> IT IS AS THOUGH HE HAS NOT CIRCUMCISED.

GEMARA. R. Abina said in the name of R. Jeremiah b. Abba in Rab's name: [This means,] the flesh that covers the greater part of the height of the corona.

AND IF HE IS FLESHY, etc. Samuel said: If an infant['s membrum] is overgrown with flesh, we examine him: as long as he appears circumcised when he forces himself, it is unnecessary to recircumcise him; but if not he must be recircumcised. In a Baraita It was taught: R. Simeon b. Gamaliel said: If an infant['s membrum] is overgrown with flesh, we examine him: if he does not appear circumcised when he forces himself, he must be recircumcised: otherwise he need not be recircumcised. Wherein do they differ? — They differ where it is only partially visible.<sup>2</sup> IF ONE CIRCUMCISES BUT DOES NOT UNCOVER THE CIRCUMCISION. Our Rabbis taught: He who circumcises must recite: '... Who hast sanctified us with Thy commandments, and hast commanded us concerning circumcision.' The father of the infant recites, '... Who hast sanctified us with Thy commandments and hast commanded us to lead him into the covenant of our father Abraham.' The bystanders exclaim, 'Even as he has entered the covenant, so may he enter into the Torah, the marriage canopy, and good deeds.' And he who pronounces the benediction recites: '... Who hast sanctified the beloved one<sup>3</sup> from the womb; He set a statute in his flesh, and his offsprings he sealed with the sign of the holy covenant. Therefore as a reward for this, O living God Who art our portion, give command to save the beloved of our flesh from the pit, for the sake of Thy covenant which Thou hast set in our flesh. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, Who makest the covenant. He who circumcises proselytes says, 'Blessed art Thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, Who hast sanctified us with Thy commandments and hast commanded us concerning circumcision.' He who pronounces the benediction recites, '...Who hast sanctified us with Thy commandments and hast commanded us to circumcise proselytes and to cause the drops of the blood of the covenant to flow from them, since but for the blood of the covenant Heaven and earth would not endure, as it is said, If not my covenant by day and by night, I had not appointed the ordinances of heaven and earth.<sup>4</sup> Blessed art Thou, O Lord, Who makest the covenant.' He who circumcises slaves recites: '...Who hast sanctified us with Thy commandments and hast commanded us concerning circumcision. While he who pronounces the benediction recites: '...Who hast sanctified us with Thy commandments and hast commanded us to cause the drops of the blood of the covenant to flow from them, since but for the blood of the covenant the ordinances of heaven and earth would not endure, as it is said, If not my covenant by day and by night, I had not appointed the ordinances of heaven and earth. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, Who makest the covenant.'<sup>5</sup>

## CHAPTER XX

MISHNAH. R. ELIEZER SAID: ONE MAY SUSPEND A STRAINER ON FESTIVALS, AND POUR [WINE] THROUGH A SUSPENDED [STRAINER] ON THE SABBATH.<sup>6</sup> BUT THE SAGES RULE: ONE MAY NOT SUSPEND A STRAINER ON FESTIVALS, NOR POUR [WINE] THROUGH A SUSPENDED [STRAINER] ON THE SABBATH, BUT WE MAY POUR [IT] THROUGH A SUSPENDED [STRAINER] ON FESTIVALS.

GEMARA. Seeing that R. Eliezer [holds] that we may not [even] add to a temporary tent, can it be permitted to make [one] in the first place?<sup>7</sup> What is this allusion? For we learnt: As for the stopper of a skylight, — R. Eliezer said: When it is fastened and suspended, one may close [the skylight] with it; if not, one may not close [the skylight] with it. But the Sages maintain: In both cases you may close [the skylight] with it. Whereon Rabbah b. Bar Hanah said in R. Johanan's name: All agree that a temporary tent may not be made on Festivals, whilst on the Sabbath it goes without saying. They differ only in respect of adding [to a tent]; R. Eliezer maintaining. One may not add on a Festival, whilst on the Sabbath it goes without saying; whereas the Sages rule: One may add on the Sabbath, whilst it is superfluous to speak of Festivals!<sup>8</sup> — R. Eliezer agrees with R. Judah. For it was taught: The only difference between Festivals and the Sabbath is in respect of food for consumption.<sup>9</sup> R. Judah permits the preliminary preparations of food for consumption too.<sup>10</sup> But say that we know R. Judah [to rule thus] of preparations which could not be done on the eve of the Festival; do you know him [to rule thus] of preparations which could be done on the eve of the Festival?— R. Eliezer's [ruling] goes further than R. Judah's.<sup>11</sup>

BUT THE SAGES RULE, '[etc.]. The scholars asked: What if one does suspend [it]? — R. Joseph said: If one suspends [it] he is liable to a sin-offering. Said Abaye to him: If so, if one hangs a pitcher on a peg. is he too liable?<sup>12</sup>

(1) I.e., the corona, by splitting the membrane and pulling it down. — He did not perform the peri'ah. V. supra 133a. (5) To cause his bowels to function.

(2) Lit., 'he appears and does not appear'. Samuel maintains that unless it is fully visible he must be circumcised, whereas the Baraita teaches that only where it is quite invisible is recircumcision required.

(3) Rashi refers this to Isaac; Tosaf. to Abraham.

(4) Jer. XXXIII, 25.

(5) The emphasis on the extreme importance of circumcision was probably meant to counteract the early Christian teaching, which abrogated circumcision entirely in order to attract converts; v. Weiss, Dor, II, 9. It is perhaps noteworthy that in the present passage it is precisely in connection with proselytes and slaves that this is so much emphasized.

(6) When a strainer is 'suspended', i.e., set over the vessel which receives the liquid, a 'tent' is technically made, in that the strainer covers the vessel like the top of a tent cover and protects that which is beneath it. R. Eliezer permits this on Festivals but not on the Sabbath. Again, when the liquid, e.g., wine, is poured through the strainer, the lees are separated from the wine; nevertheless he does not regard this as 'selecting' (v. supra 73a) and permits it on the Sabbath. A cloth strainer is probably meant; v. T.A.II, p. 243.

(7) As he does permit it in the Mishnah.

(8) This means that R. Eliezer forbids even adding to a temporary tent.

(9) V. p. 281, n. 8.

(10) The suspending of a strainer falls within this category.

(11) For he permits it even in the latter case.

(12) Surely not. Here too it is not a real building and is forbidden by Rabbinical law only.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 138a

Rather said Abaye: It is [forbidden] by Rabbinical law, in order that one should not act in the very way he acts on weekdays.

Abaye collected some general principles of Baraitas, and he recited: One must not stretch out a leather bag,<sup>1</sup> a strainer, a canopy,<sup>2</sup> or a camp chair;<sup>3</sup> and if he does he is not culpable. but it is forbidden. One must not make a permanent tent, and if he does he is liable to a sin-offering. But a bed, chair, three-legged stool, and a footstool may be set up at the very outset.<sup>4</sup>

NOR POUR [WINE] THROUGH A SUSPENDED (STRAINER) ON THE SABBATH. The

scholars asked: What if one does strain [wine]? — R. Kahana said: If one strains he incurs a sin-offering. R. Shesheth demurred: Is there aught for which the Rabbis impose a sin-offering whereas R. Eliezer permits it at the very outset? To this R. Joseph demurred: Why not? Surely there is a 'golden city',<sup>5</sup> where R. Meir imposes a sin-offering, while R. Eliezer gives permission at the very outset. What is this? For it was taught: A woman must not go out with a 'golden city', and if she does go out, she is liable to a sin-offering: this is R. Meir's view: but the Sages rule: She may not go out [with it], yet if she goes out she is not culpable. R. Eliezer maintained: A woman may go out with a 'golden city' at the very outset! — Said Abaye to him, Do you think that R. Eliezer refers to R. Meir, who rules that she is liable to a sin-offering? He refers to the Rabbis, who maintain that there is no culpability, though it is forbidden; whereupon he said to them, It is permitted at the very outset.<sup>6</sup>

On what grounds is he warned?<sup>7</sup> — Rabbah said: On the grounds of selecting;<sup>8</sup> R. Zera said: On the score of sifting.<sup>9</sup> Rabbah said, Reason supports my view: What is usual in selecting? One takes the edible matter and leaves the refuse, so here too he takes the edible [the wine] and leaves the refuse. R. Zera said, Reason supports my view: what is usual in sifting? The refuse [remains] on top whilst the edible matter [falls] below, so here too, — the refuse [remains] on top whilst the edible matter [drops] below.

Rami b. Ezekiel recited: One must not spread a doubled-over sheet;<sup>10</sup> yet if he does he is not culpable,<sup>11</sup> but it is forbidden. If a thread or a cord was wound about it,<sup>12</sup> it may be spread at the very outset. R. Kahana asked Rab: What about a canopy?<sup>13</sup> A bed too is forbidden. What about a bed? A canopy too is permitted, he replied. What about a canopy and a bed? A canopy is forbidden, replied he, while a bed is permitted. Yet there are no contradictions: when he said, A bed too is forbidden, [he meant one] like that used by the Carmanians.<sup>14</sup> When he said to him, A canopy too is permitted, [he referred to] one like Rami b. Ezekiel['s].<sup>15</sup> A canopy is forbidden while a bed is permitted refers to one like ours.<sup>16</sup> R. Joseph said: I saw the canopy beds of R. Huna's house stretched out at night and thrown down in the morning.<sup>17</sup>

Rab said in R. Hiyya's name: A [door] curtain may be hung up and taken down.<sup>18</sup> And Samuel said in R. Hiyya's name:

---

(1) Gud is a broad leather bag into which wine or milk was poured. It was stretched out at night tent-wise for the liquid to cool in the night air.

(2) Rashi: whose top is a handbreadth in width. Alfasi and Maim.: whose top is less than a handbreadth in width.

(3) Jast. Tosaf.: a framework over which the leather seat was stretched; this is like the making of a tent.

(4) If they have fallen. The covers or tops of these are permanently spread, so no 'tent' is made.

(5) This was a kind of ornamental headdress containing a picture of Jerusalem; v. supra 59b.

(6) Abaye's reasoning is difficult to follow unless he means that R. Eliezer was altogether ignorant of R. Meir's view (Tosaf. and marginal Gloss.).

(7) A deliberate offence is not punishable unless the transgressor is previously warned that his proposed action is forbidden on such and such a score; in the case of the violation of the Sabbath he must be advised under what category of labour his action is prohibited. The selection here is in regard to the straining of wine.

(8) He is warned that straining is tantamount to selecting.

(9) V. supra 73a for these two labours.

(10) Tent-wise over a pole, the ends being fastened to the ground, so that the whole forms a tent under which he can lie (R. Han.).

(11) Because the top or roof of this improvised tent is less than a handbreadth in width.

(12) The sheet was already on the pole from before the Sabbath, and a thread or cord was attached thereto by means of which it might be pulled down. When it is pulled down one merely adds to a temporary or improvised tent, and this Baraita permits it-.

(13) V. supra p. 695, n. 6.

(14) Inhabitants of Carmania, a province of the ancient Persian empire, with the capital Carmana. Others: a frame used by vendors of linen garments. On both translations the frameworks were such that they were taken apart and then set up; this constitutes a forbidden labour.

(15) I.e., one about which a cord was wound, and which he permits in this passage.

(16) V. p. 695, n. 8.

(17) Which shows that they may be taken apart — he was speaking of the Sabbath — and in the same way they may be set up

(18) It is not a 'tent', since it has no roof.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 138b

A bridal bed may be set up and it may be dismantled.<sup>1</sup> R. Shesheth son of R. Idi said: That was said only where its roof is not a handbreadth [in width],<sup>2</sup> but if its roof is a handbreadth, it is forbidden. And even if the roof is not a handbreadth, this was said only where there is not [the width of] a handbreadth within three [handbreadths] from the top; but if there is a handbreadth within three from the top, it is forbidden. And this is said only if its slope is less than a handbreadth, but if its slope is a hand breadth, the slopes of tents are as tents.<sup>3</sup> And it was said only if it does not descend a handbreadth below the bed; but if it descends a handbreadth below the bed, it is forbidden.

R. Shesheth son of R. Idi also said: A peaked cap<sup>4</sup> is permitted. But it was stated: a peaked cap is forbidden? — There is no difficulty: in the one case it is a handbreadth [in size];<sup>5</sup> in the other it is not a handbreadth. If so, if one lets his cloak protrude a handbreadth,<sup>6</sup> is he too culpable?;<sup>7</sup> — Rather [say] there is no difficulty: here it is tightly fitted [on his head]; there it is not tightly fitted.<sup>8</sup>

Rami b. Ezekiel sent to R. Huna: Tell us, pray, those well-favoured dicta which you told us [formerly] in Rab's name, two about the Sabbath and one about Torah. He sent [back] to him: As to what was taught, It is permitted to stretch the leather bag<sup>9</sup> by its thongs,<sup>10</sup> Rab said: They learnt this only of two men; but [if done] by one man, it is forbidden.<sup>11</sup> Abaye said: But a canopy, even [if stretched] by ten men, is forbidden, [for] it is impossible that it shall not be somewhat stretched.

What is the other [dictum]? If one of the shafts of a stove falls off, it [the stove] may be handled; if both [fall off], it may not be handled,<sup>12</sup> Rab said: Even if one [falls out] it is forbidden, lest he [re]fix it.<sup>13</sup>

'[And one about] Torah': for Rab said: The Torah is destined to be forgotten in Israel, because it is said, Then the Lord will make thy plagues wonderful:<sup>14</sup> now, I do not know what this wonder is, but when it is said, Therefore, behold, I will proceed to do a wonderful work among this people, even a wonderful work and a wonder [and the wisdom of their wise men shall perish],<sup>15</sup> it follows that this wonder refers to Torah.

Our Rabbis taught: When our Masters entered the vineyard at Yabneh,<sup>16</sup> they said, The Torah is destined to be forgotten in Israel, as it is said, Behold, the days come, saith the Lord God, that I will send a famine in the land, not a famine of bread, nor a thirst for water, but of hearing the words of the Lord. And it is said, And they shall wander from sea to sea, and from the north even to the east; they shall run to and fro to seek the word of the Lord, and shall not find it.<sup>17</sup> 'The word of the Lord' means halachah,' 'the word of the Lord' means 'The End';<sup>18</sup> 'the word of the Lord' means prophecy. And what does 'they shall run to and fro to seek the word of the Lord' mean? Said they, A woman is destined to take a loaf of terumah and go about in the synagogues and academies to know whether it is unclean or clean, and none will know<sup>19</sup> whether it is clean or unclean. But that is explicitly stated, All food which may be eaten [...shall be unclean]?<sup>20</sup> Rather to know whether it is a first degree or a second degree [of uncleanness],<sup>21</sup> and none will know. But that too is a Mishnah. For we learnt: If a [dead] creeping thing<sup>22</sup> is found in an oven, the bread within it is a second, because the oven is a

first?<sup>23</sup> — They will be in doubt over what R. Adda b. Ahabah asked Raba: Let us regard this oven as though it were filled with uncleanness, and let the bread be a first? He replied, We do not say. Let us regard this oven as though it were filled with uncleanness. For it was taught: You might think that all utensils become unclean in the air space of an earthen vessel: therefore it is stated, whatsoever is in it shall be unclean...all food therein which may be eaten: food and liquids become unclean in the air space of an earthen vessel.<sup>24</sup> It was taught. R. Simeon b. Yohai said: Heaven forbid that the Torah be forgotten in Israel, for it is said, for it shall not be forgotten out of the mouths of their seed.<sup>25</sup> Then how do I interpret, they shall run to and fro to seek the word of the Lord, and shall not find it? They will not find

- 
- (1) v. p. 696. n. 6; also T.A. II, p. 457. n. 311, where it is understood as a sedan chair or litter.
  - (2) It being spread over a very narrow pole.
  - (3) Hence it is forbidden. By 'its slope' is meant the distance at the base from the vertical. Obviously such is unfit for use, and Rashi observes that a bridal bed was not for sleeping. This is unsatisfactory, and Tosaf. suggests other interpretations but rejects them too as equally unsatisfactory. V. 'Er. 102a (Sonc. ed., p. 709. n. 15).
  - (4) Jast.: A felt cap with a shade in front.
  - (5) It may not be worn on the Sabbath, as it technically forms a tent.
  - (6) He winds it about his head so as to protrude this distance.
  - (7) Read with Asheri, is it too forbidden'?
  - (8) Rashi: In the latter case a peaked cap is forbidden, not as a 'tent' but lest the wind blow it off and he come to carry it.
  - (9) V. p. 695. n. 5.
  - (10) The interdict supra a is only where it is unprovided with thongs or straps.
  - (11) Rashi: two men do not stretch it well; but one person is forced to tie one end to a stake, stretch it, and then tie the other end to another stake, whereby it becomes a tent. Rashi however is dissatisfied with this explanation and states that he does not understand it, nor are other commentators more satisfactory.
  - (12) The shafts are the four feet upon which it stands.
  - (13) Which is labour. But the first view is that it can stand well enough with one shaft missing to make this fear unlikely.
  - (14) Deut. XXVIII, 59.
  - (15) Isa. XXIX, 14.
  - (16) Whither R. Johanan b. Zakkai transported or founded an academy after the destruction of the second Temple. 'Vineyard' is a metaphor for the academy, because the scholars sat in rows like vines, J. Ber. IV, 1. The time referred to here is probably that of the Hadrianic persecutions.
  - (17) Amos VIII, 11f
  - (18) The designated time of redemption, when the Messiah will appear. Tosaf. finds the analogy for this interpretation in Ezra I.
  - (19) Lit., 'understand'.
  - (20) Lev. XI, 34. Surely the Written Law will be available.
  - (21) V. p. 55. n. 6.
  - (22) Sherez, which defiles utensils and food.
  - (23) The sherez touches the oven, which in turn touches the bread, The Rabbis could not imagine complete forgetfulness even of the Mishnah. (9) For immediately the sherez enters the air space of the oven, even before it actually touches it, it defiles, hence one should regard the sherez as though completely filling it.
  - (24) But if the sherez were regarded as completely filling the oven, utensils therein too should be unclean, as though they touched the sherez, for direct contact therewith does defile them. Thus in the future it will be doubtful whose view, R. Adda b. Ahabah's or Raba's, is correct.
  - (25) Deut. XXXI, 21.

## **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 139a**

a clear halachah or a clear Mishnah<sup>1</sup> in any place.<sup>2</sup>

It was taught. R. Jose b. Elisha said: If you see a generation overwhelmed by many troubles, go

forth and examine the judges of Israel, for all retribution that comes to the world comes only on account of the Judges of Israel, as it is said, Hear this, I pray you ye heads of the house of Jacob, and rulers of the house of Israel, that abhor judgment, and pervert all equity. They build up Zion with blood and Jerusalem with iniquity. The heads thereof judge for reward, and the priests thereof teach for hire, and the prophets thereof divine for money; yet will they lean upon the Lord, etc.<sup>3</sup> They are wicked, but they place their confidence in Him Who decreed, and the world came into existence.<sup>4</sup> Therefore the Holy One, blessed be He, will bring three punishments upon them answering to the three sins which they cultivate,<sup>5</sup> as it is said, Therefore shall Zion for your sake be ploughed as a field, and Jerusalem shall become heaps, and the mountain of the house as the high places of a forest.<sup>6</sup> And the Holy One, blessed be He, will not cause His Divine presence to rest upon Israel until the wicked judges and officers cease out of Israel, for it is said, And I will turn my hand upon thee, and thoroughly purge away thy dross, and will take away all thy tin. And I will restore thy judges as at the first, and thy counsellors as at the beginning, etc.<sup>7</sup>

‘Ulla said: Jerusalem shall be redeemed only by righteousness,<sup>8</sup> as it is written, Zion shall be redeemed with judgement, and her converts with righteousness.<sup>9</sup>

R. Papa said: When the haughty cease to exist [in Israel], the magi<sup>10</sup> shall cease [among the Persians]. When the judges cease to exist [in Israel], the chiliarchi<sup>11</sup> shall cease. ‘When the haughty cease to exist [in Israel], the magi shall cease [among the Persians]’; as it is written, And I will surely purge away thy haughty ones.<sup>12</sup> When the judges cease to exist [in Israel], the chiliarchi shall cease, as it is written, The Lord hath taken away thy judgements, he hath cast out thine enemy.<sup>13</sup>

R. Melai<sup>14</sup> said in the name of R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon: What is meant by the verse, The Lord hath broken the staff of the wicked, the sceptre of the rulers?<sup>15</sup> ‘The Lord hath broken the staff of the wicked’ refers to the judges who become a staff for their sheriffs;<sup>16</sup> ‘the sceptre of the rulers’ refers to the scholars in the families of the judges.<sup>17</sup> Mar Zutra said: This refers to the scholars who teach the laws of the public<sup>18</sup> to ignorant judges.<sup>19</sup>

R. Eleazar b. Melai said in the name of Resh Lakish: What is meant by the verse, For your hands are defiled with blood, and your fingers with iniquity; your lips have spoken lies, your tongue muttereth wickedness?<sup>20</sup> ‘For your hands are defiled with blood’: this refers to the judges: ‘and your fingers with iniquity’, to the judges’ scribes;<sup>21</sup> ‘your lips have spoken lies’ to the advocates of the judges;<sup>22</sup> ‘your tongue muttereth wickedness’ — to the litigants. R. Melai also said in the name of R. Isaac of Magdala: From the day that Joseph departed from his brothers he did not taste wine, for it is written, [The blessings of thy father...shall be on the head of Joseph]. And on the crown of the head of him who was a nazirite [since his departure] from his brethren.<sup>23</sup> R. Jose b. R. Hanina said: They too did not taste wine, for it is written, And they drank, and drank largely with him:<sup>24</sup> which implies [that they did] not [drink] until then. And the other?<sup>25</sup> — There was no extensive drinking,<sup>26</sup> yet there was [moderate] drinking.<sup>27</sup>

R. Melai also said: As a reward for, and when he seeth thee, he shall be glad in his heart,<sup>28</sup> he was privileged to wear the breastplate of judgment upon his heart.

The citizens of Bashkar<sup>29</sup> sent [a question] to Levi: What about [setting up] a canopy [on the Sabbath]; what about cuscuta in a vineyard?<sup>30</sup> what about a dead man on a Festival?<sup>31</sup> By the time he [the messenger] arrived [at Levi’s home] Levi had died. Said Samuel to R. Menashia, If you are wise, send them [an answer]. [So] he sent [word] to them: ‘As for a canopy, we have examined it from all aspects and do not find any aspect by which it can be permitted’. But let him send them [a permissive ruling] in accordance with Rami b. Ezekiel?<sup>32</sup> [He did not do this] because they were not learned in the law.<sup>33</sup> ‘Cuscuta in a vineyard is a [forbidden] mixture’. But let him send them [a reply] in accordance with R. Tarfon. For it was taught: As for cuscuta, R. Tarfon maintains: It is not

kil'ayim<sup>34</sup> in a vineyard; while the Sages rule: It is kil'ayim in a vineyard. And it is an established principle: The view of him, who is lenient in respect to Palestine,<sup>35</sup> is halachah without Palestine?-[Likewise] because they were not learnt in the law. Rab announced: He who wishes to sow cuscuta in a vineyard, let him sow.<sup>36</sup> R. Amram the pious would ban [a person] for this. R. Mesharsheya would give a perutah<sup>37</sup> to a Gentile child to sow it for him.<sup>38</sup> Then let him give it to an Israelite child? — He would come to adhere [to this practice when he grew up]. Then let him give it to an adult Gentile?—He might come to substitute an Israelite for him.

As for a corpse. he sent [word to them]: Neither Jews nor Syrians [non-Jews] may occupy themselves with a corpse, neither on the first day of a Festival nor on the second.<sup>39</sup> But that is not so? For R. Judah b. Shilath said in R. Assi's name: Such a case happened in the synagogue of Ma'on<sup>40</sup> on a Festival near the Sabbath,

- 
- (1) I.e., an absolute and definite ruling. completely intelligible and not subject to controversy.
- (2) Lit., 'in one place'. I.e., in any of the places whither they shall wander (Maharsha).
- (3) Mic. III, 9-11.
- (4) This phrase is now liturgical.
- (5) Lit., 'which is in their hand'.
- (6) Ibid. 12.
- (7) Isa. I, 25f.
- (8) I.e., through the exercise of righteousness.
- (9) Isa. I, 27.
- (10) The Guebres, who caused the Jews much suffering under the Sassanians, cf. Sanh., Sonc. ed., p 504, n. 6.
- (11) [גזירפטי] (Pers. Wezirpat, a ruler, Funk, Schwarz, Festschrift, p. 432) the name of a class of oppressive Persian officers.]
- (12) Deriving סיגיד from סגיד, great, haughty.
- (13) Zeph. III, 15.
- (14) MS. O.: Simlai.
- (15) Isa. XIV, 5.
- (16) They support their underlings in evil; or, support them in their refusal to summon the defendant to court or to enforce the court verdict unless they are well-paid for it (Rashi).
- (17) I.e., unfit judges appointed by the scholars of their family.
- (18) הלכות צבור. Probably laws concerning communal matters, the imposts of levies for communal and charitable purposes v. Herzog, The Main Institutions of Jewish Law. Vol. 1, XXIII.
- (19) Rashi: the judges being appointed in reliance that these scholars would guide them in law, whereas they subsequently act of their own accord in many cases.
- (20) Isa. LIX, 3.
- (21) Who record verdicts falsely.
- (22) Rashi: who instruct the litigants how to plead. V, Aboth, Sonc. ed., p. 6, n. 1.
- (23) Gen. XLIX, 26. E.V.: 'of him that was separate from his brethren'. A nazirite is forbidden wine, Num. VI, 2-3.
- (24) Gen. XLIII, 34.
- (25) R. Melai: why does he omit the brothers?
- (26) Lit., 'no drunkenness'. During the period of separation.
- (27) On the part of the brothers.
- (28) Ex. IV, 14 — the reference is to Aaron.
- (29) Caskar, the chief town in the Mesene region. on the right bank of the old Tigris; directly opposite, on the left bank, lay Wasit, and the two are to some extent identified; v. Obermeyer. pp. 91-3.
- (30) Does it infringe the prohibition against divers plants being sown together? v. Deut. XXII, 9.
- (31) What arrangements are permissible for handling him, the funeral, etc.
- (32) Who permits its spreading when it is furnished with cords, v. supra 138a.
- (33) They would go still further.
- (34) V. Glos.

(35) Lit., 'the land' par excellence.

(36) V. Halevy. Doroth, I, 3, p. 137 (נדד).

(37) A small coin.

(38) He agreed with Rab, nevertheless he did it in an unusual manner, so as not to encourage laxity.

(39) Though the second is only a Rabbinical institution.

(40) A town near Tiberias.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 139b

though I do not know whether it preceded or followed it,<sup>1</sup> and when they went before R. Johanan, he said to them: Let Gentiles occupy themselves with him [the dead]. Raba too said: As for a corpse,<sup>2</sup> on the first day of Festivals Gentiles should occupy themselves with him; on the second day of Festivals Israelites may occupy themselves with him, and even on the second day of New Year, which is not so in the case of an egg?<sup>3</sup> [Here too] because they were not learned in the law.

R. Abin b. R. Huna said in R. Hama b. Guria's name: A man may wrap himself in a canopy sheet and [tie it] with its cords to go out into the street on the Sabbath without fear.<sup>4</sup> How does this differ from R. Huna's [dictum]. for R. Huna said in Rab's name: If one goes out on the Sabbath wearing a garment not provided with [proper] fringes as required by law, he is liable to a sin-offering?<sup>5</sup> — Fringes are important in relation to the cloak, hence they are not merged [therein]; these are not of [separate] importance, and [so] are accounted as nought.

Rabbah<sup>6</sup> son of R. Huna said: A man may employ an artifice in connection with a strainer on a festival, suspending it for pomegranates yet straining lees therein.<sup>7</sup> Said R. Ashi: Provided he does place pomegranates in it.<sup>8</sup> How does it differ from what was taught: One may brew beer on the [intermediate days of a] Festival<sup>9</sup> when it is required for the Festival, but if not required for the Festival it is forbidden: [this applies to] both barley beer and date beer. Though one has old [beer], he may practise an evasion<sup>10</sup> and drink of the new? — There the matter is not evident;<sup>11</sup> here the matter is evident.<sup>12</sup>

The scholars said to R. Ashi: See, sir, a Rabbinical disciple, whose name is R. Huna b. Hiwan — others State, R. Huna b. Hilwon — who took peel of garlic,<sup>13</sup> placed it in the bung hole of a barrel, and asserted, 'My intention is to put it away [here].'<sup>14</sup> He also went and dozed in a ferry and thus crossed to the other side and looked after his fruit, asserting, 'My intention was to sleep.' Said he to them, You speak of an artifice: it is an artifice [in connection with] a Rabbinical [interdict].<sup>15</sup> and a disciple of the Rabbis will not come to do this at the very outset.<sup>16</sup> MISHNAH. WATER MAY BE Poured OVER LEES IN ORDER TO CLARIFY THEM, AND WINE MAY BE STRAINED THROUGH CLOTHS AND THROUGH A BASKET MADE OF PALM TWIGS; AND AN EGG MAY BE PASSED THROUGH A MUSTARD STRAINER;<sup>17</sup> AND ENOMLIN<sup>18</sup> MAY BE PREPARED ON THE SABBATH. R. JUDAH SAID: ON THE SABBATH [IT MAY ONLY BE MADE] IN A GOBLET; ON FESTIVALS, IN A LAGIN;<sup>19</sup> AND ON THE INTERMEDIATE DAYS OF FESTIVALs IN A BARREL. R. ZADOK SAID: IT ALL DEPENDS ON THE [NUMBER OF] GUESTS.

GEMARA. Ze'iri said: One may pour clear wine and clear water into a strainer on the Sabbath without fear,<sup>20</sup> but not turbid [liquids]. An objection is raised: R. Simeon b. Gamaliel said: One may stir up a barrel of wine, [i.e.] the wine and the lees, and pour it into a strainer on the Sabbath without fear!<sup>21</sup> — Ze'iri explained it: They learnt this of the season of the wine pressing.<sup>22</sup>

WINE MAY BE STRAINED THROUGH CLOTHS. R. Shimi b. Hiyya said: Provided that one does not make a hollow.<sup>23</sup>

AND THROUGH A BASKET MADE OF PALM TWIGS. R. Hiyya b. Ashi said in Rab's name: Provided he does not lift it [the basket] a handbreadth from the bottom of the vessel.<sup>24</sup>

Rab said: [Spreading] a rag over half a cask [to cover it] is permitted; over the whole cask, is forbidden.

R. Papa said: A man must not stuff chips into the mouth of a cask jug.<sup>25</sup> because it looks like a strainer. R. Papa's household poured wine slowly from one vessel to another.<sup>26</sup> R. Aha of Difti<sup>27</sup> objected: But there is the residue?<sup>28</sup> — The residue had no value in R. Papa's household.<sup>29</sup>

AN EGG MAY BE PASSED THROUGH A MUSTARD STRAINER. R. Jacob Karhah recited:

(1) I.e., whether the Festival fell on Friday on which day the death occurred, so that it had to be buried on the same day, or whether it fell on Sunday and the death occurred on the Sabbath, so that the burial could not be delayed any longer.

(2) Of a person who died on a Sabbath which was followed by a Festival.

(3) An egg laid on the first day of any Festival except New Year may be eaten on the second day too. But in respect to a corpse New Year is the same as other Festivals.

(4) Of transgression.

(5) The garment has fringes. but since they are not in accordance with the law they are regarded not as part thereof but as a burden which entails a sin offering. Thus here too, since the normal function of the cords is to spread the sheet, not to tie it round a person, they constitute a burden.

(6) Var. lec.: R. Abin.

(7) Lit., to suspend pomegranates therein, but he suspends lees therein.

(8) For some time.

(9) I.e., the intermediate days of Passover and Tabernacles, which enjoy semi-sanctity, being treated as profane in some respects and as holy in others.

(10) Of the law.

(11) The evasion is not obvious, for a person who sees him brew beer does not know that he has sufficient already for the festival.

(12) That he is evading the law, unless he actually puts pomegranates in it, since its usual function is to strain them.

(13) Jast. R. Han.: a head of garlic.

(14) But actually it was to prevent the wine from running out, and thus he repaired the barrel, as it were.

(15) For even if he did these without an artifice he would only violate a Rabbinical, not a Scriptural interdict.

(16) Without an artifice — hence he does nothing wrong.

(17) Rashi: the strainer contains mustard, and when the egg is poured upon it the yolk passes through and the white remains on top. R. Halevi (quoted by Rash): the egg is strained into a dish, not into mustard, but a mustard strainer is specified in order that the action on the Sabbath, though permitted, shall be done differently from what it is on weekdays.

(18) V. Gemara infra.

(19) Larger than a goblet (כוס) but smaller than a barrel (הבית).

(20) Of transgression.

(21) Though the liquid is turbid through the stirring.

(22) All wine is turbid then and drunk thus; hence it is not made fit for drinking (which would be forbidden on the Sabbath) by being put through the strainer.

(23) The cloth must be taut and not form a hollow

(24) Which receives the wine. Otherwise it forms a 'tent', v. p. 694, n. 1. (9) In the latter case a 'tent' is made.

(25) I.e., a jug used for taking wine out of a cask; the chips act as a strainer.

(26) So as to leave the sediment behind.

(27) V. p. 35, n. 5.

(28) The last drops percolating through the dregs left behind in the first vessel, which shows that their purpose was to strain the wine.

(29) He was a beer brewer (B.M. 65b) and could afford to throw away the little wine left at the bottom together with the chips, thus leaving nothing at all there to show their real motive.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 140a

Because it is only done for colouring.<sup>1</sup>

It was stated: If mustard grain is kneaded on Sabbath eve, — on the morrow, Rab said: One must crush [dissolve] it<sup>2</sup> 'with a utensil, but not by hand.'<sup>3</sup> Said Samuel to him: 'By hand'! Does one then crush it every day by hand — is it asses' food? Rather said Samuel: He must crush it by hand, but not with a utensil. It was stated, R. Eleazar said: Both the one and the other are forbidden; while R. Johanan ruled: Both the one and the other are permitted. Abaye and Raba both say: The halachah is not as R. Johanan. R. Johanan [subsequently] adopted R. Eleazar's thesis, while R. Eleazar adopted Samuel's thesis. Abaye and Raba both said [then]: The halachah is as R. Johanan.

Abaye's mother<sup>4</sup> prepared [it] for him, but he would not eat [it]. Ze'iri's wife prepared [some] for R. Hiyya b. Ashi, but he would not eat [it]. Said she to him, 'I prepared it for your teacher [Ze'iri] and he ate, whilst you do not eat!'

Raba b. Shaba said: I was standing before Rabina and I stirred [the mustard] for him with the smooth [inner] part of the garlic, and he ate it.

Mar Zutra said: The law is not as all these opinions. but as the following which was stated; If mustard is kneaded on the eve of the Sabbath, on the morrow one may crush [dissolve] it both by hand or with a utensil; he may pour honey in it, yet he must not beat it up but may mix them. If cress was chopped up on the eve of the Sabbath, on the morrow one may put oil and vinegar into it and add ammitha<sup>5</sup> thereto; and he must not beat then, up but may mix them. If garlic was crushed on the eve of the Sabbath, on the morrow one may put beans and grits therein, yet he must not pound then,, but may mix them, and one may add ammitha to it. What is ammitha? — Ninya,<sup>6</sup> Abaye observed: This proves that ninya is good for [seasoning] cress.

AND ENOMLIN MAY BE PREPARED ON THE SABBATH. Our Rabbis taught: Enomlin may be prepared on the Sabbath but aluntith may not be prepared on the Sabbath. What is enomlin and what is aluntith? — Enomlin is [a mixture of] wine, honey, and pepper. Aluntith is [a mixture of] old wine, clear water and balsam, which is prepared as a cooling [draught] in the baths.<sup>7</sup> R. Joseph said: I Once entered the baths after Mar 'Ukba; on leaving I was offered a cup of [such] wine, and I experienced [a cooling sensation] from the hair of my head [right] down to my toe nails; and had I drunk another glass I would have been afraid lest it be deducted from my merits in the future world.<sup>8</sup> But Mar 'Ukba drank it every day? Mar 'Ukba was different, because he was accustomed to it.

MISHNAH. HILTITH<sup>9</sup> MUST NOT BE DISSOLVED IN WARM WATER,<sup>10</sup> BUT IT MAY BE PUT INTO VINEGAR; AND ONE MUST NOT CAUSE LEEKS TO FLOAT,<sup>11</sup> NOR RUB THEM;<sup>12</sup> BUT THEY MAY BE PUT INTO A SIEVE<sup>13</sup> OR A BASKET.<sup>14</sup> STUBBLE MAY NOT BE SIFTED THROUGH A SIEVE, NOR PLACED ON AN EMINENCE, FOR THE CHAFF TO DROP DOWN; BUT ONE MAY TAKE IT UP IN A SIEVE AND PUT IT INTO THE MANGER.<sup>15</sup>

GEMARA. The scholars asked: What if one does dissolve [it]? R. Adda of Naresh<sup>16</sup> maintained before R. Joseph: If one dissolves [it] he is liable to a sin-offering. Said Abaye to him: If so, if one soaks<sup>17</sup> raw meat in water, is he too liable?<sup>18</sup> Rather said Abaye: It is a Rabbinical [prohibition], that one should not act as he does during the week. R. Johanan asked R. Jannai: May hiltith be dissolved in cold water? It is forbidden. replied he. But we learnt: HILTITH MUST NOT BE DISSOLVED IN WARM WATER, implying that it is permitted in cold water? If so,<sup>19</sup> what is the difference between you and me? Our Mishnah is [the opinion of] an individual. For it was taught: Hiltith may be dissolved neither in warm nor in cold water; R. Jose said: In warm water it is forbidden; in cold it is

permitted.

What is it made for? [As a remedy] for asthma.<sup>20</sup> R. Aha b. Joseph suffered with asthma. He went to Mar 'Ukba, [who] advised him, 'Go and drink three [gold denar] weights of hiltith on three days.' He went and drank it on Thursday and Friday. The following morning he went and asked [about it] in the Beth Hamidrash.<sup>21</sup> Said they to him, The school of R. Adda-others state, the school of Mar son of R. Adda recited: One may drink a kab or two kabs without fear.<sup>22</sup> About drinking, said he, I do not ask.<sup>23</sup> My question is, What about dissolving it?<sup>24</sup> R. Hiyya b. Abin observed to them: This case happened to me, and I went and consulted R. Adda b. Ahabah. but he could not inform me. [So] I went and asked R. Huna, and he answered me, Thus did Rab say: He may dissolve [it] in cold water and place it in the sun. Is this [only] according to him who permits [dissolving]? [No.] It is even according to him who forbids [it]: that is only if one had not drunk at all; but here, since he had drunk [it] on Thursday and Friday, if he would not drink it on the Sabbath he would be endangered.

R. Aha b. Joseph was walking along, leaning<sup>25</sup> on the shoulder of R. Nahman b. Isaac, his sister's son. When we reach R. Safra's house, lead me in, he requested.<sup>26</sup> When they arrived [there] he led him in. How about rubbing [the stiffness out of] linen [washing]?<sup>27</sup> asked he; is his intention to soften the linen, and it is permitted, or perhaps his intention is to make it whiter,<sup>28</sup> which is forbidden? — His intention is to soften it, replied he, and it is permitted. When he went out he [R. Nahman] enquired, What did you ask him? I asked him, What about rubbing linen on the Sabbath, replied he, and he answered me, It is permitted. But let the Master inquire about a scarf?<sup>29</sup> I do not ask about a scarf, because I asked it of R. Huna and he decided it' for me. Then let the Master solve this from a scarf?- There it looks like making it whiter,<sup>30</sup> but here it does not look like making it whiter.

R. Hisda said: As for linen,

---

(1) Sc. when the yolk is poured into a stew; but actually both the yolk and the white are fit for food, and therefore this is not an act of 'selecting' (v. Mishnah 73a).

(2) In water.

(3) He regards the latter as the usual way. and therefore it is forbidden on the Sabbath.

(4) v. p. 316, n. 3.

(5) A kind of cress or pepperwort (*Lepidum sativum*) Jast.

(6) Jast.: ammi, Bishop's weed. Rashi: mint.

(7) , Hence it partakes somewhat of the nature of a medicine, and therefore it is forbidden.

(8) A second glass would inevitably have killed me but for a miracle, which would be ultimately debited to my account.

(9) Jast. *assa foetida*, an umbelliferous plant used as a resin in leaves, for a spice and for medicinal purposes.

(10) To be drunk medicinally.

(11) I.e.. pour water over them to make the refuse float up so that it can be removed.

(12) By hand, likewise to remove the refuse.

(13) And the refuse may fall through.

(14) Probably an open-work basket is meant which may act somewhat as a sieve. Though sifting is forbidden, these are permitted, because even if the refuse does fall through it is only incidental.

(15) Though some chaff may fall through. this is unintentional, the Mishnah agreeing with R. Simeon that whatever is unintentional is permitted.

(16) V. p. 279. n. 11.

(17) The Hebrew is the same for dissolves and soaks.

(18) Surely not.

(19) That you do not accept me as a greater authority on the Mishnah than yourself.

(20) Lit., 'heaviness of heart'.

(21) To ask whether he might take it on Sabbath.

(22) Of transgression.

- (23) Lit., 'it was not in his hand'.  
(24) If the hiltith is dissolved before the Sabbath.  
(25) Lit., 'Supporting himself'.  
(26) He was an old man.  
(27) When it is starched. The rubbing softens it and makes it whiter.  
(28) Lit., 'to beget whiteness'.  
(29) Or, turban.  
(30) One is more particular about a scarf.

## **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 140b**

to draw it away from the cane is permitted; to draw out the cane from it is forbidden.<sup>1</sup> Raba said: But if it is a weaver's implement, it is permitted.<sup>2</sup>

R. Hisda said: A bunch of vegetables, if fit as food for animals, may be handled; if not, it is forbidden.

R. Hiyya b. Ashi said in Rab's name: A meat hook<sup>3</sup> is permitted [to be handled]; a fish [hook] is forbidden.<sup>4</sup>

R. Kattina said: He who stands in the middle of a [marital] bed is as though he stood on a woman's stomach.<sup>5</sup> But this is incorrect.

R. Hisda also said: When a scholar buys vegetables, let him buy long ones, for one bunch is like another [in thickness], and so the length [comes] of itself.<sup>6</sup>

R. Hisda also said: When a scholar buys canes,<sup>7</sup> let him buy long ones; one load is like another, so the length [comes] of itself.

R. Hisda also said: When a scholar has but little bread, let him not eat vegetables, because it whets [the appetite]. R. Hisda also said: I ate vegetables neither when poor nor when rich.<sup>8</sup> When poor, because it whets [the appetite]; when rich, because I say, Where the vegetables are to enter, let fish and meat enter!<sup>9</sup>

R. Hisda also said: If a scholar has but little bread he should not divide [his meal].<sup>10</sup> R. Hisda also said: If a scholar has but little bread he should break [bread].<sup>11</sup> What is the reason? Because he does not do it generously.<sup>12</sup> R. Hisda also said: Formerly I would not break [bread] until I had passed my hand through the whole of my wallet and found there as much as I needed.

R. Hisda also said: When one can eat barley bread but eats wheaten bread he violates, thou shalt not destroy.<sup>13</sup> R. Papa said: When one can drink beer but drinks wine, he violates, thou shalt not destroy.<sup>14</sup> But this is incorrect: Thou shalt not destroy, as applied to one's own person, stands higher.<sup>15</sup>

R. Hisda also said: When a scholar has no oil, let him wash with pit water.<sup>16</sup>

R. Hisda also said: If a scholar buys raw meat he should buy the neck, because it contains three kinds of meat.

R. Hisda also said: When a scholar buys linen [underwear], he should buy it from the Nehar Abba<sup>17</sup> and wash<sup>18</sup> it every thirty days, and I guarantee that it will relieve him [from buying another] for a full year. What does kitonitha [underwear] mean? Kitta na'ah [fine flax].<sup>19</sup>

R. Hisda also said: A scholar should not sit upon a new mat, because it destroys the garments.<sup>20</sup>

R. Hisda also said: A scholar should not send his garments to his host<sup>21</sup> for washing, for this is not in good taste, lest he see something<sup>22</sup> and he come to despise him.

R. Hisda advised his daughters: Act modestly before your husbands: do not eat bread before your husbands,<sup>23</sup> do not eat greens at night,<sup>24</sup> do not eat dates at night nor drink beer at night,<sup>25</sup> and do not ease yourselves where your husbands do,<sup>26</sup> and when someone calls at the door, do not say ‘who is he’ but ‘who is she?’<sup>27</sup> He [R. Hisda] held a jewel in one hand and a [valueless] seed grain in the other; the pearl he showed them but the seed grain he did not show them until they were suffering,<sup>28</sup> and then he showed it to them.<sup>29</sup>

ONE MUST NOT CAUSE LEEKS TO FLOAT. Our Mishnah<sup>30</sup> does not agree with the following Tanna. For it was taught, R. Eliezer b. Jacob said: One must not look at the sieve at all.<sup>31</sup>

MISHNAH. ONE MAY SWEEP OUT [THE MANGER] FOR A STALL OX,<sup>32</sup> AND MOVE [THE REMNANTS] ASIDE FOR THE SAKE OF A GRAZING ANIMAL:<sup>33</sup> THIS IS R. DOSA'S VIEW, BUT THE SAGES FORBID IT. ONE MAY TAKE [FODDER] FROM ONE ANIMAL AND PLACE IT BEFORE ANOTHER ANIMAL ON THE SABBATH.<sup>34</sup>

GEMARA. The scholars asked: Do the Rabbis disagree with the first clause, or with the second, or with both?— Come and hear: For it was taught, But the Sages maintain: Both the one and the other<sup>35</sup> must not be moved on a side.<sup>36</sup>

R. Hisda said: They differ in respect of a ground manger,<sup>37</sup> but all agree that a manger which is a vessel<sup>38</sup> is permitted. But is there any opinion that a ground manger is permitted: surely one levels the holes? — Rather if stated, it was thus stated: R. Hisda said: They differ in respect of a vessel manger, but all hold that a ground manger is forbidden.

ONE MAY TAKE [FODDER] FROM ONE ANIMAL [etc.]. One [Baraita] taught: One may take [fodder] from before an animal that is fastidious and place [it] before an animal that is not fastidious; while another taught: One may take [fodder] from before an animal that is not fastidious and place [it] before an animal that is fastidious. Abaye observed: Both [Baraitas hold] that one may take from an ass [to put] before an ox, but not from an ox [and place it] before an ass. Now, when it is taught, ‘One may take from before an animal that is fastidious’, it refers to an ass, which does not drop saliva [into its food]; ‘and place [it] before an animal that is not fastidious’, to a cow,

---

(1) Linen was hung up on a cane passing through the sleeves to dry. A cane must not be handled on the Sabbath, being regarded as mukzeh, as it stands to be used as fuel.

(2) For it is then a utensil, which may be handled.

(3) Lit., ‘a suspender of meat’ — i.e., a hook. Tosaf. and Jast.

(4) The first was more like a utensil than the second.

(5) Because he is incited to impure thoughts.

(6) I.e., the additional length is extra value — presumably the price was not increased.

(7) For fuel.

(8) Or, I would eat vegetables neither when rich nor when poor.

(9) Which are more nutritious.

(10) Eat a little now and a little later, as at no time will he have enough.

(11) To distribute it among the guests at a meal.

(12) MS. M. deletes the two intervening passages.

(13) Deut. XX, 19. I.e., it is wasteful extravagance.

- (14) Was his attitude influenced by the fact that he was a beer brewer?
- (15) To consume better food and drink is beneficial, not wasteful.
- (16) The scum thickens it into a semblance of oil.
- (17) A canal in the Bagdad region; Obermeyer, p. 239.
- (18) Lit., 'whiten'.
- (19) Jast. Rashi: the upper class — its wearer is fit to be a member of the upper classes — a play on words, of course.
- (20) Being hard, it injures the texture.
- (21) The keeper of the boarding house where he stays.
- (22) A euphemism for semen.
- (23) You may eat too much.
- (24) Because of their odour.
- (25) Because of their laxative properties.
- (26) Even in their absence.
- (27) I.e., 'who is it' but in the feminine, not the masculine form.
- (28) With curiosity, to know what he was holding.
- (29) To prove the folly of curiosity (Jast. s.v. **בזרא**, which 'Aruch reads instead of **כורא**).
- (30) Which continues, BUT THEY MAY BE PUT INTO A SIEVE.
- (31) I.e., one must not handle it for any purpose on the Sabbath.
- (32) If it contains chips, etc., they may render the straw repulsive and cause the animal to go off its feed.
- (33) Which is ordinarily fed on pasture. — R. Han. and Jast. Rashi translates: one may move aside the straw, if there is much, lest the animal tread it into the dung.
- (34) Because the second will eat it, and therefore it is not unnecessary handling.
- (35) Sc. fodder in a manger and straw lying in front of an animal.
- (36) Thus they disagree with both clauses.
- (37) I.e., a small low fenced enclosure on the ground. The Rabbis forbid it lest one comes to level up holes in the ground.
- (38) I.e., a real manger.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 141a

which drops saliva.<sup>1</sup> And when it is taught, 'One may take [fodder] from before an animal that is not fastidious', it refers to an ass, which is not particular about what it eats;<sup>2</sup> 'and put [it] before an animal that is fastidious,' to a cow, which is particular about what it eats.<sup>3</sup> MISHNAH. ONE MUST NOT MOVE STRAW [LYING] UPON A BED WITH HIS HAND, YET HE MAY MOVE IT WITH HIS BODY. BUT IF IT IS FODDER FOR ANIMALS, OR A PILLOW OR A SHEET WAS UPON IT BEFORE NIGHTFALL, HE MAY MOVE IT WITH HIS HAND.<sup>4</sup> ONE MAY UNDO A HOUSEHOLDER'S CLOTHES PRESS,<sup>5</sup> BUT NOT FORCE IT DOWN.<sup>6</sup> BUT A LAUNDERER'S [PRESS] MAY NOT BE TOUCHED.<sup>7</sup> R. JUDAH SAID: IF IT WAS UNDONE BEFORE THE SABBATH, ONE MAY UNFASTEN THE WHOLE AND REMOVE IT.

GEMARA. R. Nahman said: A radish, if it is the right way up, it is permitted; if it is reversed, it is forbidden.<sup>8</sup> R. Adda b. Abba said, The scholars<sup>9</sup> said, We learnt [a Mishnah] in disagreement with R. Nahman: ONE MUST NOT MOVE STRAW [LYING] UPON A BED WITH HIS HAND, YET HE MAY MOVE IT WITH HIS BODY. BUT IF IT IS FODDER FOR ANIMALS, OR A PILLOW ON A SHEET WAS UPON IT BEFORE NIGHTFALL, HE MAY MOVE IT WITH HIS HAND: this proves, indirect<sup>10</sup> handling is not designated handling;<sup>11</sup> this proves it.

Rab Judah<sup>12</sup> said: To crush peppergrains one by one with a knife-handle is permitted; in twos, it is forbidden.<sup>13</sup> Raba said: Since he does it in a different way,<sup>14</sup> crushing even many [is permitted] too.

Rab Judah also said: If one bathes in water, he should first dry himself<sup>15</sup> and then ascend, lest he come to carry<sup>16</sup> four cubits in a karmelith.<sup>17</sup> If so, when he enters<sup>18</sup> too, his force propels the water four cubits,<sup>19</sup> which is forbidden? — They did not prohibit one's force in a karmelith.

Abaye — others state, Rab Judah — said: One may scrape off the clay from his foot on to the ground, but not on to a wall. Said Raba, Why not on to a wall? because It looks like building?<sup>20</sup> but it is ignorant building?<sup>21</sup> Rather said Raba: He may scrape it off on to a wall but not on to the ground, lest he come to level holes. It was stated, Mar son of Rabina said: Both are forbidden; R. Papa said: Both are permitted. According to Mar son of Rabina, whereon shall he scrape it? He scrapes it on a plank.<sup>22</sup>

Raba said: A man should not sit on the top of a stake,<sup>23</sup> lest an article roll away from him<sup>24</sup> and he come to fetch it.

Raba also said: One must not bend sideways a cask [which is standing] on the ground,<sup>25</sup> lest he come to level hollows.

Raba also said: One must not squeeze a cloth stopper into the mouth of a jug, lest he come to wring [it] out.

R. Kahana said: As for the clay [mire] on one's garment, he may rub off from the inside but not from the outside.<sup>26</sup> An objection is raised: One may scrape off the clay from his shoes with the back of a knife, and that which is on one's garment he may scrape off with [even]<sup>27</sup> his finger nail, providing that he does not rub it. Surely that means that he must not rub it at all? — No: he must not rub it from the outside but only from the inside.

R. Abbahu said in R. Eleazar's name in R. Jannai's name: A new shoe may be scraped, but not an old one.

---

(1) Hence the cow will eat after the ass.

(2) It eats fodder even when it contains thorns and thistles.

(3) Spurning thorns and thistles.

(4) V. supra 50a for notes.

(5) The two boards of the press fitted on to four perforated rods: the upper board was pressed down and pegs were inserted in the holes to keep it there. The press may be undone by withdrawing these pegs, because the clothes are required for the Sabbath.

(6) As the clothes will be wanted during the week, but not on the Sabbath.

(7) This was screwed down very tightly, and undoing it would resemble taking a utensil to pieces.

(8) V. supra 123a for notes.

(9) Be rab may mean either the academy founded by Rab, or scholars in general, v. Weiss, Dor, III, 158.

(10) Lit., 'from the side'.

(11) Cf. supra 43b, p 201, n. 1,

(12) Asheri in Bez. I, 21 reads: R. Huna.

(13) Because then it looks like grinding.

(14) From usual, which is in a mill or a mortar.

(15) I.e., the part of his body that is not in the water.

(16) The water upon him.

(17) V. Glos.

(18) Lit., 'goes down'.

(19) His weight makes the water spurt that distance.

(20) Sc. the addition of clay to the wall.

(21) Lit., 'a field labourer'. I.e., surely none but the ignorant would think of building in such a manner.

(22) Lying on the ground.

(23) At the entrance to an alley. whereby carrying therein is permitted; v. p. 30, n. 2.

(24) 'Without the entrance, where it is public ground.

(25) Text as emended by Bah.

(26) In the latter case he looks as though he desires to wash the garment, though it is not actual washing.

(27) So Wilna Gaon.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 141b

With what does one scrape it? — Said R. Abbahu: With the back of a knife. A certain old man said to him, Delete your [teaching] on account of what R. Hiyya taught: One must not scrape either a new shoe or all old one, nor must he rub his foot with oil while it is in the shoe or sandal;<sup>1</sup> but one may rub his foot with oil and place it in his shoe or sandal; he may also oil his whole body and roll himself on a leather spread without fear.<sup>2</sup> R. Hisda said: They learnt this only [if his intention is] to polish it;<sup>3</sup> but [if it is] to dress it,<sup>4</sup> it is forbidden. 'To dress it'? surely that is obvious? Moreover, does any one permit it [if he desires] to polish it? — Rather if stated, It was thus stated: R. Hisda said: They learnt this only of a quantity [sufficient merely] to polish it; but [if] the quantity<sup>5</sup> [is sufficient] to dress it, it is forbidden. Our Rabbis taught: A small[-footed] man must not go out with the shoe of a large[-footed] man,<sup>6</sup> but he may go out with [too] large a shirt. A woman must not go out with a gaping shoe,<sup>7</sup> nor may she perform halizah therewith; yet if she does perform halizah therewith, the halizah is valid. And one must not go out with a new shoe: of what shoe did they rule this? Of a woman's shoe.<sup>8</sup> Bar Kappara taught: They learnt [this] only where she had not gone out therein one hour before nightfall;<sup>9</sup> but if she went out therein on the eve of the Sabbath, it is permitted.

One [Baraita] taught: A shoe may be removed from its last; while another taught: It may not be removed. There is no difficulty: one is [according to] R. Eliezer, the other [according to] the Rabbis. For we learnt: If a shoe is on the last, — R. Eliezer declares it clean, while the Sages declare it is unclean.<sup>10</sup> This is well according to Raba, who maintained: It is permitted [to handle] an article whose function is for a forbidden purpose, whether it is required itself or for its place: then it is correct. But on Abaye's view that it may be [handled] for itself, but it is forbidden [to handle it] when its place is required,<sup>11</sup> what can be said?<sup>12</sup> — We treat here of one [a shoe] that is loose [on the last].<sup>13</sup> For it was taught, R. Judah said: If it is loose, it is permitted [to remove it]. The reason [then why it is permitted] is because it is loose. But if it is not loose it is not [permitted]? This is well on Abaye's view that an article whose function is for a forbidden purpose may be [handled] when required for itself, but not when its place [only] is required: then it is correct. But according to Raba, who maintains, it is permitted [to handle it] both when required for itself or when its place is required, what can be said: [for] why particularly a loose [shoe], — even if not loose too it is thus? That<sup>14</sup> represents R. Judah's view in R. Eliezer's name. For it was taught: R. Judah said in R. Eliezer's name: If it is loose, it is permitted.<sup>15</sup>

## CHAPTER XXI

MISHNAH. A MAN MAY TAKE UP HIS SON WHILE HE HAS A STONE IN HIS HAND OR A BASKET WITH A STONE IN IT; AND UNCLEAN TERUMAH MAY BE HANDLED TOGETHER WITH CLEAN [TERUMAH] OR WITH HULLIN.<sup>16</sup> R. JUDAH SAID: ONE MAY ALSO REMOVE<sup>17</sup> THE ADMIXTURE [OF TERUMAH IN HULLIN] WHEN ONE [PART IS NEUTRALIZED] IN A HUNDRED [PARTS].<sup>18</sup>

GEMARA. Raba said: If one carries out<sup>19</sup> a live child with a purse hanging around its neck, he is culpable on account of the purse; a dead child with a purse hanging around its neck, he is not culpable. 'A live child with a purse hanging around its neck, he is culpable on account of the purse. But let him be culpable on account of the child? — Raba agrees with R. Nathan, who maintained, A living [person] carries himself.<sup>20</sup> But let the purse be counted as nought in relation to the child? Did we not learn, [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? — A bed is accounted as nought in relation to a living person,<sup>21</sup> but a purse is not accounted as nought in relation to the child.

‘A dead child with a purse hanging around its neck, he is not culpable.’ But let him be culpable on account of the child? Raba agrees with R. Simeon, who maintained: One is not culpable on account of a labour unrequired per se.<sup>22</sup>

We learnt: A MAN MAY TAKE UP HIS SON WHILE HE HAS A STONE IN HIS HAND?<sup>23</sup> — The School of R. Jannai said: This refers to a child who pines for his father.<sup>24</sup> If so,

- 
- (1) Because the oil incidentally softens the leather, which is forbidden.
  - (2) Of transgression.
  - (3) When he puts his oiled foot in the shoe or sandal his purpose is to polish the leather.
  - (4) To soften the leather or make it more pliable.
  - (5) Of oil rubbed on to the foot.
  - (6) Lest it fall off, and he come to carry it.
  - (7) Rashi. Jast.: ‘a flappy (outworn) shoe’ — either because she may be laughed at and so she will take it off’ (Rashi), or it fall off, and she come to carry it.
  - (8) She is particular about the fit, and if it is not exact, she may remove and carry it. ‘New’ means never worn at all.
  - (9) Lit., ‘while it was yet day Friday.’
  - (10) ‘Clean’ and ‘unclean’ mean not susceptible and susceptible to uncleanness respectively. R. Eliezer holds that as long as it is on the last it is not a completely finished article, whereas only such can become unclean. Since it is not a finished article, it may not be handled on the Sabbath. The view of the Rabbis is the reverse.
  - (11) V. notes supra 123b.
  - (12) For the function of the last is a forbidden one, and in removing the shoe one must necessarily handle the last, though he does not require the use of the last itself, and according to Abaye that is forbidden.
  - (13) So that the last is not handled at all.
  - (14) The Baraita which makes a distinction between where it is loose or not
  - (15) Though R. Eliezer holds that as long as it is on the last it is not completely finished (v. supra) and therefore may not be handled, that is only if it is tightly fitted on it, so that there is some difficulty in removing it. But if it is loose and comes off easily he admits that it is finished; hence it ranks as an article, is susceptible to defilement, and may be handled on the Sabbath.
  - (16) Although the stone or the unclean terumah by itself may not be handled as mukzeh.
  - (17) Lit., ‘take up’.
  - (18) If one part of terumah is accidentally mixed with a hundred parts of hullin it is neutralized and the mixture is permitted to non-priests. Nevertheless, since it does contain some terumah, though it cannot be distinguished from the rest, one part must be removed, and R. Judah permits this on the Sabbath.
  - (19) From a private into a public domain.
  - (20) V. supra 94a.
  - (21) Since the bed is required for him.
  - (22) V. supra 30a; carrying out a dead child comes under this category, supra 94b.
  - (23) This proves that the man is not regarded as himself holding the stone, which would be forbidden. Hence by analogy he does not carry out the purse suspended around the child's neck; why then is he culpable on its account?
  - (24) If he does not take him up he may sicken with pining, though it will not actually endanger him: hence since the father does not actually handle the stone himself he is permitted to take him up.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 142a

why particularly a stone? the same applies to a denar! Why did Raba say: They learnt only a stone, but a denar is forbidden? — In the case of a stone, if it falls down the father will not come to fetch it, [but] with a denar, if it falls down the father will come to fetch it. It was taught in accordance with Raba: If one carries out his garments folded up and lying on his shoulder, or his sandals or his rings

in his hands, he is liable; but if he was wearing them, he is not culpable. If one carries out a person with his garments' upon him, with his sandals on his feet and his rings on his hands,<sup>1</sup> he is not culpable. Hence if he carried them as they are<sup>2</sup> he would be culpable.<sup>3</sup> A BASKET WITH A STONE IN IT: yet why? let the basket be [regarded as] a stand for a forbidden article?<sup>4</sup> — Said Rabbah b. Bar Hanah in R. Johanan's name: We treat here of a basket full of produce.<sup>5</sup> Then let the produce be thrown out, and let the stone be thrown out, and then we can collect [the produce] by hand?<sup>6</sup> — As R. Elai said [elsewhere] in Rab's name: The reference is to fruit which becomes soiled, so here too [we treat] of fruit which becomes soiled.<sup>7</sup> Then let one shake it [the basket] about?<sup>8</sup> — Said R. Hiyya b. Ashi in Raba's name: We treat here of a broken basket, so that the stone itself becomes a wall for the basket.<sup>9</sup>

[UNCLEAN] TERUMAH MAY BE HANDLED, etc. R. Hisda said: They learnt [this] only where the clean [terumah] is underneath and the unclean is on top; but if the clean [terumah] is on top and the unclean underneath, one must take the clean and leave the unclean.<sup>10</sup> But if the clean is underneath too, let him throw off [the unclean] and take it? — Said R. Elai in Rab's name: We treat of fruit which becomes soiled. An objection is raised: One may handle unclean terumah together with clean terumah or with hullin, whether the clean is on top and the unclean is below, or the unclean is on top and the clean is underneath; this refutes R. Hisda? — R. Hisda answers you: Our Mishnah [means that] it is required for itself;<sup>11</sup> the Baraitha is where its place is required.<sup>12</sup> What compels R. Hisda to interpret our Mishnah as meaning that it is required for itself?<sup>13</sup> — Said Raba, Our Mishnah, by deduction, supports him. For the second clause<sup>14</sup> states: If money is lying on a cushion, one shakes the cushion, and it falls off. Whereon Rabbah b. Bar Hanah said in R. Johanan's name: They learnt this only if it [the cushion] is required for itself; but if its place is required, one removes it while it [the money] is upon it. And since the second clause means that it is required for itself, the first clause too means that it is required for itself.

R. JUDAH SAID: ONE MAY ALSO REMOVE, etc. Yet why? surely he makes it fit?<sup>15</sup> — R. Judah agrees with R. Eliezer, who maintains: The terumah lies as a [separate] entity.<sup>16</sup> For we learnt: If a se'ah of terumah falls into less than a hundred,<sup>17</sup> and thus they become a [forbidden] mixture, and then some of the mixture falls elsewhere,<sup>18</sup> R. Eliezer said: It creates a [forbidden] mixture as though it were certain terumah,<sup>19</sup> but the Sages maintain: The mixture creates a [forbidden] mixture only in proportion.<sup>20</sup> [But] say that you know him [to rule thus] with stringency; do you know him [to rule thus] with lenience?<sup>21</sup> — Rather [reply thus]: He [R. Judah] rules as R. Simeon, as we learnt: If a se'ah of terumah falls into a hundred,<sup>22</sup> and one has no time to remove [it] until another falls in, it is [all] forbidden;<sup>23</sup> but R. Simeon permits it.<sup>24</sup> Yet how [does this follow]? Perhaps there they differ in this: viz., the first Tanna holds: Though they fell in consecutively it is as though they fell in simultaneously, so that each falls into fifty; whereas R. Simeon holds: The first is neutralized in the hundred, and this one is neutralized in a hundred and one?<sup>25</sup> — Rather [reply thus]: He [R. Judah] rules as R. Simeon b. Eleazar. For it was taught, R. Simeon b. Eleazar said: One may cast his eyes at one side and eat from the other.<sup>26</sup> Yet does he agree with him?

(1) I.e., the man is wearing them.

(2) If the person carried were holding, not wearing them.

(3) This is analogous to Raba's dictum, for a purse 'suspended from a child's neck is not in the position of being worn.

(4) V. p. 213, n. 4.

(5) 'So that the basket serves as a stand for a permitted thing.

(6) And replace it in the basket. Why did they permit to carry the stone?

(7) If thrown on the ground, e.g., figs and grapes.

(8) Until the stone lies at a side, when it can be thrown out without affecting the produce.

(9) By filling up the gap.

(10) And there is no reason for handling the unclean.

(11) I.e., he wishes to eat the terumah. Therefore if the clean terumah is on top he can simply take it and leave the rest.

- (12) He needs the place where the utensil containing it is standing: therefore he must remove them — Sc. the clean and the unclean — together, whatever their position.
- (13) So that he has to explain the Mishnah as referring to when the unclean terumah is on top.
- (14) Sc. the Mishnah infra b.
- (15) For use. This should be preventively forbidden out of consideration for that which is made fit by means of labour.
- (16) Since one part is to be removed, it is as though the terumah therein lay separate and distinct, and therefore the whole mixture is fit for use in any case.
- (17) Se'ahs of hullin.
- (18) I.e., into another pile of produce.
- (19) Sc. as though it were all terumah and therefore it can only be neutralized by a hundred times its quantity. Thus he regards the terumah as distinct.
- (20) E.g., if a se'ah of terumah falls into nine se'ahs of hullin in the first place, and then a se'ah of the mixture falls into another heap of produce, this second se'ah is regarded as containing one tenth of a se'ah of terumah only, and if the second pile contains ten se'ahs it neutralizes it.
- (21) As in our Mishnah, where this view would result in greater lenience.
- (22) Hence it is neutralized, but that one se'ah of the whole must be removed.
- (23) Since here are now two se'ahs of terumah in one hundred of hullin.
- (24) It is now assumed that his reason is because he regards the first se'ah as lying distinct and apart, and therefore the second se'ah alone is counted, and that too is neutralized.
- (25) Hence on the contrary, instead of regarding the terumah as a thing apart, he maintains that it becomes entirely one with the hullin.
- (26) I.e., he may decide to remove a se'ah from one side of the pile and then, without actually removing it, eat from the other. Thus the removing is not essential.

## **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 142b**

surely he disagrees? For it was taught, R. Judah said: One removes the admixture [of terumah in hullin] when one part [is neutralized] in a hundred and one parts;<sup>1</sup> R. Simeon b. Eleazar said: One casts his eyes at one side and eats from the other?<sup>2</sup> — R. Judah's [ruling] goes beyond R. Simeon b. Eleazar's.<sup>3</sup> MISHNAH. IF A STONE IS ON THE MOUTH OF A CASK [OF WINE], ONE TILTS IT ON A SIDE AND IT FALLS OFF.<sup>4</sup> IF IT [THE CASK] IS [STANDING] AMONG [OTHER] CASKS,<sup>5</sup> HE LIFTS IT OUT, TILTS IT ON A SIDE, AND IT FALLS OFF. IF MONEY IS LYING ON A CUSHION, ONE SHAKES THE CUSHION, AND IT FALLS OFF. IF DIRT<sup>6</sup> IS UPON IT, ONE WIPES IT OFF WITH A RAG;<sup>7</sup> IF IT IS OF LEATHER,<sup>8</sup> WATER IS Poured OVER IT UNTIL IT DISAPPEARS.

GEMARA. R. Huna said in Rab's name: They learnt this only where one forgot [it there], but if he placed [it there]. it [the cask] becomes a stand for a forbidden article.

IF IT IS [STANDING] AMONG [OTHER] CASKS, etc. Which Tanna holds that wherever there is something permitted and something forbidden, one must occupy oneself with what is permitted, not with what is forbidden?<sup>9</sup> — Said Rabbah b. Bar Hanah in R. Johanan's name, It is R. Simeon b. Gamaliel. For we learnt: If one selects beans on a festival, Beth Shammai maintain: He must select the edible [beans] and eat them;<sup>10</sup> whereas Beth Hillel rule: He may select in the usual way<sup>11</sup> into his lap or into a plate. Now it was taught, R. Simeon b. Gamaliel said: When was this said? When the edible exceeds the non-edible;<sup>12</sup> but if the non-edible exceeds the edible, all agree that he must select the edible. But here it is analogous to where the edible exceeds the non-edible?<sup>13</sup> -Since he cannot take [the whole of] the wine, should he desire it, unless he lifts it up, it is analogous to where the non-edible exceeds the edible.<sup>14</sup> IF IT IS [STANDING] AMONG THE CASKS, HE LIFTS IT OUT. It was taught, R. Jose said: If the cask is lying among a store [of casks], or if glassware is lying under it, he lifts it out elsewhere, tilts it on a side, so that it falls off, takes thereof what he requires, and replaces it.

IF MONEY IS LYING ON A CUSHION: R. Hiyya b. Ashi said: They learnt this only where one forgot [it there]; but if he placed [it there],<sup>15</sup> it [the cushion] became a stand for a forbidden article. Rabbah b. Bar Hanah said: They learnt this only when it is required for itself; but if its place is required, one may remove it [the cushion] while they [the coins] are yet upon it. And thus did Hiyya b. Rab of Difti<sup>16</sup> recite: They learnt this only when it is required for itself; but if its place is required, one may move it while they are yet upon it.

IF MONEY IS LYING ON A CUSHION, ONE SHAKES, etc. R. Oshaia said: If one forgets a purse in a courtyard, he places a loaf or a child thereon and moves it. R. Isaac said: If one forgets a brick in a courtyard, he places a loaf or a child thereon and moves it. R. Judah b. Shila said in R. Assi's name: They once forgot a saddlebag full of money in the street, and went and consulted R. Johanan and he told them, Place a loaf or a child thereon and move it.<sup>17</sup> Mar Zutra said: The law is as all these rulings, where one forgets. R. Ashi said: Even if one forgets, this is still not [permitted], and they permitted [the expedient of] a loaf or a child only in connection with a corpse.<sup>18</sup>

Abaye placed a ladle on a pile of sheaves;<sup>19</sup> Raba placed a knife on a young dove<sup>20</sup> and handled it. Said R. Joseph: How keen are the rulings of children!<sup>21</sup> assume that the Rabbis ruled thus when one forgets: but was it said [that it is permitted] at the very outset? Abaye retorted: But that I am a person of importance,<sup>22</sup> would I need a ladle on sheaves: surely they are fit for reclining thereon.<sup>23</sup> Raba retorted: But that I am a person of importance, would I need a knife on a young dove? surely it is fit for me as raw meat.<sup>24</sup> Thus the reason is because it is fit as raw meat; but if it were not fit as raw meat it might not [be handled]:<sup>25</sup> shall we say that Raba agrees with R. Judah?<sup>26</sup> But surely Raba said to his servant, Roast me a duck<sup>27</sup> and throw its entrails to a cat?<sup>28</sup>

---

(1) One hundred and one is stated inclusively.

(2) Thus R. Judah insists on actual removal.

(3) He agrees with R. Simeon b. Eleazar but adds that since mere intention suffices to make the mixture fit, one can also remove the se'ah on the Sabbath.

(4) When he wishes to draw the contents.

(5) And the falling stone might cause damage.

(6) E.g., secretion, spittle, etc.

(7) But not with water, which is forbidden as washing.

(8) Which is not such as is washed with water.

(9) As here: one must not handle the stone, a forbidden article, but the whole cask, which is a permitted object, even though the stone lies upon it.

(10) Leaving the non-edible beans in the bowl.

(11) I.e., he can remove the non-edible beans, if he wishes.

(12) Then Beth Hillel permit the latter to be picked out, because it is less trouble.

(13) For there is more trouble in lifting out the whole cask than in simply removing the stone.

(14) Eventually he must lift out the cask and tilt it in order to obtain the wine at the very bottom; hence there is no more trouble in lifting it out now.

(15) Before the Sabbath.

(16) V. p. 35, n. 5.

(17) Less than four cubits at a time, since carrying in a street is forbidden; or, within a barrier formed by a chain of persons, v. 'Er. 43b.

(18) V. supra 30b.

(19) To handle the latter in virtue of the former.

(20) Killed, raw and unsalted.

(21) Said sarcastically.

(22) Who sets an example.

(23) Hence I may hand]e them in any case, and I place the ladle there merely because I do not wish to encourage laxity

of observance.

(24) Which used to be eaten in his days.

(25) Though it would still be fit for dogs; thus fitness for dogs does not permit handling by humans.

(26) Who holds the view expressed in the preceding note; v. Bez. 6b.

(27) It was a festival.

(28) Thus he permitted him to handle it, though unfit for human beings just then, entrails not being eaten on Festivals: nevertheless on the previous day, before the festival commenced, they would have been fit for human beings too.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 143a

There, since they would putrefy,<sup>1</sup> his mind was [set] upon them from the previous day.<sup>2</sup> Logic too indicates that Raba agrees with R. Judah. For Raba lectured: A woman must not enter a wood-shed to take thence a wood poker;<sup>3</sup> and if a wood poker is broken [on a Festival], it may not be used as fuel on the Festival, because we may heat with utensils but not with fragments of utensils. This proves it.<sup>4</sup>

MISHNAH. BETH SHAMMAI SAY: ONE MAY REMOVE BONES AND [NUT]SHELLS FROM THE TABLE;<sup>5</sup> BUT BETH HILLEL RULE: ONE MUST TAKE AWAY THE WHOLE BOARD AND SHAKE IT.<sup>6</sup> ONE MAY REMOVE FROM THE TABLE CRUMBS LESS THAN THE SIZE OF AN OLIVE AND THE PANICLES OF BEANS AND LENTILS, BECAUSE THEY ARE FOOD FOR ANIMALS. AS FOR A SPONGE, IF IT HAS A LEATHERN HANDLE, ONE MAY WIPE [THE BOARD] WITH IT; IF NOT, ONE MAY NOT WIPE [THE BOARD] WITH IT.<sup>7</sup> [THE SAGES MAINTAIN]:<sup>8</sup> IN EITHER CASE IT MAY BE HANDLED ON THE SABBATH<sup>9</sup> AND IS NOT SUSCEPTIBLE TO DEFILEMENT.<sup>10</sup>

GEMARA. R. Nahman said: As for us, we have no other [view] but that Beth Shammai agrees with R. Judah, and Beth Hillel with R. Simeon.<sup>11</sup>

ONE MAY REMOVE CRUMBS FROM THE TABLE. This supports R. Johanan. For R. Johanan said: Crumbs less than an olive in size may not be wantonly<sup>12</sup> destroyed.<sup>13</sup>

PANICLES OF BEANS. Who is the authority? [Apparently] R. Simeon, who rejects [the interdict of] mukzeh?<sup>14</sup> Then consider the final clause: AS FOR A SPONGE, IF IT HAS A LEATHERN HANDLE, ONE MAY WIPE [THE BOARD] WITH IT; IF NOT, ONE MAY NOT WIPE WITH IT: this agrees with R. Judah, who maintains, That which is unintentional is forbidden?<sup>15</sup> — Here even R. Simeon agrees, for Abaye and Raba both maintained: R. Simeon admits in a case of ‘cut off his head but let him not die.’<sup>16</sup>

The kernels of Syrian dates<sup>17</sup> may be handled, since they are fit [for cattle] on account of their parent source,<sup>18</sup> but those of Persian [dates] are forbidden.<sup>19</sup> Samuel handled them in virtue of [a piece of] bread.<sup>20</sup> (Mnemonic: SHarnas SHapaz.)<sup>21</sup> Samuel is consistent with his view, for Samuel said: One may carry out all his requirements with bread.<sup>22</sup> Rabbah handled them in virtue of a bowl [flask] of water. R. Huna the son of R. Joshua made them as a pot of excrements.<sup>23</sup> Said R. Ashi to Amemar: But may we make a pot of excrements at the outset?<sup>24</sup> R. Shesheth threw them away [spat them out] with his tongue. R. Papa threw them behind the couch.<sup>25</sup> It was said of R. Zechariah b. Eucolos that he would turn his face to the back of the couch and throw them away. [

---

(1) If left until the evening after the Festival.

(2) Intending them for cats, and therefore they are mukan (q.v. Glos.).

(3) For wood in a shed is generally meant for fuel, not to be used as a utensil,

(4) That Raba accepts the interdict of mukzeh, in accordance with R. Judah.

(5) By hand, though they are not even fit for a dog — dry and hard bones are referred to for Beth Shammai do not accept

the interdict of mukzeh.

(6) But the bones and nutshells may not be handled, Beth Hillel accepting the interdict of mukzeh.

(7) For fear of wringing out the absorbed moisture.

(8) This is omitted in some versions.

(9) When dry.

(10) Being neither a wooden utensil, a garment, a sack, nor metal, and only these can become unclean.

(11) R. Judah accepts the interdict of mukzeh; R. Simeon does not. Hence the views ascribed to Beth Shammai and Beth Hillel respectively in our Mishnah must be reversed.

(12) Lit., 'by hand'.

(13) Rashi: since the Mishnah states, ONE MAY REMOVE, implying that they are removed by hand, and must not be thrown away. Tosaf. rejects this deduction: moreover, it appears from Ber. 52b that 'may be destroyed' is the correct reading. Accordingly, Tosaf. reads there: ...may be wantonly destroyed, the deduction being from the statement, BECAUSE THEY ARE FOOD FOR ANIMALS, which may be destroyed.

(14) For on Judah's view it is mukzeh, since it was together with the edible portion before the Sabbath when it was not mukan for animals.

(15) The unintentional act is that in holding it water is wrung out.

(16) V. p. 357, n. 8.

(17) These were of an inferior quality and only fit for cattle.

(18) Lit., 'their mother'. Sc. the date itself, v. n. 8, the case here being the reverse.

(19) Because the dates themselves were fit for human beings.

(20) Similar to the cases given supra 142b.

(21) V. p. 149, n. 6. SH=SHemuel (Samuel). R=Rabbah; N=R. Huna; S=R. ASHi, SH=SHesheth, P=R. Papa; Z=R. Zechariah.

(22) Supra 50b.

(23) He collected all the kernels in front of him; the quantity made them repulsive and he could treat them as a pot of excrements, which may be removed.

(24) Surely not. Thus he disagrees with R. Huna.

(25) Upon which he reclined while eating.

## **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 143b**

### CHAPTER XXII

MISHNAH. IF A CASK [OF WINE] IS BROKEN<sup>1</sup> ONE MAY SAVE THEREOF THE REQUIREMENTS<sup>2</sup> FOR THREE MEALS, AND HE [THE OWNER] CAN SAY TO OTHERS, 'COME AND SAVE FOR YOURSELVES', PROVIDED THAT HE DOES NOT SPONGE IT UP.<sup>3</sup> FRUIT MAY NOT BE SQUEEZED IN ORDER TO EXPRESS THEIR JUICES:<sup>4</sup> IF THEY EXUDE OF THEIR OWN ACCORD THEY ARE PROHIBITED. R. JUDAH SAID: IF [THEY STAND] AS EATABLES,<sup>5</sup> THAT WHICH EXUDES FROM THEM IS PERMITTED; BUT IF FOR LIQUIDS,<sup>6</sup> THAT WHICH EXUDES FROM THEM IS PROHIBITED. IF HONEYCOMBS ARE CRUSHED ON THE EVE OF THE SABBATH AND IT [THE HONEY] EXUDES SPONTANEOUSLY, IT IS FORBIDDEN; BUT R. ELEAZAR<sup>7</sup> PERMITS IT.

GEMARA. A Tanna taught: One must not sponge up wine nor dab up oil,<sup>8</sup> so that he should not act as he does during the week.

Our Rabbis taught: If one's produce is scattered in his courtyard, he may collect a little at a time and eat it,<sup>9</sup> but not into a basket or a tub, so that he should not act as he does during the week. FRUIT MAY NOT BE SQUEEZED, [etc.]. Rab Judah said in Samuel's name: R. Judah agreed with the Sages in respect to olives and grapes. What is the reason? Since they are [normally] for expressing, he puts his mind to them.<sup>10</sup> But 'Ulla said in Rab's name: R. Judah disagreed in respect of olives and grapes too. While R. Johanan said: The halachah is as R. Judah in the case of other

produce, but the halachah is not as R. Judah in the case of olives and grapes. Rabbah said in Rab Judah's name in Samuel's name: R. Judah agreed with the Sages in respect of olives and grapes, while the Sages agreed with R. Judah in respect of other produce. Said R. Jeremiah to R. Abba: Then wherein do they differ? When you find it [I will tell you,] he replied.<sup>11</sup> R. Nahman b. Isaac said: It is reasonable that they differ in the case of mulberries and pomegranates.<sup>12</sup> For it was taught: If one draws off oil from olives, or wine from grapes,<sup>13</sup> and [then] carries them in,<sup>14</sup> whether as eatables or for their liquids, that which exudes from them is forbidden. If one draws fluid out of mulberries or juice<sup>15</sup> out of pomegranates, and [then] carries them in, as eatables, that which exudes from them is permitted; [if he carries them in] for their liquid or without specifying [their purpose], that which exudes from them is forbidden: the words of R. Judah. But the Sages maintain: Whether for eating or for drinking, that which exudes from them is forbidden.

Now, does R. Judah hold that if it [the purpose] is unspecified, it [the exuding liquid] is forbidden? But surely we learnt: A woman's milk defiles,<sup>16</sup> [whether it flows] with or without [the woman's] desire; a cow's milk defiles only [when it flows] with [its owner's] desire.<sup>17</sup> Said R. Akiba, It [the reverse] follows a minori: if woman's milk, which is set apart for infants only, defiles [whether it flows] with or without [her] desire, then cow's milk, which is set apart for both infants and adults, surely defiles [whether it flows] with or without [the owner's] desire.<sup>18</sup> [Said they to him]: If a woman's milk is unclean<sup>19</sup> without [her] desire, that may be because the blood of her wound is unclean;<sup>20</sup> shall cow's milk be unclean

---

(1) On the Sabbath.

(2) Lit., 'food'.

(3) I.e., he must not absorb the spilt wine in a sponge, lest he wring it out (into a vessel), which is forbidden.

(4) This is forbidden under threshing, v. supra 73a.

(5) E.g., dates which are intended for eating.

(6) E.g., dates intended for honey.

(7) This is the reading supra 19b, R. Eleazar b. Shammua' being the Tanna that is meant — Rashi ibid; v. Bah. Cur. edd. R. Eliezer.

(8) With his hands, which he then wipes on the edge of a vessel so that the oil runs unto it.

(9) This implies that he may collect only what he intends eating there and then. Tosaf. however, favours the deletion of 'and eat it'.

(10) If they exude their liquid he does not mind, or is even pleased.

(11) Probably: if you think carefully about it you will find the answer yourself.

(12) Which were not usually pressed for juice.

(13) Ri. (v. Tosaf. a.l.) Rashi translates; if oil oozes out of olives, etc. — of its own accord.

(14) To the house for storing. 'Then' is added on the Ri's explanation. Rashi: he had (previously) carried in.

(15) Lit., 'wine'.

(16) I.e., if it falls on a food-stuff it makes it liable to defilement, cf. p. 45, n. 1, likewise, it is defiled itself if it comes into contact with a dead sherez (q.v. Glos.)- Rashi, Maim. and Asheri in Maksh. VI, 8.

(17) Cf. p. 45, n. 1.

(18) For the power of rendering food susceptible to uncleanness depends upon whether the fluid is regarded as a liquid or not. Hence since cows milk is more widely used as a liquid than woman's milk, its power in this respect cannot be less than that of the latter.

(19) In the same sense as in p. 727, n. 7.

(20) Likewise in the same sense; Nid. 55b.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 144a

without [the owner's] desire, though the blood of its wound is clean? I am more stringent in the case of milk than in the case of blood, replied he, because if one milks<sup>1</sup> as a remedy<sup>2</sup> it [the milk] is unclean, whereas if one lets blood as a remedy it is clean. Said they to him: Let baskets of olives and

grapes prove it, for the liquid that exudes from them with [their owner's] desire is unclean; without [their owner's] desire, is clean. Now does not 'with desire' mean that he [the owner] is pleased therewith;<sup>3</sup> whilst 'without [his] desire' means that it [the purpose] is unspecified?<sup>4</sup> Now if olives and grapes, which stand to be pressed, yet where [the juice exudes] without desire it is nothing: how much more so mulberries and pomegranates, which do not stand to be pressed?<sup>5</sup> — No: 'with desire' means that it is unexpressed, whilst 'without desire' means that he [the owner] revealed his mind, saying, 'It does not please me. An alternative answer is: baskets of olives and grapes are different, [for] since it stands to be wasted,<sup>6</sup> he [the owner] indeed renounces it beforehand.<sup>7</sup> We have [thus] found that R. Judah agrees with the Rabbis in the case of olives and grapes. How do we know that the Rabbis agree with R. Judah in the case of other fruits?<sup>8</sup> Because it was taught: One may express

---

(1) A cow, or if one draws off a woman's milk.

(2) Not because the milk is required, but because its presence in the animal or woman may be injurious to them.

(3) I.e., from his explicit statements we understand that he is pleased therewith. — It may be observed that where fruit is kept for its juice, its exuding is regarded as in conformity with the owner's desire, whether he actually wanted it just then or not.

(4) In which case it is clean, because it is not regarded as a liquid. This must at least represent the view of R. Judah, whose range of liquids is more restricted than that of the Rabbis.

(5) And since according to R. Judah it is not a liquid in respect of defilement, when it exudes on the Sabbath it should be permitted. This is the point of the difficulty.

(6) Sc. the liquid that exudes. Thus 'baskets' is intentionally stated here, for the juice runs out through the holes.

(7) Hence it certainly does not exude with his desire. But if the fruit is in other

(8) Excluding mulberries and pomegranates.

## **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 144b**

plums, quinces and sorb-apples,<sup>1</sup> but not pomegranates, and [indeed] the household of Menasia b. Menahem used to express pomegranates.<sup>2</sup> And how do you know that this is the [ruling of] the Rabbis: perhaps it is R. Judah['s view]?- Even granted that it is R. Judah['s]: when have you heard R. Judah [to permit the juice], when it exudes of itself: have you heard him [to rule that] we may express it at the very outset?<sup>3</sup> But what you must answer is since they are not intended for pressing, [it is permitted] even at the outset; consequently even if it is assumed to be the ruling of the Rabbis, since they are not intended for pressing [it is permitted] at the very outset. Hence it follows that this [agrees with] the Rabbis [too].<sup>4</sup> This proves it.

'The household of Menasia b. Menahem used to express pomegranates.' R. Nahman said: The halachah is in accordance with the household of Menasia b. Menahem. Said Raba to R. Nahman: Was then Menasia b. Menahem a Tanna?<sup>5</sup> And should you say [that you mean], The halachah is as this Tanna<sup>6</sup> because he agrees with the [practice of] Menasia b. Menahem: just because he agrees with Menasia b. Menahem, the halachah is as he! Does Menasia b. Menahem represent the majority of people?<sup>7</sup> Yes. For we learnt: If one maintains thorns in a vineyard, — R. Eleazar said: They are forbidden;<sup>8</sup> but the Sages maintained: Only that the like of which is [normally] kept<sup>9</sup> creates an interdict. Now R.

utensils which conserve the liquid, it is regarded as exuding with his desire even where he said nothing. Hanina said: What is R. Eleazar's reason? Because in Arabia the thorns of fields are kept for the camels.<sup>10</sup> How compare! Arabia is a [whole] region, but here his practice<sup>11</sup> counts as nought in relation to that of all [other] people! — Rather this is the reason,<sup>12</sup> as R. Hisda. For R. Hisda said: If beets are expressed and [the juice] poured into a mikweh,<sup>13</sup> it renders the mikweh unfit on account of changed appearance.<sup>14</sup> But these are not normally expressed?<sup>15</sup> What you must then answer is that since he assigned value thereto,<sup>16</sup> it ranks as liquid;<sup>17</sup> so here too, since one assigns a value thereto, it ranks as a liquid.<sup>18</sup> R. Papa said: The reason is that it is something wherewith a mikweh may not be

made in the first place, and everything wherewith a mikweh may not be made in the first place renders a mikweh unfit through changed appearance.<sup>19</sup> We learnt elsewhere: If wine, vinegar, or secretion [of olives]<sup>20</sup> falls therein [a mikweh] and changes its appearance, it is unfit.<sup>21</sup> Which Tanna holds that secretion [of olives] is a liquid?<sup>22</sup> — Said Abaye, It is R. Jacob. For it was taught, R. Jacob said: The secretion is as a liquid, and why did they [the Sages] rule, The secretion which exudes at the beginning<sup>23</sup> is clean?<sup>24</sup> Because one does not desire to keep it. R. Simeon said: Secretion is not as a liquid, and why did they rule, The secretion that exudes from the bale made up for the press<sup>25</sup> is unclean? Because it cannot but contain particles of diluted oil. Wherein do they differ?<sup>26</sup> They differ in respect to what oozes after [the olives have been subject to their own] pressure. Raba said: The reason is because it is something whereof a mikweh may not be made, and such renders a mikweh unfit through change of colour.<sup>27</sup> Rab Judah said in Samuel's name: One may squeeze out a cluster of grapes into a pot,<sup>28</sup> but not into a plate.<sup>29</sup> R. Hisda observed: From our master's words we may learn [that] one may milk a goat into a pot [of food], but not into a plate. This proves that he holds: a liquid that unites with<sup>30</sup> a [solid] foodstuff is [accounted] a foodstuff. Rami b. Hama objected: If a zab milks a goat, the milk is unclean.<sup>31</sup> But if you say, A liquid that unites with a [solid] foodstuff is a foodstuff, whereby did it become susceptible?<sup>32</sup> — As R. Johanan said [elsewhere], By the drop [of milk] smeared on the nipple: so here too by the drop smeared on the nipple.<sup>33</sup> Rabina objected: If a person unclean through a corpse squeezes out olives or grapes

- 
- (1) Because their juice is not normally expressed, and therefore that is not akin to threshing, which is the reason of the prohibition in the case of other fruits.
- (2) On weekdays, which shows that pomegranates are intended for this.
- (3) Surely not.
- (4) For the same logic holds good on their view too.
- (5) Of course not. The practice of this household is merely quoted, but he himself could give no ruling.
- (6) Who forbids with pomegranates.
- (7) That the halachah should be decided by his practice.
- (8) Lit., 'sanctified'. Viz., the grapes, on account of the mixture of plants; Deut. XXII, 9.
- (9) I.e., a plant which is wanted and valuable, which excludes thorns.
- (10) Thus Arabian practice decides the law, and the same is true here.
- (11) Lit., 'mind'.
- (12) For R. Nahman's ruling that one may not press pomegranate..
- (13) V. Glos.
- (14) The water is stained red and no longer looks like water.
- (15) Hence their juice should be of no account.
- (16) Sc. the juices.
- (17) Which can invalidate a mikweh.
- (18) Viz., the juice of pomegranates. Rashi: R. Nahman accordingly explains the Baraita thus: — One may squeeze plums, etc., not for their juice, since this would automatically give the juice a value of its own as a liquid, which in turn prohibits squeezing, but in order to improve the taste of the fruit. But not pomegranates. even to improve the fruit, for since some, as the house of Menasia b. Menahem, squeeze it for the sake of the juice, should you permit the former the latter too may be done. This does not apply to plums etc. which no-one squeezes for the sake of their juice.
- (19) Yet no value is assigned thereto and the juice is not a liquid.
- (20) A fluid given off by olives before the actual oil is expressed. It is in fact a kind of diluted oil.
- (21) V. Mik. VII, 4.
- (22) To invalidate a mikweh.
- (23) When the olives are first loaded in the press, but before they are actually pressed.
- (24) It does not render food insusceptible to defilement; v. p. 45, n. 1.
- (25) Jast.: a bale of loose texture containing the olive pulp to be pressed. This fluid denotes a further stage than the previous.
- (26) Since both admit that the first fluid is clean, while that which oozes from the olive pulp is unclean, in respect of what do they disagree?

(27) That is why the serial fluid makes the mikweh unfit; accordingly that ruling agrees with all.

(28) Of food, for obviously the juice will not be drunk separately but is meant to season the food; as such it remains a food, i.e., a solid, itself.

(29) As it may then be drunk separately, notwithstanding that one does not generally drink from a plate.

(30) Lit., comes into'.

(31) A zab defiles everything through hesset (v. p. 395, n. 1); here too he exercises hesset on the milk.

(32) To defilement, for no foodstuff can be unclean unless a liquid has previously fallen upon it (v. p. 45, n. 1). — The law is stated generally- which implies that it is so even if he milks it into a pot of food.

(33) The milker smears the first drop around the nipple, to facilitate the flow. This drop of course counts as a liquid, and all the subsequent milk is touched thereby.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 145a

exactly as much as an egg [in quantity] it is clean.<sup>1</sup> Hence if more than an egg [in quantity] it [the juice] is unclean; but if you say, A liquid that unites with a [solid] foodstuff is a foodstuff, whereby did it become susceptible? He raised the objection and he himself answered it: It refers to squeezing out into a plate.

R. Jeremiah said, This is dependent on Tannaim: If one smooths [the surface of dough] with grapes [grape juice], it does not become susceptible [to defilement];<sup>2</sup> R. Judah maintained: It is made susceptible, Do they not differ in this: one Master holds, A liquid that unites with a [solid] foodstuff is a foodstuff, while the other Master holds that it is not a foodstuff? — Said R. Papa. All hold, A liquid that unites with a foodstuff is not a foodstuff,<sup>3</sup> but here they differ in respect of a liquid that will eventually be destroyed:<sup>4</sup> one Master holds, It is [accounted] a liquid; while the other Master holds, It is not a liquid. And [they differ] in the [same] controversy as that of these Tannaim. For it was taught: If one splits olives<sup>5</sup> with unclean hands, they are rendered susceptible;<sup>6</sup> if in order to salt them,<sup>7</sup> they are not rendered susceptible; if in order to know whether the olives are ripe<sup>8</sup> for gathering<sup>9</sup> or not, they do not become susceptible; R. Judah said: They do become susceptible. Now, surely they differ in this, viz., one Master holds: A liquid that stands to be destroyed<sup>10</sup> is [accounted] a liquid, while the other Master holds that it is not a liquid!<sup>11</sup> -Said R. Huna the son of R. Joshua: These [latter] Tannaim [indeed] differ in respect of a liquid that stands to be destroyed, while the former Tannaim<sup>12</sup> differ in respect of liquid whose purpose is to polish [the dough].<sup>13</sup> R. Zera said in R. Hiyya b. Ashi's name in Rab's name: A man may squeeze a bunch of grapes into a pot [of food], but not into a plate; but [one may squeeze] a fish for its brine even into a plate.<sup>14</sup> Now, R. Dimi sat and stated this ruling. Said Abaye to R. Dimi, You recite it in Rab's name, hence it presents no difficulty to you; [but] we recite it in Samuel's name, so it presents a difficulty to us. Did Samuel say, '[One may squeeze] a fish for its brine even into a plate'? Surely it was stated: If one presses out [pickled] preserves,<sup>15</sup> — Rab said: If for their own sake,<sup>16</sup> it is permitted; if for their fluid,<sup>17</sup> he is not culpable, nevertheless it is forbidden. But with boiled preserves, whether for their own sake or for their fluid, it is permitted. While Samuel ruled: Both with [pickled] preserves and boiled preserves, if for their own sake, it is permitted; if for their fluid, he is not culpable, yet it is forbidden!<sup>18</sup> — By God! replied he, 'Mine eyes have beheld, and not a stranger':<sup>19</sup> I heard it from R. Jeremiah's mouth, and R. Jeremiah from R. Zera, and R. Zera from R. Hiyya b. Ashi, and R. Hiyya b. Ashi from Rab.

To turn to [the main] text: 'If one presses out [pickled] preserves, — Rab said: If for their own sake, it is permitted; if for their fluid, he is not culpable, nevertheless it is forbidden. But with boiled preserves, whether for their own sake or for their fluid, it is permitted. While Samuel ruled: Both with [pickled] preserves and boiled preserves, if for their own sake, it is permitted; if for their fluid, he is not culpable, yet it is forbidden. R. Johanan said: Both with [pickled] and boiled preserves, if for their own sake, it is permitted; if for their fluid, he is liable to a sin-offering'. An objection is raised: One may squeeze [pickled] preserves on the Sabbath for the requirements of the Sabbath, but not against the termination of the Sabbath; but one must not express olives and grapes, and if he

does, he is liable to a sin-offering: this is a difficulty according to Rab, Samuel, and R. Johanan? — Rab reconciles it with his view, Samuel with his, and R. Johanan with his. ‘Rab reconciles it with his view’: One may squeeze [pickled] preserves on the Sabbath for the requirements of the Sabbath, but not against the termination of the Sabbath. When is this said? when it is [done] for their own sake; but if for their fluid, he is not culpable, yet it is forbidden; while [as for] boiled preserves, whether [done] for their own sake or for their fluid, it is permitted. But one must not express olives and grapes, and if he does he is liable to a sin-offering. ‘Samuel explains it according to his view’: One may squeeze [pickled] preserves on the Sabbath for the requirements of the Sabbath, [and] the same applies to boiled preserves. When is this said? When it is for their own sakes; but if for their fluid, he is not culpable, yet it is forbidden. And one must not express olives and grapes, and if he does, he is liable to a sin-offering. ‘R. Johanan explains it according to his view’: One may squeeze [pickled] preserves for the requirements of the Sabbath, but not against the termination of the Sabbath. This applies to both [pickled] and boiled preserves. When is that said? When it is for their own sake; but he must not squeeze them for their fluid, and if he does, it is as though he squeezed olives and grapes, and he is liable to a sin-offering. R. Hiyya b. Ashi said in Rab's name: By the words of the Torah<sup>20</sup> one is culpable for the treading out of olives and grapes alone. And the School of Menasseh taught likewise: By the words of the Torah one is culpable for the treading out of olives and grapes alone. And a witness [attesting] what he heard from<sup>21</sup> another witness is valid

- 
- (1) This person defiles food, and in turn the food, if not less than the size of an egg in quantity, defiles liquids. Here the man does not touch the expressed juice. Now from the very first drop that issues the residue is less than the necessary minimum, and therefore it cannot defile the liquid that follows. V. Toh. III, 3; v. Pes., Sonc. ed., p. 153, n. 2.
- (2) Presumably the flour was kneaded with eggs, which do not render it susceptible, and the first Tanna teaches that the grape juice does not do so either.
- (3) So cur, edd., which Rashi and Tosaf. support. Wilna Gaon states that the reading of the Geonim, as well as that of Alfasi, is: is a foodstuff.
- (4) For the heat of the oven will dry it up.
- (5) Rashi: to soften them.
- (6) To defilement through the liquid that oozes out because he is pleased with it, since the olives are softened thereby, v. p. 45, nn. 1,4.
- (7) When very hard they cannot take salt, and therefore he desires to soften them slightly, but not so much that the juice oozes out; hence he is not pleased therewith.
- (8) Lit., ‘have arrived’.
- (9) Whether they are soft enough for the oil to be easily expressed.
- (10) The liquid which oozes out of course is lost.
- (11) And similarly do the Tannaim of the former Baraitha differ on the same question.
- (12) Who discuss the smoothing of dough.
- (13) But the question of waste does not enter here, because this liquid serves a definite purpose. giving the dough a brighter colour.
- (14) Because it is a foodstuff, not a drink, and the squeezing merely separate. its composite parts, viz., the brine from the flesh.
- (15) I.e., raw vegetables, preserved or pickled in wine or vinegar.
- (16) I.e., he wishes to eat them, and they bear too much moisture at present.
- (17) He actually wishes to drink its fluid.
- (18) Now the squeezing of boiled preserves is like that of a fish for its brine. Thus Samuel is self-contradictory.
- (19) Job XIX, 27. That Rab is the authority for the reported ruling.
- (20) Pentateuchal law.
- (21) Lit., ‘from the mouth’.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 145b

in evidence concerning a woman alone.<sup>1</sup> The scholars asked: What about a witness [attesting] what

he heard from another witness in evidence relating to a firstling?<sup>2</sup> — R. Ammi forbids [the admission of his testimony]; while R. Assi permits it. Said R. Ammi to R. Ashi, But the School of Menasseh taught: A witness testifying what he heard from another witness is valid in testimony concerning a woman alone? — Say: Only in testimony for which a woman is valid.<sup>3</sup> R. Yemar recognized as fit a witness [testifying] from the mouth of another witness in respect to a firstling, [whereupon] Meremar called him ‘Yemar who permits firstlings.’<sup>4</sup> Yet the law is, A witness [testifying] from the mouth of another witness is valid in respect to firstlings.

HONEYCOMBS. When R. Oshaia came from Nehardea, he came and brought a Baraita with him:<sup>5</sup> If one crushes olives and grapes on the eve of the Sabbath, and they [their juices] ooze out of themselves, they are forbidden; but R. Eleazar and R. Simeon permit them. R. Joseph observed. Does he come to inform us of another person?<sup>6</sup> — Said Abaye to him, He comes to tell us much. For if [we learnt] from our Mishnah [alone], I would argue, Only there [is it thus], since it [the honey] was a [solid] foodstuff originally and is now a foodstuff; but here that they [the grapes, etc.] were originally a foodstuff but now<sup>7</sup> a fluid, I would say, It is not so. Hence he informs us [otherwise].

MISHNAH. WHATEVER WAS PUT INTO HOT WATER BEFORE THE SABBATH MAY BE STEEPED [AGAIN] IN HOT WATER ON THE SABBATH; BUT WHATEVER WAS NOT PUT INTO HOT WATER BEFORE THE SABBATH MAY [ONLY] BE RINSED WITH HOT WATER ON THE SABBATH, EXCEPT OLD SALTED [PICKLED] FISH, [SMALL SALTED FISH],<sup>8</sup> AND THE COLIAS OF THE SPANIARDS,<sup>9</sup> BECAUSE THEIR RINSING COMPLETES THEIR PREPARATION.<sup>10</sup>

GEMARA. What, for example?<sup>11</sup> R. Safra said: E.g., R. Abba's fowl[s].<sup>12</sup> R. Safra also said: I once paid a visit there [Palestine] and ate thereof, and but for R. Abba who made me drink wine of three foliages<sup>13</sup> I would have been in danger.<sup>14</sup> R. Johanan expectorated at [the mention of] Babylonian kutah.<sup>15</sup> Said R. Joseph: Then we [Babylonians] should expectorate at R. Abba's fowl!<sup>16</sup> Moreover, R. Gaza has related, I once paid a visit there [in Palestine] and prepared some Babylonian kutah, and all the invalids of the West [Palestine] asked me for it.

WHATEVER WAS NOT PUT INTO HOT WATER, etc. What if one does rinse [them]?<sup>17</sup> R. Joseph said: If one rinses them, he incurs a sin-offering. Mar the son of Rabina said, We too learnt thus: EXCEPT OLD SALTED [PICKLED] FISH, AND THE COLIAS OF THE SPANIARDS, BECAUSE THEIR RINSING COMPLETES THEIR PREPARATION: this proves it.<sup>18</sup>

R. Hiyya b. Abba and R. Assi were sitting before R. Johanan, while R. Johanan was sitting and dozing. Now, R. Hiyya b. Abba asked R. Assi, Why are the fowls in Babylonia fat?<sup>19</sup> Go to the wilderness of Gaza, replied he, and I will show you fatter ones. Why are the festivals in Babylon [so] joyous? Because they [its inhabitants] are poor.<sup>20</sup> Why are the scholars in Babylonia distinguished [in dress]? Because they are not well learned.<sup>21</sup> Why are idolaters lustful? Because they eat abominable and creeping things. R. Johanan awoke thereat [and] said to them, Children! did I not this teach you: Say unto wisdom, Thou art my sister:<sup>22</sup> if the matter is as clear to thee as that thy sister is interdicted to thee, say it; but if not do not say it? Said they to him, Then let the Master tell us some of these? Why are the fowls of Babylonia fat? Because they were not sent into exile, as it is said, Moab hath been at ease from his youth, and he hath settled on his lees...neither hath he gone into capacity: [therefore his taste remaineth in him, and his scent is not changed].<sup>23</sup> And how do we know that they suffered exile here [in Palestine]? Because it was taught, R. Judah said: For fifty-two years no man passed through Judea, as it is said, For the mountains will I take up a weeping and wailing, and for the pastures of the wilderness a lamentation, because they are burned up, so that none passeth through...both the fowl of the heavens and the beast [behemah] are fled, they are gone:<sup>24</sup> the numerical value of behemah is fifty-two.<sup>25</sup> R. Jacob said in R. Johanan's name: They all returned save the colias of the Spaniards. For Rab said: The water courses of Babylonia carry back

the water to the fountain of Etam;<sup>26</sup> but these [colias], since their spine is not firm, could not go up.<sup>27</sup> Why are the festivals in Babylonia joyous? Because they were not subject to that curse, whereof it is written, I will also cause all her mirth to cease, her feasts, her new moons, her Sabbaths, and all her solemn assemblies,<sup>28</sup> and it is written, Your new moons and your appointed feasts my soul hateth: they are a trouble unto me.<sup>29</sup> What does 'they are a trouble unto me' mean? — Said R. Eleazar: The Holy One, blessed be He, saith, Not enough is it for Israel that they sin before Me, but that they trouble Me to know which evil decree I am to bring upon them. R. Isaac said: There is no single festival when troops did not come to Sepphoris.<sup>30</sup> R. Hanina said: There is no single festival when there did not come to Tiberias a general with his suite and centurions.<sup>31</sup>

Why are the scholars of Babylonia distinguished [in dress]? Because they are not in their [original] homes,<sup>32</sup> as People say, In my own town my name [is sufficient]; away from home, my dress.<sup>33</sup> In days to come shall Jacob take root, Israel shall blossom [yaziz] and bud [ufarah].<sup>34</sup> R. Joseph recited, This refers to scholars in Babylonia who wreath blossoms [ziziz] and flowers [perahim] around the Torah.<sup>35</sup>

Why are idolaters lustful? Because they did not stand at Mount Sinai. For when

- 
- (1) He is valid to attest a man's death, so that his wife may remarry v. Yeb. 90b.
  - (2) A firstling of animals may not be eaten until it receives a blemish accidentally, which must be proved by witnesses.
  - (3) A woman is a valid witness only in certain matters, which includes a firstling's blemish, and in these hearsay too is admissible.
  - (4) Said in a critical spirit.
  - (5) Lit., 'in his hand'.
  - (6) What purpose does this Baraita serve? The, same principle is expressed in our Mishnah by R. Eleazar, and he merely tells us that it is also R. Simeon's view.
  - (7) Lit., 'at the end'.
  - (8) Var. lec. omits this.
  - (9) A kind of tunny-fish.
  - (10) V. supra 39a top for notes.
  - (11) Is put into hot water and then steeped again.
  - (12) Which he boiled and kept many days in hot water until they dissolved; then he ate them as a remedy.
  - (13) I.e., in the third year.
  - (14) I was moved to expectorate, so sickly was it.
  - (15) He disliked it so much.
  - (16) The disparagement of the Babylonian delicacy gave him offence.
  - (17) The old salted fish etc.
  - (18) Since it completes their preparation it is the equivalent of boiling.
  - (19) Fatter than the Palestinian ones.
  - (20) And live drably during the rest of the year, therefore they appreciate the festivals all the more.
  - (21) Lit., 'they are not sons of (i.e., they do not possess) the Torah'. — Hence they have nothing else but dress to distinguish them.
  - (22) Prov. VII, 4.
  - (23) Jer. XLVIII, 11. The verse is quoted to show the adverse physical effects of exile.
  - (24) Ibid. IX, 9 (E.V. 10).
  - (25) I.e.,  $\aleph=2$ ;  $\beth=5$   $\daleth=40$ ;  $\varepsilon=5$ . Thus he translates: the fowl of the heavens is fled for fifty-two (years). Of course, the fifty-two years of desolation are based on historical figures (Meg. 11b), and this verse is merely quoted as a support or hint. (Tosaf.).
  - (26) The highest eminence in Palestine (Zeb. 54b). According to Josephus (Ant. VIII, 7,3) it was sixty stadia south of Jerusalem, and it supplied the city with water. The mikweh used by the High Priest on the Day of Atonement, which was situated above the Water Gate, was also drawn thence (Yoma 31a). — Thus as the water flowed from Babylonia it carried along the fish which had migrated from Palestine.

(27) The whole discussion was probably a mere jeu d'esprit as a relaxation after serious study.

(28) Hos. II, 13.

(29) Isa. I, 14.

(30) V. p. 16, n. 6. They were quartered on the Jews and naturally hindered the joy of the festival.

(31) אֲנָמוֹן lit., 'cane bearer', but MS.O. reads: אֲנָמוֹן, a general. For קוֹמוֹת Jast. suggests that קוֹמוֹת (= comites, members of the imperial cabinet) should be read. בְּעֵלֵי זְמוֹרָה = rod bearers, i.e., centurions.

(32) i.e., they hail from Palestine.

(33) There I must make myself known and distinguished through dress. — This is certainly a more charitable explanation than the previous.

(34) Isa. XXVII, 6.

(35) This is in support of R. Johanan's estimate of the Babylonian scholars.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 146a

the serpent came upon Eve he injected a lust into her:<sup>1</sup> [as for] the Israelites who stood at Mount Sinai, their lustfulness departed; the idolaters, who did not stand at Mount Sinai, their lustfulness did not depart.<sup>2</sup> R. Aha son of Raba asked R. Ashi. What about proselytes? Though they were not present, their guiding stars<sup>3</sup> were present, as it is written, [Neither with you only do I make this covenant and this oath], but with him that standeth here with us this day before the Lord our God, and also with him that is not here with us this day.<sup>4</sup> Now he differs from R. Abba b. Kahana, for R. Abba b. Kahana said: Until three generations the lustful [strain] did not disappear from our Patriarchs: Abraham begat Ishmael, Isaac begat Esau, [but] Jacob begat the twelve tribes in whom there was no taint whatsoever.<sup>5</sup>

MISHNAH. ONE MAY BREAK OPEN A CASK IN ORDER TO EAT RAISINS THEREOF, PROVIDED THAT HE DOES NOT DESIGN MAKING A UTENSIL;<sup>6</sup> AND ONE MAY NOT PERFORATE THE BUNG OF A CASK:<sup>7</sup> THIS IS R. JUDAH'S RULING; BUT THE SAGES PERMIT IT. AND ONE MUST NOT PIERCE IT AT THE SIDE THEREOF,<sup>8</sup> WHILE IF IT IS PERFORATED<sup>9</sup> ONE MUST NOT PLACE WAX UPON IT, BECAUSE HE CRUSHES IT.<sup>10</sup> R. JUDAH SAID: [SUCH] AN INCIDENT CAME BEFORE R. JOHANAN B. ZAKKAI IN ARAB<sup>11</sup> AND HE SAID, I FEAR ON HIS ACCOUNT [THAT HE MAY BE LIABLE] TO A SIN-OFFERING.

GEMARA. R. Oshaia said: They learnt this only of pressed [raisins]; but not when they are loose [apart].<sup>12</sup> 'But not if they are loose [apart]?' An objection is raised: R. Simeon b. Gamaliel said: One may bring a cask of wine, strike off its head with a sword, and place it before guests on the Sabbath, and he need have no fear!<sup>13</sup> — That is [according to] the Rabbis: our Mishnah is [according to] R. Nehemiah.<sup>14</sup> Now, what compels R. Oshaia to establish our Mishnah as agreeing with R. Nehemiah, so that it refers to pressed [raisins]; let him explain it as referring to loose [raisins] and [in agreement with] the Rabbis? — Said Raba, Our Mishnah presents a difficulty to him: why particularly teach 'RAISINS : let him [the Tanna] teach 'fruit?' Hence it follows thence that the reference is to pressed [raisins].

One [Baraitha] taught: One may untie, unravel, or cut through the wicker wrappers of raisins and dates.<sup>15</sup> Another was taught: One may untie, but not unravel or cut. There is no difficulty: one agrees with the Rabbis; the other with R. Nehemiah. For it was taught, R. Nehemiah said: Even a spoon, even a robe, and even a knife may be handled only when required for their [usual] function.

R. Shesheth was asked: What about piercing a cask with a spit<sup>16</sup> on the Sabbath? does he intend [making] an opening, so it is forbidden, or perhaps his intention is to be generous<sup>17</sup> and it is permitted? — He intends [making] an opening, replied he, and it is forbidden. An objection is raised: R. Simeon b. Gamaliel said: One may bring a cask of wine and strike off its head with a sword? —

There his intention is certainly to be generous: but here, if he really means to be generous — let him open it.<sup>18</sup>

ONE MAY NOT PERFORATE THE BUNG, etc. R. Huna said: The controversy is [in respect of a hole] at the top;<sup>19</sup> but all agree that it is forbidden at the side,<sup>20</sup> and thus he teaches, ONE MUST NOT PIERCE IT AT THE SIDE THEREOF. But R. Hisda maintained: The controversy is in [respect of a hole] at the side, but all agree that it is permitted on the top, and as to what he teaches, ONE MUST NOT PIERCE IT AT THE SIDE THEREOF, there it refers to the cask itself.<sup>21</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: One may not pierce a new hole<sup>22</sup> on the Sabbath, but if one comes to add,<sup>23</sup> he may add; but some say, One may not add. But they all agree that one may pierce an old hole<sup>24</sup> at the very outset. Now as to the first Tanna, wherein does it differ from [boring] a new hole, which may not [be done]? [Presumably] because an opening is [thereby] effected! Then in adding too an opening is improved (effected)?<sup>25</sup> — Said Rabbah: By the words of the Torah<sup>26</sup> every opening which is not made for putting in and taking out is not an opening, and it was the Rabbis who forbade it<sup>27</sup> on account of [the ventilation of] a hen-coop, which is made to permit the fresh air to enter and the fumes to pass out.<sup>28</sup> Hence 'if one comes to add, he may add': [for] in a hen-coop one will certainly not come to add,

---

(1) Cf. II Esdras IV, 30.

(2) The idea is that the serpent infected Eve (i.e., the human race) with lust, from which, however, those who accept the moral teachings of the Torah are freed. Cf. B.B. 16a: The Holy One, blessed be He, created the evil passions, but He also created the Torah as their antidote. Thus this passage does not teach the doctrine of 'Original Sin', which Judaism rejects; v. Hertz, Genesis, pp. 59-60, 'Jewish view on the "Fall of Man,"'. V. also Weiss, Dor, II, p. 9.

(3) On mazzal v. Sanh., Sonc. ed., p. 629, n. 10.

(4) Deut. XXIX, 14f. The teachings of Judaism and its spiritual ennoblement were freely meant for all mankind.

(5) Even before the Revelation at Sinai.

(6) i.e., a proper opening for the cask; this constitutes a labour.

(7) If it is tightly fitted in the cask, so that wine etc., may be poured out through the perforation, R. Han. regards the bung as the whole cover fitted into the top of the cask.

(8) This is explained in the Gemara.

(9) And one wishes to close the holes.

(10) I.e., he spreads it, which is forbidden.

(11) v. p. 600, n. 5.

(12) If the raisins are pressed together, a knife must be handled for cutting them out, and at the same time the barrel may be broken open with it. But if they are loose, so that a knife or axe is not required, it may not be handled merely for breaking the cask open.

(13) Of violating the Sabbath.

(14) That a utensil may be handled only for its normal use.

(15) Unripe dates and raisins were packed in wrappers made of plaited palm branches, to ripen. If the wrapper is tied with a cord one may untie it, unravel its strands, or cut it.

(16) I.e., by forcing it between the splices.

(17) Lit., 'a good eye' — i.e., to widen the opening so that the wine may flow freely, not niggardly but he does not mean to make a permanent opening.

(18) By withdrawing the bung, when the wine would flow no less freely.

(19) There the Rabbis permit it, because it is unusual to make an opening there, but rather the whole bung is removed.

(20) As an opening is sometimes made there in preference to withdrawing the stopper from the top, lest dust etc., fall in. 'Side' and 'top' both refer to the bung or lid, viz., the side of the bung and the top of the bung, but not to the sides of the cask itself.

(21) Not the bung.

(22) In a vessel.

(23) I.e., enlarge an existing hole.

(24) Which became stopped up.

(25) כמתקן may mean both effected and improved. — By enlarging the hole he completes its work.

(26) By Pentateuchal law.

(27) Sc. the hole under discussion, as the wine is not poured into the barrel through it.

(28) V. supra 102b.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 146b

on account of insects.<sup>1</sup> Yet 'some say, One may not add': Sometimes one may not make it [the hole] [properly] in the first place, and so come to enlarge it. R. Nahman lectured on the authority of R. Johanan: The halachah is as 'some maintain'.

But they all agree that you may pierce an old hole at the very outset! Rab Judah said in Samuel's name: They learnt this only where it was done in order to conserve [the fragrance];<sup>2</sup> but if in order to strengthen it [the cask], it is forbidden.<sup>3</sup> How is it [when it is] to conserve, and how is it [when meant] to strengthen?<sup>4</sup> — Said R. Hisda: If it is above the [level of the] wine, its purpose is to conserve; if below the [top of the] wine, its purpose is to strengthen.<sup>5</sup> Rabbah said: [If] below the [top of the] wine, that too is to conserve. Then how is it to strengthen? — E.g. if it was pierced below the lees.<sup>6</sup>

Abaye said to Rabbah, Something which supports you was taught: A closed house has four cubits; if one had broken open its door-frame, it does not receive four cubits.<sup>7</sup> A closed house [room] does not defile all around it; if he had broken through the door-frame, it defiles all around it.<sup>8</sup>

[The insertion of] a tube,<sup>9</sup> Rab forbids, while Samuel permits. As for cutting it in the first place,<sup>10</sup> all agree that it is forbidden; [again], all agree that replacing it<sup>11</sup> is permitted. They differ only where it is cut but not made to measure:<sup>12</sup> he who forbids [its insertion] [holds that] we preventively prohibit [it], lest he come to cut it out in the first place; while he who permits it, [holds that] we do not preventively prohibit.

This is dependent on Tannaim: One may not cut a tube on a Festival, and it is superfluous to speak of the Sabbath. If it falls out,<sup>13</sup> it may be replaced on the Sabbath, and it goes without saying on Festival[s]. While R. Josiah is lenient. To what does R. Josiah refer, Shall we say, to the first clause? Surely he prepares a utensil?<sup>14</sup> Again, if to the second clause, the first Tanna too certainly permits it? Hence they must differ where it is cut but not made to measure: one Master holds, we preventively prohibit, while the other Master holds, We do not preventively prohibit. R. Shisha son of R. Idi lectured in R. Johanan's name: The halachah is as R. Josiah. WHILE IF IT IS PERFORATED, etc. Oil [to stop up the hole], Rab forbids, while Samuel permits.<sup>15</sup> He who forbids [holds]: We preventively prohibit on account of wax;<sup>16</sup> while he who permits [holds]: We do not preventively prohibit. R. Samuel b. Bar Hanah observed to R. Joseph: You distinctly told us in Rab's name [that with] oil [it] is permitted

Tabuth the fowler<sup>17</sup> said in Samuel's name: [To shape] a myrtle leaf<sup>18</sup> is forbidden. — What is the reason? R. Yemar of Difti<sup>19</sup> said: It is a preventive measure on account of [the making of] a pipe. R. Ashi said: It is a preventive measure lest one pluck it [from the tree]. Wherein do they differ? They differ where it is [already] plucked and [others too] are lying about.<sup>20</sup>

[To wear] linen sheets,<sup>21</sup> Rab forbids, while Samuel permits.<sup>22</sup> Of soft ones all agree that it is permitted;<sup>23</sup> in the case of hard ones all agree that it is forbidden.<sup>24</sup> They differ in respect of medium ones: he who forbids [holds that] they look like a burden; while he who permits [holds that] they do not look like a burden. Now, this [view] of Rab was stated not explicitly but by inference. For Rab visited a certain place where he had no room.<sup>25</sup> So he went out and sat in a karmelith. Linen sheets

were brought him,<sup>26</sup> [but] he did not sit [upon them]. He who saw this thought that it was because linen sheets are forbidden. Yet that is not so, for Rab had indeed announced [that] linen sheets are permitted, but he did not sit on them out of respect for our masters: and who are they? R. Kahana and R. Assi.<sup>27</sup>

MISHNAH. A DISH MAY BE PLACED IN A PIT FOR IT TO BE GUARDED, AND WHOLESOME WATER INTO NOISOME WATER FOR IT TO BE COOLED, OR COLD WATER IN THE SUN FOR IT TO BE HEATED. IF ONE'S GARMENTS FALL INTO WATER ON THE ROAD, HE MAY WALK IN THEM WITHOUT FEAR. WHEN HE REACHES THE OUTERMOST COURTYARD<sup>28</sup> HE MAY SPREAD THEM OUT IN THE SUN, BUT NOT IN SIGHT OF THE PEOPLE.<sup>29</sup>

GEMARA. [But] it is obvious?<sup>30</sup> — You might say, Let us preventively forbid it on account of the levelling of depressions;<sup>31</sup> hence he [the Tanna] informs us [otherwise].

AND WHOLESOME WATER, [etc.] It is obvious? — The second clause is required: OR COLD WATER IN THE SUN, [etc.]. That too is obvious? — You, might say, Let us preventively forbid it, lest he come to put it away in [hot] ashes;<sup>32</sup> therefore he teaches us [otherwise].

IF ONE'S GARMENTS DROP, [etc.] Rab Judah said in Rab's name: Wherever the Sages forbade [aught] for appearance's sake, it is forbidden even in the innermost chambers.<sup>33</sup> We learnt: HE MAY SPREAD THEM OUT IN THE SUN, BUT NOT IN SIGHT OF THE PEOPLE? — it is [a controversy of] Tannaim. For it was taught: He may spread them out in the sun, but not in sight of the people; R. Eleazar and R. Simeon forbid it.

R. Huna said:

- 
- (1) One does not make the ventilation hole too large for fear of insects, worms, etc., entering.
  - (2) I.e., the hole was closed up for that purpose. The closing is done quite feebly, and there is no real work in reopening it.
  - (3) To reopen it, because it was firmly closed and its re-opening is tantamount to making a new hole.
  - (4) What is the general rule which determines its purpose?
  - (5) That the wine should not drip out.
  - (6) There it has to bear the weight of all the wine and so must be strengthened.
  - (7) If a number of houses open into a common courtyard and their owners wish to divide it, each to have his own privately, each receives four cubits along the breadth of the courtyard for every door to his house that gives upon it, and the rest is shared equally. Now, if one of the doors had been walled up, but without its frame being broken through, its owner can still claim the four cubits for it; but if the frame was first broken through and then it was closed up, it ceases to count as a door, and the four cubits are lost. V. B.B. 12a.
  - (8) If a room containing a corpse is closed, i.e., the door is walled up, the defilement of the corpse does not extend beyond it. But if the door-frame was first broken and then walled up, so that no aperture at all is visible, the house is regarded as a grave and defiles everything around it to a distance of four cubits. — Thus an opening must be absolutely closed before it ceases to count as such, and the same applies to the cask.
  - (9) I.e., into a barrel, as a pipe.
  - (10) To the required size of the hole.
  - (11) Sc. a fitted tube which had fallen out.
  - (12) It had not been tested in the hole to see whether it fits exactly.
  - (13) From the bottle, where it serves as a pipe.
  - (14) Surely he does not permit the making of a tube!
  - (15) Rab forbids thick semi-solid oil to be spread over the hole, while Samuel permits it.
  - (16) The spreading of wax too may be regarded as permissible if one is allowed to spread oil.
  - (17) Rashi. Others: = רִישׁ בֵּי אָבִי, the head of the family (in Ta'an. 10a).

- (18) One may not shape a myrtle leaf into a funnel or pipe and insert it into the mouth of a bottle or cask.
- (19) V. p. 35, n. 5.
- (20) There are plenty of leaves, so that there is no fear that one may pluck it, hence it is permitted (Wilna Gaon); but the first reason still holds good. R. Han. explains it thus: All agree that one may not make a funnel and insert it in the hole of a cask, but they differ where the leaf was already lying in the hole as a funnel from before the Sabbath. According to R. Yemar it is still forbidden to pour wine through it, lest he make a funnel, but according to R. Ashi it is permitted, since there is no fear of plucking a leaf from the tree.
- (21) Which are folded together and used as a pillow or bolster.
- (22) Rab forbids a person to wrap them about himself and walk through the streets, thus wearing them as a garment, while Samuel permits it.
- (23) They give warmth and therefore may certainly be regarded as a garment.
- (24) They give no warmth and are merely a burden.
- (25) Rashi: for his disciples.
- (26) Tosaf: of medium quality, neither hard nor soft.
- (27) They were his disciple-colleagues (v. Sanh. 36b), and it was not fitting that he should enjoy a comfort which had not been provided for them.
- (28) Within the town.
- (29) Lest they suspect him of having washed them on the Sabbath.
- (30) That a dish may be placed in a pit.
- (31) He may find depressions in the floor of the pit and level them.
- (32) Which is forbidden.
- (33) V. Bez. 9a.

### **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 147a**

If one shakes out his cloak<sup>1</sup> on the Sabbath, he is liable to a sin-offering.<sup>2</sup> Now, we said this only of new ones, but in the case of old ones we have nought against it; and this is said only of black ones, but in the case of white or red ones we have nought against it; [but in any case there is no culpability] unless he is particular about them.<sup>3</sup>

‘Ulla visited Pumbeditha. Seeing the scholars shaking their garments he observed, ‘The scholars are desecrating the Sabbath.’ Said Rab Judah to them, ‘Shake them in his presence, [for] we are not particular at all [about the clothes].’ Abaye was standing before R. Joseph. Said he to him, ‘Give me my hat.’ Seeing some dew upon it he hesitated to give it to him. ‘Shake it and throw it off,’ he directed, ‘[for] we are not particular at all.’

R. Isaac b. Joseph said in R. Johanan's name: If one goes out on the Sabbath with a cloak folded up [and] lying on his shoulders, he is liable to a sin-offering.<sup>4</sup> It was taught likewise: Clothes vendors who go out on the Sabbath with cloaks folded up [and] lying on their shoulders are liable to a sin-offering. And they [the Sages] said this not of clothes vendors alone but of all men, but that it is the nature of merchants to go out thus. Again, if a shopkeeper goes out with coins bound up in his wrapper, he is liable to a sin-offering. And they said this not of a shopkeeper alone but of all men, but that it is a shopkeeper's nature to go out thus. And runners may go out with the scarfs on their shoulders;<sup>5</sup> and they said this not of runners alone but of all men, but that it is the nature of runners to go out thus.<sup>6</sup>

R. Judah said: It once happened that Hyrcanus, son of R. Eliezer b. Hyrcanus, went out on the Sabbath with the scarf on his shoulder, but that a thread [thereof] was wound round his finger.<sup>7</sup> But when the matter came before the Sages they said, [It is permitted] even if a thread is not wound about one's finger. R. Nahman b. R. Hisda lectured in R. Hisda's name: The halachah is [that it is permissible] even if a thread is not wound about his finger.

‘Ulla visited the academy of Assi b. Hini [and] was asked: Is it permitted to make a marzeb on the Sabbath? Said he to them, Thus did R. Ilai say: It is forbidden to make a marzeb on the Sabbath. What is a marzeb? — Said R. Zera: The capes<sup>8</sup> worn by Babylonian women.<sup>9</sup> R. Jeremiah was sitting before R. Zera [and] asked him, How is it thus? It is forbidden, replied he. And how is it thus? It is forbidden, replied he.<sup>10</sup> R. Papa said: Adopt this general rule: Whatever [is done] with the intention of gathering it [the skirts] up<sup>11</sup> is forbidden; whatever is for adornment is permitted. Just as R. Shisha son of R. Idi used to adorn himself with his cloak.<sup>12</sup>

When R. Dimi came,<sup>13</sup> he said: On one occasion Rabbi went out into the field with the two ends of his cloak lying on his shoulder. [Thereupon] Joshua b. Ziruz, the son of R. Meir's father-in-law, said to him: Did not R. Meir declare one liable to a sin-offering in such a case?<sup>14</sup> Was R. Meir so very particular?<sup>15</sup> he exclaimed.’ [So] Rabbi let his cloak fall. When Rabin came,<sup>16</sup> he said: It was not Joshua b. Ziruz but Joshua b. Kapusai, R. Akiba's son-in-law. Said he: Did not R. Akiba declare one liable to a sin-offering in such a case? Was R. Akiba so very particular? he exclaimed. [So] Rabbi let his cloak fall. When R. Samuel b. R. Judah came, he said: It was stated that this [question] was asked.<sup>17</sup>

**MISHNAH. IF ONE BATHES IN THE WATER OF A PIT<sup>18</sup> OR IN THE WATER OF TIBERIAS<sup>19</sup> AND DRIES HIMSELF EVEN WITH TEN TOWELS, HE MUST NOT FETCH THEM IN HIS HAND.<sup>20</sup> BUT TEN MEN MAY DRY THEIR FACES, HANDS, AND FEET ON ONE TOWEL AND FETCH IT IN THEIR HANDS. ONE MAY OIL AND [LIGHTLY] MASSAGE [THE BODY]. BUT NOT KNEAD<sup>21</sup> OR SCRAPE.<sup>22</sup> YOU MUST NOT GO DOWN TO A WRESTLING GROUND,<sup>23</sup> OR INDUCE VOMITING,<sup>24</sup> OR STRAIGHTEN AN INFANT[‘S LIMBS],<sup>25</sup> OR SET A BROKEN BONE. IF ONE'S HAND OR FOOT IS DISLOCATED, HE MUST NOT AGITATE IT VIOLENTLY IN COLD WATER BUT MAY BATHE IT IN THE USUAL WAY, AND IF IT HEALS, IT HEALS.**

**GEMARA. THE WATER OF A PIT** is taught analogous to **THE WATER OF TIBERIAS**: just as the water of Tiberias is hot, so [by] the water of a pit hot [water is meant]; [and furthermore, it states] **IF ONE BATHES**: only if it is done, but not at the outset.<sup>26</sup> Hence

- 
- (1) Rashi: to free it from the dust. Tosaf.: he shakes off the dew.
  - (2) As it is tantamount to washing it.
  - (3) He would never put them on thus; then the dusting is tantamount to washing. But if he is not particular about the dust there is no culpability in any case.
  - (4) The part which is thrown over the shoulder is considered a burden.
  - (5) These were swift runners, e.g., for carrying express messages. In T.A. I, p. 603, n. 530b, it is conjectured that the סוּדָר (scarf) was their only garment, apart from a loincloth.
  - (6) Even if they are folded up and not hanging down (Wilna Gaon and ‘Aruk) — though presumably they are wound round their necks in the first place.
  - (7) To prevent it from falling off.
  - (8) Lit., ‘pouches’.
  - (9) Formed by drawing up the skirts of their garments backwards and attaching it with ribbons, thus shaping it like a tube or gutter, which is the meaning of marzeb.
  - (10) He gathered up his skirts in various ways and asked him whether such were permissible on the Sabbath.
  - (11) Rashi: to remain so permanently. Wilna Gaon, citing Maim.: to prevent it from being torn or soiled. Jast. translates: with the intention of creasing.
  - (12) After putting it on he would smooth and straighten it out to make it more becoming. This is permitted even on the Sabbath.
  - (13) v. p. 12, n. 9.
  - (14) For it is not wearing but carrying a burden.
  - (15) As to call this a burden.

(16) V. p. 12, n. 9.

(17) The incident did not actually happen, but the question was asked in the academy: Rabbi thought of permitting it, but was dissuaded when told of R. Meir's (or, R. Akiba's) view.

(18) Which had been heated.

(19) Which was naturally hot-Tiberias possessed thermal springs.

(20) Even if carrying is permitted, e.g..in his house or where an 'erub has been provided.

(21) I.e., massage strongly.

(22) With a scraper, perhaps a strigil, to invigorate the circulation.

(23) So Jast. Heb. Kordima. MS.M. and Jer. read: כַּלְפֵי לֹמְיָא i.e., the clay ground (of the brickyard). Rashi translates: the name of a river.

(24) By means of an emetic.

(25) By manipulation.

(26) For otherwise the Mishnah should read: one may bathe.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 147b

sousing the whole body<sup>1</sup> is well [permitted] even at the very outset.<sup>2</sup> Who (is the authority for this)? It is R. Simeon. For it was taught: A man must not souse the whole of his body, either with hot or with cold water: this is R. Meir's view; but R. Simeon permits it. R. Judah said: It is forbidden with hot water, but permitted with cold.

AND DRIES HIMSELF EVEN WITH TEN TOWELS. The first clause informs us of the most surprising ruling. and the second clause informs us of the most surprising ruling. 'The first clause informs us of the most surprising ruling': even these, which do not contain much water, [are forbidden]; for since there is only one person, he will come to wring it out. 'And the second clause informs us of the most surprising ruling': even these, though they contain very much water [are permitted]; for since there are many, they will remind each other.<sup>3</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: A man may dry himself with a towel and place it on the window-sill, but he must not give it to the bath attendants, because they are suspected of that thing.<sup>4</sup> R. Simeon said: One may dry himself with one towel and bring it home.<sup>5</sup> Abaye asked R. Joseph: What is the law? Said he to him, Lo! there is R. Simeon; lo! there is Rabbi; lo! there is Samuel; lo! there is R. Johanan.<sup>6</sup> 'R. Simeon', as we have stated. 'Rabbi': for it was taught. Rabbi said: When we learnt Torah at R. Simeon[ 's academy] in Tekoa,<sup>7</sup> we used to carry up oil and towels from the courtyard to the roof and from the roof to an enclosure,<sup>8</sup> until we came to the fountain where we bathed. 'Samuel': for Rab Judah said in Samuel's name: A person may dry himself with a towel and carry it home [wrapped round] his hand.<sup>9</sup> 'R. Johanan': for R. Hiyya b. Abba said in R. Johanan's name: The halachah is: A person may dry himself with a towel and carry it home [wrapped round] his hand. Yet did R. Johanan say thus: surely R. Johanan said, The halachah is as an anonymous Mishnah, whereas we learnt: AND DRIES HIMSELF EVEN WITH TEN TOWELS, HE MUST NOT FETCH THEM IN HIS HAND? — He recited this as Ben Hakinai[ 's view].<sup>10</sup>

R. Hiyya b. Abba said in R. Johanan's name: The bath attendants may bring women's bathing clothes to the baths, providing that they cover their heads and the greater part of their bodies in them.<sup>11</sup> As for a sabnitha,<sup>12</sup> R. Hiyya b. Abba said in R. Johanan's name: One must tie its two bottom ends.<sup>13</sup> R. Hiyya b. Abba also said in R. Johanan's name: [That means] below the shoulders.<sup>14</sup> Raba said to the citizens of Mahoza: When you carry the apparel of the troops,<sup>15</sup> let them drop below your shoulders.<sup>16</sup>

ONE MAY OIL AND LIGHTLY MASSAGE [THE BODY]. Our Rabbis taught: One may oil and massage the bowels [of an invalid] on the Sabbath, provided this is not done as on weekdays. How then shall it be done? — R. Hama son of R. Hanina said: They must first be oiled and then

massaged.<sup>17</sup> R. Johanan said: The oiling and massaging must be done simultaneously.

**BUT [ONE MAY] NOT KNEAD.** R. Hiyya b. Abba said in R. Johanan's name; One may not stand on the mud of Diomsith,<sup>18</sup> because it stimulates [the body] and loosens [the bowels]. Rab Judah said in Rab's name: The complete period of Diomsith is twenty-one days, and Pentecost is included.<sup>19</sup> The scholars asked: Does Pentecost belong to this end or to that end?<sup>20</sup> — Come and hear: For Samuel said: All potions [medicines] [taken] between Passover and Pentecost are beneficial.<sup>21</sup> Perhaps that is [only] there, where it is beneficial [only] as long as the weather is cold: but here it is on account of the heat,<sup>22</sup> [so] when the weather is warm it is [even] more beneficial.

R. Helbo said: The wine of Perugitha<sup>23</sup> and the water of Diomsith cut off the Ten Tribes from Israel.<sup>24</sup> R. Eleazar b. 'Arak visited that place. He was attracted to them,<sup>25</sup> and [in consequence] his learning vanished. When he returned, he arose to read in the Scroll [of the Torah].<sup>26</sup> He wished to read, Hahodesh hazeh lakem [This month shall be unto you, etc.],<sup>27</sup> [instead of which] he read haharesch hayah libbam.<sup>28</sup> But the scholars prayed for him, and his learning returned. And it is thus that we learnt, R. Nehorai said: Be exiled to a place of Torah, and say not that it will follow thee, for thy companions will establish it in thy possession;<sup>29</sup> and do not rely on thine own understanding.<sup>30</sup> A Tanna taught: His name was not R. Nehorai but R. Nehemiah; whilst others state, his name was R. Eleazar b. 'Arak, and why was he called R. Nehorai? Because he enlightened [manhir] the eyes of the Sages in halachah.<sup>31</sup>

**BUT [ONE MAY] NOT SCRAPE.** Our Rabbis taught: One may not scrape with a strigil on the Sabbath. R. Simeon b. Gamaliel said: If one's feet are soiled with clay and dirt he may scrape them off in the usual way, without fear. R. Samuel b. Judah's mother made him a silver strigil. **YOU MAY NOT GO DOWN TO A WRESTLING GROUND.** What is the reason? Because of sinking [in the clay soil].<sup>32</sup>

**ONE MAY NOT INDUCE VOMITING ON THE SABBATH.** Rabbah b. Bar Hanah said in R. Johanan's name: They learnt this only [when it is effected] by a drug, but it may be done by hand<sup>33</sup> It was taught, R. Nehemiah said: It is forbidden even during the week, because of the waste of food.

**OR STRAIGHTEN AN INFANT[‘S LIMBS].** Rabbah b. Bar Hanah said in R. Johanan's name: To swaddle an infant on the Sabbath is permitted. But we learnt: **YOU MAY NOT STRAIGHTEN?**<sup>34</sup> There it refers to the spinal vertebrae, which appears as building.<sup>35</sup>

**ONE MAY NOT RESET A BROKEN BONE.** R. Hana of Bagdad said in Samuel's name:

---

(1) As opposed to an actual bath.

(2) Even in hot water.

(3) Should one forget himself and wish to wring it out.

(4) Sc. of wringing it out and giving it to others. V. 'Er., Sonc. ed., p. 610 notes.

(5) Presumably wrapped about him as a garment, or where an 'erub is provided.

(6) All these have stated their view, and surely they furnish a reliable guide.

(7) Near Bethlehem in Judea.

(8) V. supra 7a.

(9) V. n. 4.

(10) Not anonymously.

(11) So that they are brought as garments.

(12) 'Aruch; Cur. edd. saknitha. Rashi: a large cloth covering, falling over the shoulders. Maim: a small cloth, not large enough to cover the head and the greater part of the body.

(13) So that it should not fall off.

(14) So that it looks like wearing apparel.

- (15) To the baths. The troops (non-Jewish) were billeted in Jewish houses (Cf. Ta'an. 21a), and the Jews had to perform such offices as bringing their bathing outfits to the baths, carrying them through the streets.
- (16) V. p. 745, n. 5.
- (17) On weekdays it was reversed.
- (18) Jast.: identical with Emmaus, a town in the plain of Judea renowned in Talmudic days for its warm springs and luxurious life.
- (19) Only twenty-one days in the year does one derive medical benefit from Diomsith, and Pentecost is included in those twenty-one days.
- (20) I.e., does the period commence with Pentecost or end with it?
- (21) Hence Pentecost ends the period.
- (22) I.e., the healing properties of Diomsith reside in the heat of its springs.
- (23) A place in northern Israel famous for its wine. A similar statement is made in Lev. Rab. about the wine of Pelugto near Tiberias, and probably the two are identical.
- (24) They were so much pre-occupied with these pleasures that they neglected learning and lost faith, which ultimately led to their exile and disappearance.
- (25) Sc. its inhabitants and their luxurious life.
- (26) In Talmudic days the weekly lesson of the Pentateuch was read by a number of the congregation, each of whom read a part.
- (27) Ex. XII, 2.
- (28) Their hearts were silent; or perhaps it is an unintelligible phrase. Each word differs only by one letter from the original to which in turn it bears some resemblance, and the story is quoted as an illustration of the seductive powers of Diomsith!
- (29) Intellectual intercourse is essential if one is to retain his learning.
- (30) V. Ab. IV, 14.
- (31) If R. Nehorai was identical with R. Eleazar b. 'Arak, his statement was thus a result of personal experience.
- (32) This makes walking a labour (Jast.). Rashi: the clay of that river (v. n. on Mishnah) is slippery, and so one may fall into the water, saturate his garments, and then ring them out. R. Han.: one may easily sink into the soft mud, thus giving many people the labour of hauling him out.
- (33) By thrusting the finger down the throat.
- (34) And that is the purpose of swaddling.
- (35) If one is dislocated it may not be reset.

## **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 148a**

The halachah is that one may reset a fracture.<sup>1</sup> Rabbah b. Bar Hanah visited Pumbeditha. He did not attend Rab Judah's session, [so] he sent Adda the waiter to him and said, 'Go and seize him.'<sup>2</sup> So he went and seized him. When he [Rabbah] appeared, he found him [Rab Judah] lecturing, One may not reset a fracture. Said he to him, Thus did R. Hana of Bagdad say in Samuel's name: The halachah is that one may reset a fracture. Said he to him, Surely Hana is one of ours and Samuel is one of ours,<sup>3</sup> yet I have not heard this; did I then not summon you justly?<sup>4</sup>

IF ONE'S HAND IS DISLOCATED, etc. R. Awia was sitting before R. Joseph. when his hand became dislocated.<sup>5</sup> How is it thus? asked he. It is forbidden. And how is it thus?<sup>6</sup> It is forbidden. In the meantime his hand reset itself.<sup>7</sup> Said he to him, what is your question? Surely we learnt, IF ONE'S HAND OR FOOT IS DISLOCATED HE MUST NOT AGITATE IT VIOLENTLY IN COLD WATER, BUT MAY BATHE IT IN THE USUAL WAY, AND IF IT HEALS, IT HEALS. But did we not learn: ONE MAY NOT RESET A FRACTURE, he retorted, yet R. Hana of Bagdad said in Samuel's name, The halachah is that one may reset a fracture.<sup>8</sup> — Will you weave all in one web?<sup>9</sup> he replied; where it was stated it was stated, but where it was not stated it was not stated.<sup>10</sup>

MISHNAH. A MAN MAY BORROW PITCHERS OF WINE AND PITCHERS OF OIL FROM HIS NEIGHBOUR, PROVIDED HE DOES NOT SAY TO HIM, 'LEND [THEM] [HALWENI] TO ME';<sup>11</sup> AND SIMILARLY A WOMAN [MAY BORROW] LOAVES FROM HER NEIGHBOUR. IF HE DOES NOT TRUST HIM HE LEAVES HIS CLOAK WITH HIM [AS A PLEDGE] AND MAKES A RECKONING WITH HIM AFTER THE SABBATH. IN THE SAME WAY, IF THE EVE OF PASSOVER IN JERUSALEM FALLS ON A SABBATH, ONE LEAVES HIS CLOAK WITH HIM [THE VENDOR] AND RECEIVES HIS PASCHAL LAMB<sup>12</sup> AND MAKES A RECKONING WITH HIM AFTER THE FESTIVAL.

GEMARA. Raba son of R. Hanan asked Abaye: Wherein does halweni differ from hash'ileni?<sup>13</sup> In the case of hash'ileni, he replied, he [the lender] will not come to write it down;<sup>14</sup> whereas [if he says] halweni he will come to write it down. But since on weekdays it sometimes happens that one wishes to say halweni but says hash'ileni, yet he is not particular<sup>15</sup> and comes to write it down, so on the Sabbath too he may come to write it down?<sup>16</sup> — On the Sabbath, he replied since the Rabbis permitted hash'ileni only, but not halweni, the matter is distinguishable and he will not come to write.

Raba son of R. Hanan said to Abaye: Consider! The Rabbis said, 'Regarding all actions on Festivals, as far as it is possible to vary, we vary them;<sup>17</sup> then the women who fill their pitchers on Festivals, why do they not vary [their way of doing it]? Because it is impossible. How should they do it: shall those who [usually] draw [water] with a large pitcher [now] draw [it] with a small pitcher? then they increase the amount of walking! Shall those who [usually] draw [water] with, a small pitcher [now] draw it with a large one? then they increase the burden.

---

(1) He held that this is the correct reading of the Mishnah.

(2) Rashi: take his coat until he comes.

(3) They are both of our district.

(4) Otherwise we would have remained in error.

(5) Lit., 'his hand changed' — from its place.

(6) He manipulated his hand in various ways and asked of each whether it was permitted on the Sabbath.

(7) Lit., 'was healed'.

(8) Which shows that the text may be corrupt. and so the same may apply to the present quotation.

(9) Will you apply the same argument to all?

(10) You cannot assume that the text is corrupt here too.

(11) This is explained in the Gemara.

(12) If one forgot to buy an animal before the Sabbath, he leaves his cloak as a pledge with a vendor on the Sabbath, and takes an animal, but must not actually buy it then, fixing its price.

(13) Both mean 'lend me', the first implying for a considerable time, the second for a short period (Rashi). — The Mishnah forbids the use of the first term. [Tosaf.: in the first case the object itself passes into the possession of the borrower; in the second, the borrower enjoys only right of use in the object while the object itself remains the possession of the lender. V. Tosaf. a.l., Kid. 47b and Rappaport J. Das Darlehen pp. 29ff.]

(14) He expects to remember it in any case.

(15) He allows him to keep it for a long time, though the request was only hash'ileni.

(16) Thinking that the borrower may keep it a long time.

(17) So as not to do them in the same way as during the week, even where they are permitted.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 148b

Shall one spread a cloth? then he may come to wring it out. Shall one cover it with a lid? it [the string wherewith it is tied] may break and he will come to knot it.<sup>1</sup> Therefore it is impossible.

Raba son of R. Hanan also said to Abaye: We learnt, One must not clap [the hands], beat [the

breast], or dance<sup>2</sup> on Festivals. Yet we see that they do it, and do not rebuke them in any way? — Then on your reasoning, when Rabbah said: A man should not sit on the top of a stake, lest an article roll away from him and he come to fetch it,<sup>3</sup> — yet we see [women]<sup>4</sup> who carry pitchers and sit at the entrance of alleys, and we do not rebuke them? But leave Israel: better that they should [sin] in ignorance than deliberately. Now, he understood from this that that [principle] holds good only in respect of Rabbinical [enactments] but not Scriptural laws.<sup>5</sup> Yet that is not so: there is no difference between a Rabbinical and a Scriptural law. For lo! the addition to the Day of Atonement is Scriptural,<sup>6</sup> yet we see them [women] eat and drink until it is dark and do not rebuke them.

AND SIMILARLY A WOMAN [MAY BORROW] LOAVES FROM HER NEIGHBOUR, [etc.] Only on the Sabbath is it forbidden, but on weekdays it is well. Shall we say that our Mishnah does not agree with Hillel, for we learnt: And thus Hillel used to say: A woman must not lend a loaf to her neighbour without first valuing it, lest wheat advances and they [the lender and the borrower] come to [transgress the prohibition of] usury?<sup>7</sup> — You may even say [that it agrees with] Hillel: the one is in a place where its value is fixed; the other, where its value is not fixed.<sup>8</sup>

IF HE DOES NOT TRUST HIM. It was stated: As for a loan made on a Festival, — R. Joseph said: It cannot be claimed;<sup>9</sup> whilst Rabbah<sup>10</sup> said: It can be claimed. ‘R. Joseph said: It cannot be claimed’, for if you say that it can be claimed, he [the lender] will come to record it. ‘Rabbah said: It can be claimed’, for if you say that it cannot, he will not lend him, and so he will come to abstain from the joy of the Festival.

We learnt: IF HE DOES NOT TRUST HIM, HE LEAVES HIS CLOAK WITH HIM: now, it is well if you say that it cannot be claimed, therefore he must leave his cloak with him and make a reckoning with him after the Sabbath. But if you say that it can be claimed, why must he leave his cloak with him: let him, lend it and then [re-]claim it? — He says, I do not wish to stand at court and before judges.

R. Idi b. Abin objected: If one kills a cow and apports it on New Year, [then] if the month was prolonged it cancels [the debt]; but if not, it does not cancel the debt.<sup>11</sup> But if it cannot be claimed,<sup>12</sup> what does it cancel! — There it is different, because it is [retrospectively] revealed that it was a weekday.<sup>13</sup> Come and hear [a refutation] from the second clause: ‘but if not, it does not cancel the debt’. Now, it is well if you say that it can be claimed, hence he teaches [that] it does not cancel [the debt]; but if you say that it cannot be claimed, then what is meant by ‘it does not cancel [the debt]’? — That if he [the debtor] pays him, he accepts it: whence it follows that the first clause means that [even] if he pays him he must not accept!<sup>14</sup> — In the first clause he must tell him, ‘I release it,’ while in the second he need not say, ‘I release it’. As we learnt: If one repays a debt in the seventh year he [the creditor] must tell him, ‘I release it;’ but if he [the debtor] replies, ‘[I repay] even so,’ he may accept it from him, for it is said, And this is the word<sup>15</sup> of the release.<sup>16</sup>

R. Awia used to take a pledge.<sup>17</sup> Rabbah<sup>18</sup> b. ‘Ulla had recourse to an artifice.<sup>19</sup>

IN THE SAME WAY, IF THE EVE OF PASSOVER, etc. R. Johanan said: One may sanctify his Passover sacrifice on the Sabbath<sup>20</sup> and his Festival sacrifice on the Festival.<sup>21</sup> Shall we say that we can support him: IN THE SAME WAY, IF THE EVE OF PASSOVER IN JERUSALEM FALLS ON A SABBATH, ONE LEAVES HIS CLOAK WITH HIM AND RECEIVES HIS PASCHAL LAMB, AND MAKES A RECKONING WITH HIM AFTER THE FESTIVAL?<sup>22</sup> — [No.] We treat here of one who assigns shares to others together with himself in his Passover sacrifice,<sup>23</sup> so that it stands sanctified from before. But we learnt: One may not enrol [to share] in an animal on the Festival in the first place?<sup>24</sup> — Here it is different: since he is a habitue of his, it is as though he had enrolled for it beforehand. But R. Oshaia taught: ‘A man can go to a shepherd to whom he is accustomed to go and he gives him a sheep for his Passover sacrifice, and he sanctifies it and fulfils

his obligation therewith? — There too, since he is accustomed to go to him, he [the shepherd] does indeed sanctify it beforehand.<sup>25</sup> But he states, ‘he sanctifies it’?<sup>26</sup> — This sanctification is a Rabbinical preferment.<sup>27</sup> But did R. Johanan say thus? Surely R. Johanan said: The halachah is [always] as an anonymous Mishnah, whereas we learnt: One may not sanctify, vow a ‘valuation’,<sup>28</sup> devote,<sup>29</sup> or separate terumoth and tithes: all these were said of Festivals, and how much more so of the Sabbath! — There is no difficulty: One refers to obligatory offerings for which there is a fixed time;<sup>30</sup> the other refers to obligations for which there is no fixed time.

**MISHNAH. A MAN MAY COUNT HIS GUESTS AND HIS DAINY PORTIONS BY WORD OF MOUTH, BUT NOT FROM WRITING. A MAN MAY CAST LOTS WITH HIS SONS AND THE MEMBERS OF HIS HOUSEHOLD FOR THE TABLE,<sup>31</sup> PROVIDED THAT HE DOES NOT INTEND TO OFFSET A LARGE PORTION AGAINST A SMALL ONE.<sup>32</sup> AND [PRIESTS] MAY CAST LOTS FOR SACRIFICES ON FESTIVALS, BUT NOT FOR THE PORTIONS.<sup>33</sup> [**

---

(1) With a permanent knot, which is forbidden.

(2) The former two in grief the third in joy.

(3) V. supra 141a.

(4) V. Bah.

(5) Both cases mentioned here are Rabbinical.

(6) The fast must begin before the Day of Atonement actually commences, and this is deduced from Scripture; v. Yoma 81b.

(7) V. B.M. 75a.

(8) If the price of the loaf is fixed (and our Mishnah refers to such) even Hillel agrees, because if it advances the lender will make an allowance when it is returned.

(9) In a court of Law.

(10) Alfasi and Asheri read: Raba.

(11) This refers to New Year following the seventh year, debts contracted during which are void (v. Deut. XV, 1, 2). The months consist of either thirty or twenty-nine days; in the former case the following month is celebrated with two days as New Moon, the first of which is the last day of the previous month. Now if a butcher kills a cow and divides it among his customers on credit on the first New Year's day following the seventh year: if the previous month, Elul, consisted of thirty days, this New Year's Day was really the last day of Elul, i.e., of the seventh year, and therefore the debt cannot be claimed. But if Elul consisted of twenty-nine days, this New Year's Day is the first of the eighth year, hence the debt can be claimed. — New Year, of course, is a Festival.

(12) Sc. a debt contracted on any Festival.

(13) Sc. the last day of Elul, in spite of the fact that it was celebrated as New Year.

(14) Surely not! The year of release does not actually cancel debts but merely deprives the creditor of his right to exact them.

(15) E. V. ‘manner’.

(16) Deut. XV, 2.I.e., the creditor must inform the debtor of the release.

(17) From anyone who borrowed from him on a Festival.

(18) Var. lec.: Raba.

(19) Rashi: after the Festival he would take an article from the debtor and then detain it.

(20) I.e., when the eve of Passover falls on the Sabbath.

(21) An animal must be formally sanctified before it may be offered as a sacrifice. This may not be done on Sabbaths or Festivals, but since two animals are actually offered on those days respectively they may be sanctified too, if that was not done previously.

(22) And of course he would have to sanctify it on the same day.

(23) Those who participate in the sacrifice must formally enrol themselves as members to share in that particular animal (v. Ex. Xli, 4). Thus the payment is merely for a share in an animal which is already consecrated.

(24) Because it is regarded as transacting business, v. Bez. 27b.

(25) I.e., the shepherd sanctifies it on the festival even on his behalf.

(26) I.e., when he receives it.

(27) I.e. the Rabbis held it more fitting that the owner too should sanctify the animal, but actually that has already been done.

(28) Heb. **מועריכין** This is the technical term for a vow to give one's own or another person's 'valuation' to the Temple. V. Lev. XXVII, 1ff

(29) Heb. **מהרימין**, i.e. renounce an object by dedicating it absolutely for priestly use; v. Lev. XXVII, 28f.

(30) E.g., the Passover sacrifice and Festive offerings. Such may be sanctified on the Sabbath and Festivals, as otherwise the obligation must remain unfulfilled.

(31) Which portion of the food shall belong to each.

(32) The portions must be alike in size, not one larger and one smaller, so that the first drawn by lot shall receive the largest, etc.

(33) This is explained in the Gemara.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 149a

GEMARA. What is the reason? — R. Bibi said: It is a preventive measure, lest he erase.<sup>1</sup> Abaye said: It is a preventive measure, lest he read.<sup>2</sup> Wherein do they differ? — They differ where it is written high up on the wall: according to him who says, Lest he erase, we do not fear; but according to him who says, Lest he read [secular documents], we do fear. Now, as to him who says, 'Lest he erase', let us fear lest he read [secular documents]? Moreover, have we no fear that he may erase?<sup>3</sup> Surely we learnt: One may not read by the light of a lamp; whereon Rabbah said: Even if it is as high as twice a man's stature, even if it is as high as [the measurement of] two ox-goads, or even as ten houses on top of each other, he must not read?<sup>4</sup> — Rather they differ where it is written on the wall and is low down: according to him who says, 'Lest he erase', we fear; [but] according to him who says, 'Lest he read [secular documents]', we do not fear, [for] one will not confuse a wall with a document.<sup>5</sup>

Now, according to him who says, 'Lest he read [etc.]', let us fear lest he erase? — Rather they differ where it is engraved on a tablet or a board: on the view that it is 'lest he erase', we have no fear; but on the view that it is 'lest he read', we do fear. But according to him who says, lest he erase, let us fear lest he read [etc.]? And should you answer, a tablet or a board cannot be confused with a document, — surely it was taught: A man may count how many shall be within and how many without<sup>6</sup> and how many portions he is to set before them, from writing on a wall, but not from writing on a tablet or a board. How is it meant? Shall we say that it is indeed written, wherein does one differ from the other? Hence it must surely mean that it is engraved, yet he states, 'from writing on the wall, but not from writing on a tablet or a board'? — Rather [say thus]: In truth [they differ] where it is written high up on the wall, and as for your difficulty about Rabbah's [ruling], [the ruling] of Rabbah is dependent on Tannaim. For it was taught: A man may count his guests and his dainty portions by word of mouth, but not from writing. R. Aha permits [it] from writing on the wall. How is it meant: Shall we say that it is written low down, — then let us fear lest he erase it? Hence it must surely mean that it is written high up, which proves that Rabah's [ruling] is dependent on Tannaim.

Now these Tannaim are as the following: For it was taught: One must not look in a mirror on the Sabbath; R. Meir permits [one to look]<sup>7</sup> in a mirror that is fixed to the wall. Why is one fixed to the wall different? — [Presumably] because in the meanwhile<sup>8</sup> he will recollect!<sup>9</sup> then even if it is not fixed, he will recollect? — We treat here of a metal mirror, and [the reason is] in accordance with R. Nahman's [dictum] in Rabbah b. Abbuha's name. For R. Nahman said in Rabbah b. Abbuha's name: Why was it ruled that a metal mirror is forbidden? Because a man usually removes straggling hairs with it.<sup>10</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: The writing under a painting or an image<sup>11</sup> may not be read on the Sabbath. And as for the image itself, one must not look at it even on weekdays, because it is said, Turn ye not unto idols.<sup>12</sup> How is that taught? — Said R. Hanin: [Its interpretation is,] Turn not unto that

conceived in your own minds.<sup>13</sup>

A MAN MAY CAST LOTS WITH HIS SONS, etc. Only with his sons and household, but not with strangers:<sup>14</sup> what is the reason? As Rab Judah said in Samuel's name. For Rab Judah said in Samuel's name: The members of a company who are particular with each other<sup>15</sup> transgress [the prohibitions of] measure, weight, number, borrowing and repaying on the Festival,<sup>16</sup>

- (1) He may find too many names on the list and erase some before instructing his servant to invite the guests.
- (2) Secular documents.
- (3) If the list is high up.
- (4) V. supra 11a. Though he could not reach the lamp to tilt it; hence the same reasoning applies here.
- (5) No one is likely to think that since he may read something written on a wall he may also read business documents.
- (6) I.e., how many guests shall be placed at the top of the table — 'within' the privileged circle — and how many at the bottom — 'without'.
- (7) Lest he see uneven locks of hair and trim them
- (8) While he goes for a pair of scissors.
- (9) That it is the Sabbath.
- (10) Its edge being sharpened. Now the first Tanna forbids all mirrors, drawing no distinctions; whilst R. Meir does draw a distinction. That is similar to the matter just debated
- (11) I.e., the written legend beneath a picture.
- (12) Lev. XIX, 4.
- (13) Tosaf.: the interdict is only against images (or perhaps statues — Jast.) made for idolatrous purposes, but others are permitted.
- (14) For otherwise the Tanna would simply teach, A MAN MAY CAST LOTS.
- (15) I.e., members of a company at one table, each of whom has his own provisions, and when one borrows from another, are particular to weigh, measure, or count, that the exact quantity may be returned.
- (16) On Festivals one may borrow from his neighbour. but not by weight, measure or number. Likewise, he may not use the terms 'lend' and 'repay'. for these belong to monetary transactions. When members of a company are particular with each other, they are likely to be led into a transgression of these prohibitions.

### **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 149b**

and according to Beth<sup>1</sup> Hillel, usury too.<sup>2</sup> If so, the same applies to his sons and household? — As for his sons and household, this is the reason, as Rab Judah [said] in Rab's name. For Rab Judah said in Rab's name: One may lend to his sons and household on interest, in order to give them experience thereof.<sup>3</sup> If so, a large portion [set off] against a small portion [should be permitted] too? — That indeed is so, and there is a lacuna, while it is thus taught: 'A MAN MAY CAST LOTS FOR HIS SONS AND HOUSEHOLD FOR THE TABLE, even [setting] a large portion against a small portion'. What is the reason? — As Rab Judah[ 's dictum] in Rab's name. Yet only for his sons and household, but not for strangers. What is the reason? — As Rab Judah[ 's dictum] in Samuel's name. [Further, 'setting] A LARGE PORTION AGAINST A SMALL PORTION is forbidden even on weekdays in the case of strangers'. What is the reason? — On account of gambling.<sup>4</sup>

AND [PRIESTS] MAY CAST LOTS FOR, etc. What does BUT NOT FOR THE PORTIONS mean? — Said R. Jacob the son of the daughter of Jacob: But [one must not cast lots] for the portions of weekday [sacrifices] on the Festivals. That is obvious? You might argue, since it is written, for thy people are like the Priests that quarrel,<sup>5</sup> even the portions of weekdays too.<sup>6</sup> therefore he informs us [that it is not so].

R. Jacob son of Jacob's daughter also said: He through whom his neighbour is punished is not permitted to enter within the barrier [precincts] of the Holy One, blessed be He. How do we know this? Shall we say, because it is written, And the Lord said, Who shall persuade Ahab, that he may

go up and fall at Ramoth-gilead? And one said on this manner; and another said on that manner. And there came forth a spirit and stood before the Lord, and said, I will persuade him. And he said, I will go forth and be a lying spirit in the mouth of all his Prophets. And he [the Lord] said, Thou shalt entice him, and shalt prevail also: go forth, and do so.<sup>7</sup> Now we discussed, What spirit is meant? And R. Johanan answered: The spirit of Naboth the Jezreelite.<sup>8</sup> And what does 'go forth' mean? Said Rab, Go forth from within My precincts!<sup>9</sup> But perhaps there this is the reason, [viz.,] because it is written, He that speaketh falsehood shall not be established before mine eyes?<sup>10</sup> Again, [if] it is derived from here: Thou art filled with shame for glory: drink thou also, and be as one uncircumcised, etc.;<sup>11</sup> and it is maintained: 'Thou art filled with shame for glory' refers to Nebuchadnezzar: [whilst] 'drink thou also and be as one uncircumcised', refers to Zedekiah,<sup>12</sup> — one [objection] is that the whole verse is written in reference to Nebuchadnezzar;<sup>13</sup> and further, what could the righteous Zedekiah have done to him, for Rab Judah said in Rab's name: When that wicked man [Nebuchadnezzar] wished to do thus to that righteous man [Zedekiah]. etc.?<sup>14</sup> Rather [it follows] from this: Also to punish the righteous is not good.<sup>15</sup> Now, 'is not good' can mean nought but [that he is] evil,<sup>16</sup> and it is written, For thou art a God that hath no pleasure in wickedness, evil shall not sojourn with thee, [which means,] Thou art righteous, therefore evil shall not sojourn in thy habitation.<sup>17</sup>

How is it implied that HALASHIM<sup>18</sup> connotes lots? — Because it is written, How art thou fallen from heaven, O day star, son of the morning! How art thou cut down to the ground thou holsh [who didst cast lots]<sup>19</sup> over the nations, etc.<sup>20</sup> Rabbah son of R. Huna said: This teaches that he [Nebuchadnezzar] cast lots over the royal chiefs<sup>21</sup> to ascertain whose turn<sup>22</sup> it was for pederasty. And it is written, All the kings of the nations, all of them, [sleep in glory. etc.].<sup>23</sup> R. Johanan said: That means that they rested from pederasty.<sup>24</sup>

R. Johanan also said: As long as that wicked man lived mirth was never heard<sup>25</sup> in the mouth of any living being, for it is written, the whole world is at rest, and is quiet: they break forth into singing.<sup>26</sup> whence it follows that hitherto<sup>27</sup> there was no singing.

R. Isaac also said in R. Johanan's name: One may not stand in that wicked man's palace, for it is said, and satyrs shall dance there.<sup>28</sup>

Rab Judah said in Rab's name: When that wicked man [Nebuchadnezzar] wished to treat that righteous one [Zedekiah] thus,<sup>29</sup> his membrum was extended three hundred cubits and wagged in front of the whole company [of captive kings]. for it is said, Thou art filled with shame for glory: drink thou also, and be as one uncircumcised [he'orel]: the numerical value of 'orel' is three hundred

Rab Judah also said in Rab's name: When that wicked man descended to Gehenna,<sup>30</sup> all who had [previously] descended thither trembled, saying, Does he come to rule over us, or to be as weak as we [are], for it is said, Art thou also become weak as we? or art thou to rule over us?<sup>31</sup> A Heavenly Echo went forth and declared, Whom dost thou pass in beauty? go down with, and be thou laid with the uncircumcised.<sup>32</sup>

How hath the oppressor ceased! the golden city [madhebah] ceased.<sup>33</sup> Rab Judah said in Rab's name: This people hath ceased, that demanded,

(1) Var. lec. omit 'Beth', v. supra 148b.

(2) When they are not particular with each other, and one borrows and returns the same amount after its price advances, there is no usury, since neither cares whether the exact amount is returned or not. But there every change in value is scrupulously noted, and therefore if it advances there is usury. This does not refer particularly to Festivals.

(3) Lit., 'to let them know the taste of usury', i.e., the grief and anxiety it causes.

- (4) Which this resembles.
- (5) Hos. IV, 4 (E. V. 'for thy people are as they that strive with the priest').
- (6) To save them from quarrelling.
- (7) 1 Kings XXII, 20ff
- (8) This is deduced from the employment of the def. art. in Hebrew: 'and the spirit came forth', implying a particular one, viz., that of Naboth the Jezreelite, whom Ahab had turned from a living human being into a spirit — by judicial murder; v. *ibid*, ch. XXI.
- (9) Because he lured Ahab, to destruction, which proves the dictum of R. Jacob.
- (10) Ps. CI, 7. Though God sought to lure Ahab to his doom, He nevertheless desired it to be done by arguments drawn from true facts (Maharsha in Sanh. 89a).
- (11) Hab. II, 16.
- (12) And the verse is interpreted in the sense that Zedekiah too is regarded as uncircumcised and not permitted to enter the precincts of the Almighty, because Nebuchadnezzar was punished on his account.
- (13) I.e., it can be so interpreted.
- (14) V. *infra* for the complete allusion.
- (15) Prov. XVII, 26.
- (16) Translating the verse thus: even the righteous, when made the cause or vehicle of punishment, is accounted evil.
- (17) Ps. V,5 (E.V. 4).
- (18) The word used in the Mishnah.
- (19) Which didst lay low.
- (20) Isa. XIV, 12.
- (21) The kings he had captured in battle.
- (22) Lit., 'day'.
- (23) *Ibid*. 18.
- (24) The ascription of pederasty to Nebuchadnezzar may be a covert allusion to the fact that the Romans were addicted to this vice; v. Weiss, Dor, II, 21.
- (25) Lit., 'found'.
- (26) Isa. XIV,7.
- (27) I.e., before Nebuchadnezzar's death.
- (28) *Ibid*. Xlii, 21.
- (29) I.e., submit him to sexual abuse.
- (30) V. p. 153, n.8.
- (31) Isa. XIV, 10. This connects נמשלת with משל, to rule E.V.: art thou become like unto us,
- (32) Ezek. XXXII, 19.
- (33) Isa. XIV, 4.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 150a

Measure out [tribute] and bring it [to us]; others interpret: that demanded, Bring ever more and more, without measure.<sup>1</sup>

And excellent greatness was added to me:<sup>2</sup> Rab Judah said in R. Jeremiah b. Abba's name: This teaches that he rode upon a male lion to whose head he had tied a snake [for reins]. in fulfilment of what is said, and the beasts of the field also have I given him to serve him.<sup>3</sup>

MISHNAH. A MAN MUST NOT HIRE LABOURERS ON THE SABBATH, NOR INSTRUCT HIS NEIGHBOUR TO HIRE LABOURERS ON HIS BEHALF. ONE MUST NOT GO TO THE TEHUM TO AWAIT NIGHTFALL<sup>4</sup> IN ORDER TO HIRE LABOURERS OR BRING IN PRODUCE; BUT ONE MAY DO SO IN ORDER TO WATCH [HIS FIELD]. AND [THEN] HE CAN BRING [HOME] PRODUCE WITH HIM.<sup>5</sup> ABBA SAUL STATED A GENERAL PRINCIPLE: WHATEVER I HAVE A RIGHT TO INSTRUCT [THAT IT BE DONE], I AM PERMITTED TO GO TO AWAIT NIGHTFALL, FOR IT [AT THE TEHUM]. GEMARA. Wherein

does he differ from his neighbour?<sup>6</sup> — Said R. Papa: A Gentile neighbour [is meant]. R. Ashi demurred: [Surely] an order to a Gentile is [forbidden as] a shebuth?<sup>7</sup> Rather said R. Ashi: One may even say [that] an Israelite neighbour [is meant]. [Yet] he [the Tanna] informs us this: One may not say to his neighbour, ‘Hire labourers for me,’ but one may say to his neighbour, ‘Well, we shall see<sup>8</sup> whether you join me<sup>9</sup> in the evening!’<sup>10</sup> And with whom does our Mishnah agree? With R. Joshua b. Karhah. For it was taught: One must not say to his neighbour, ‘Well, we shall see whether you join me in the evening’! R. Joshua b. Karhah said: One may say to his neighbour, ‘Well, we shall see whether you join me in the evening’! Rabbah b. Bar Hanah said in R. Johanan's name: The halachah is as R. Joshua b. Karhah. Rabbah b. Bar Hanah also said in R. Johanan's name: What is R. Judah b. Karhah's reason? Because it is written, nor finding thine own pleasure nor speaking thine own words:<sup>11</sup> [explicit] speech is forbidden, but thought is permitted.<sup>12</sup>

R. Aha son of R. Huna pointed out a contradiction to Raba. Did R. Johanan say: Speech is forbidden, thought is permitted, which shows that thought is not the same as speech? But surely Rabbah b. Bar Hanah said in R. Johanan's name: One may meditate [on learning] everywhere, except at the baths or in a privy? There it is different, because [the fulfilment of] and thy camp shall be holy<sup>13</sup> is required, which is absent.<sup>14</sup> But it is also written, that he see no indecent speech [dabar] in thee?<sup>15</sup> — That is required for Rab Judah[‘s dictum]. For Rab Judah said: One may not recite the shema<sup>16</sup> in the presence of a naked heathen. Why particularly a heathen: even an Israelite too? — He proceeds to a climax:<sup>17</sup> it is superfluous to state that it is forbidden [in the presence of a naked] Israelite; but as for a heathen, Since it is written of him, whose flesh is the flesh of asses,<sup>18</sup> I might say that it is permitted therefore he tells us [otherwise]. Yet perhaps that indeed is so? Scripture saith, and they saw not their father's nakedness.<sup>19</sup>

Now, is speech forbidden? Surely R. Hisda and R. Hamnuna both said: Accounts in connection with religion may be calculated [discussed] on the Sabbath. And R. Eleazar said: One may determine charity [grants] to the poor on the Sabbath. Again, R. Jacob b. Idi said in R. Johanan's name: One may supervise matters of life and death and matters of communal urgency on the Sabbath, and one may go to the synagogues to attend to communal affairs on the Sabbath. Also, R. Samuel b. Nahmani said in R. Johanan's name: One may go to theatres and circuses and basilicas to attend to communal affairs on the Sabbath. Further, the School of Manasseh taught: One may make arrangements on the Sabbath for the betrothal of young girls and the elementary education<sup>20</sup> of a child and to teach him a trade!<sup>21</sup> — Scripture saith, nor finding thine own affairs nor speaking thine own words: thine affairs are forbidden, the affairs of Heaven [religious matters] are permitted.

Rab Judah said in Samuel's name: Unimportant accounts<sup>22</sup> and past expenditure accounts<sup>23</sup> may be calculated on the Sabbath. It was taught likewise: One may not calculate past or future accounts,<sup>24</sup> [but accounts] of unimportance

---

(1) These interpret madhebah either as me'od habeh (count and bring) or me'od habi (belo) middah (bring much, without measure).

(2) Dan. IV, 36. This was said by Nebuchadnezzar when he regained sanity after having lived seven years like a wild beast.

(3) Jer. XXVII, 6.

(4) Lit., ‘for nightfall’. I.e., one may not go as far as the tehuma on the Sabbath in readiness to cross it immediately the Sabbath terminates.

(5) Lit., ‘in his hand’. Though he may not go to the tehuma in the first place for this purpose, yet since he did so primarily in order to watch his field, he may take advantage of the fact and bring home produce too.

(6) It is obvious that if he must not engage labourers his neighbours must not either.

(7) V. Glos. This is a well-known general principle, already taught in the Mishnah supra 121a, and it need not be repeated.

(8) תנראה. The exact meaning of the expression is not established.

- (9) Lit., 'stand with me'.
- (10) Though both understand it as a hint that he desires to engage him.
- (11) Isa. LVIII, 13, q.v.
- (12) A hint is not explicit but left to the understanding.
- (13) Deut. XXIII, 15.
- (14) For speech is not mentioned in that passage.
- (15) Ibid. E.V.: 'that he see no unclean thing in thee'.
- (16) V. Glos.
- (17) Lit., 'he states, "it is unnecessary"'.  
 (18) Ezek. XXIII, 20. [I.e., nudity is common among them].  
 (19) Gen, IX, 23: This shows that it is indecent in all cases.  
 (20) Lit., 'to teach him (the) book'.
- (21) All these involve actual speech.
- (22) Lit., 'accounts of what is it to thee'. Rashi. 'Aruch and R. Han.: accounts of guests, i.e., how many guests will be present, etc.
- (23) Rashi. Lit., 'what (cost) lies in this', Aliter: 'of no practical value'. Lit., 'of what is in it'.
- (24) I.e., I have expended or will have to expend so much or so much.

### **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 150b**

or of past expenditure may be calculated. But the following contradicts it: One may reckon up accounts that are not required, but one may not reckon up on the Sabbath accounts that are necessary. E.g., a man may say to his neighbour, 'I hired so many labourers for this field,' 'I expended so many denarii for this residence.' But he must not say to him, 'I have expended so much and am [yet] to expend so much'! — Then according to your reasoning, that [Baraita] itself presents a difficulty.<sup>1</sup> But in the one case he is [still] in possession of his employee's wages;<sup>2</sup> in the other he is not in possession of his employee's wages.

**ONE MUST NOT GO TO THE TEHUM TO AWAIT NIGHTFALL.** Our Rabbis taught: It once happened that a breach was made in the field of a pious man and he decided to fence it about, when he recalled that it was the Sabbath, so he refrained and did not repair it; thereupon a miracle was performed for him, a caper bush grew up there, whence he and his household derived their livelihood.

Rab Judah said in Samuel's name: One may say to his neighbour [on the Sabbath]. 'I am going to that town to-morrow,' for if there are stations [on the road] he may go [on the Sabbath itself].<sup>3</sup> We learnt: **ONE MUST NOT GO TO THE TEHUM TO AWAIT NIGHTFALL IN ORDER TO HIRE LABOURERS OR BRING IN PRODUCE.** As for hiring, labourers, it is well, since one may not hire them on the Sabbath; but to fetch produce. let us say [that it is permitted], for if there were walls [partitions] there he might bring [it even on the Sabbath]?<sup>4</sup> — This [ruling of our Mishnah] can refer to produce attached [to the soil].<sup>5</sup> But R. Oshaia taught: One must not go to the tehumi to await nightfall in order to bring straw or stubble. As for stubble, it is well: this can refer to attached; but to what can straw refer?<sup>6</sup> — Offensive smelling straw.<sup>7</sup> Come and hear: One may go to the tehumi to await nightfall to attend to the affairs of a bride and the business of a corpse.<sup>8</sup> Thus, only for the affairs of a bride or a corpse, but not for the business of any other. As for another [with a purpose] analogous to [that of] a bride, it is well:<sup>9</sup> this is conceivable where one desires to cut a myrtle for him.<sup>10</sup> But what can the purpose in connection with a corpse be? [Presumably] in order to bring a coffin and shrouds; yet he [the Tanna] specifies a corpse. but not another;<sup>11</sup> yet why so: let us argue that [it is permissible for another too], for if there were walls there he might bring [articles even on the Sabbath]? — In the case of a corpse too, it is conceivable where the purpose is to cut out shrouds for him.<sup>12</sup>

**BUT ONE MAY GO TO THE TEHUM TO AWAIT NIGHTFALL**, etc. Though he did not recite habdalah?<sup>13</sup> Surely R. Eleazar b. Antigonus said on R. Eliezer b. Jacob's authority: One is forbidden to attend to his affairs before reciting habdalah. And should you answer that he recites habdalah in the Prayer,<sup>14</sup> surely Rab Judah said in Samuel's name: He who recites habdalah in the Prayer must [also] recite it over a cup [of wine]?<sup>15</sup> And should you answer that he does recite habdalah over a cup. — [it may be asked] is a cup procurable in the fields? — R. Nathan b. Ammi explained this before Raba: They learnt this of the season of wine pressing.<sup>16</sup> R. Abba said to R. Ashi: In the West [Palestine] we say thus: 'He who makes a distinction between holy and profane', and then we attend to our affairs. R. Ashi related: 'When I was at R. Kahana's academy he used to recite, 'Who makest a distinction between holy and profane,' and then we chopped up logs.

**ABBA SAUL STATED A GENERAL PRINCIPLE: WHATEVER I HAVE**, etc. To what does Abba Saul refer? Shall we say that he refers to the first clause, [viz.] **ONE MUST NOT GO TO THE TEHUM TO AWAIT NIGHTFALL, IN ORDER TO HIRE LABOURERS OR BRING IN PRODUCE**, —

- 
- (1) The first Baraita states in its first clause that one must not calculate past accounts, while the second clause states that past expenditure accounts are permitted.
  - (2) Then it is forbidden, for though incurred in the past, it has still to be paid.
  - (3) Burgin, pl. burganim, is an isolated residence on a road, often used as a station for travellers (Jast.). If the road to the town were dotted with these stations at intervals of less than seventy cubits the journey might be made even on the Sabbath. It is therefore permitted to mention it even in the absence of such stations.
  - (4) I.e., if the road lay between walls it might technically be a private domain wherein carrying is permitted.
  - (5) Which may not be detached under any circumstances.
  - (6) Which straw can be meant which shall not be permitted by Rab Judah's logic?
  - (7) Which may not be handled in any case, as it is mukzeh on account of its repulsiveness (v. supra 46a).
  - (8) E.g. to arrange for the funeral.
  - (9) For the implication must be that for the same purpose where it is permitted in connection with a bride or a corpse it is forbidden in connection with another.
  - (10) An overhead awning of myrtles was erected for a bride. Thus it is permitted for a bride, but not for another, since the myrtles are attached to the soil and may not be cut on the Sabbath.
  - (11) Though bringing a coffin and shrouds is just the same as bringing any other article.
  - (12) By analogy, another might desire to go to the tehumi in order to be ready to cut out a suit, and this is forbidden.
  - (13) V. Glos. and p. 333, n. 2. The difficulty is the last clause: surely he may not cut down produce before reciting habdalah?
  - (14) The 'Prayer' always refers to the 'Eighteen Benedictions', in the fourth of which a habdalah passage is inserted; v. P.B. p. 94d; Elbogen, *Der Judische Gottesdienst*, pp. 46f; 120f.
  - (15) Habdalah originally was not a statutory addition to the Sabbath evening Prayer; op. cit.
  - (16) A cup of wine is then obtainable in the fields.

### **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 151a**

then instead of **WHATEVER I HAVE A RIGHT TO INSTRUCT [THAT IT BE DONE], I AM PERMITTED TO AWAIT NIGHTFALL, FOR IT**, he should state, 'Whatever I have no right to instruct [that it be done]. I am not permitted to await nightfall for it'.<sup>1</sup> Whereas if he bases himself on the second clause, **BUT ONE MAY DO SO IN ORDER TO WATCH OVER HIS FIELDS, AND [THEN] HE CAN BRING [HOME] PRODUCE WITH HIM**, then he should state, 'Whatever I have a right to await nightfall [at the tehumi], I am permitted to instruct [that it be done]'? — In truth he refers to the second clause, but Abba Saul bases himself on the following. For Rab Judah said in Samuel's name: One may say to his neighbour, 'Watch for me over the fruit in your tehumi, and I will watch for you over the fruit in my tehumi.' And thus Abba Saul argues with the first Tanna: Do you not admit that one may say to his neighbour, 'Watch for me over the fruit in your tehumi and I will

watch for you over the fruit in my tehum?' then say, WHATEVER I HAVE A RIGHT TO INSTRUCT [THAT IT BE DONE]. I AM PERMITTED TO AWAIT NIGHTFALL FOR IT.<sup>2</sup>

What does the general principle add?<sup>3</sup> — It adds the following, which our Rabbis taught: One may not go to the tehum to await nightfall in order to bring an animal. If it is standing without the tehum, one may call it and it comes. Abba Saul stated a general principle: Whatever I have a right to say [that it shall be done],<sup>4</sup> I am permitted to await nightfall [at the tehum] for it. And one may go to await nightfall in order to attend to the affairs of a bride or of a corpse, to bring a coffin and shrouds for him. And one may give instructions to another, 'Go to such and such a place, and if you cannot obtain them from there, bring them from elsewhere; if you cannot obtain them for a maneh, obtain them for two manehs.' R. Jose son of R. Judah said: Provided that he does not mention the exact price to him.<sup>5</sup>

MISHNAH. YOU MAY GO TO THE TEHUM AGAINST NIGHTFALL IN ORDER TO ATTEND TO THE AFFAIRS OF A BRIDE OR OF A CORPSE, TO BRING A COFFIN AND SHROUDS FOR HIM. IF A GENTILE BRINGS REED-PIPES ON THE SABBATH,<sup>6</sup> ONE MUST NOT BEWAIL AN ISRAELITE ON THEM, UNLESS THEY CAME FROM A NEAR PLACE.<sup>7</sup> IF HE [A GENTILE] MADE A COFFIN FOR HIMSELF OR DUG A GRAVE FOR HIMSELF,<sup>8</sup> AN ISRAELITE MAY BE BURIED THEREIN. BUT IF [HE MADE IT] FOR THE SAKE OF AN ISRAELITE, HE MAY NEVER BE BURIED THEREIN.<sup>9</sup>

GEMARA. What does FROM A NEAR PLACE mean? Rab said: Literally from a near place.<sup>10</sup> While Samuel said: We conjecture that they [the reed-pipes] were [just] without the [city] wall during the night.<sup>11</sup> [Raba said.]<sup>12</sup> The deduction of our Mishnah supports Samuel, for it is stated: IF HE [A GENTILE] MADE A COFFIN FOR HIMSELF OR DUG A GRAVE FOR HIMSELF, AN ISRAELITE MAY BE BURIED THEREIN. This proves that it is permitted on account of a doubt,<sup>13</sup> so here too, it is permitted on account of a doubt. And we learnt in accordance with Rab [too]: A city inhabited by Israelites and Gentiles which contains baths where there is bathing on the Sabbath, if the majority are Gentiles, one [an Israelite] may bathe therein immediately; if the majority are Israelites, one must wait until hot water could be heated;<sup>14</sup> if half and half, one must wait until hot water could be heated.<sup>15</sup> R. Judah said: In the case of a small bath, if there is there<sup>16</sup> [a man of authority],<sup>17</sup> he [an Israelite] may bathe therein immediately. What is '[a man of] authority?' Said Rab Judah in the name of R. Isaac son of Rab Judah: If there is there an important personage who possesses ten slaves who heat ten kettles [of water] for him simultaneously, then if it is a small bath he [the Israelite] may bathe therein immediately.<sup>18</sup>

IF HE [A GENTILE] MADE A COFFIN FOR HIMSELF OR DUG A GRAVE FOR HIMSELF, etc. Yet why so? here too, let him wait until it could be made?<sup>19</sup> — Said 'Ulla: It refers to one [a grave] that stands in an [army] camp.<sup>20</sup> That is well of a grave; [but] what can be said of a coffin? Said R. Abbahu: It refers to [a coffin] that is lying on his grave.<sup>21</sup> MISHNAH. ALL THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE DEAD MAY BE DONE; HE MAY BE ANOINTED WITH OIL AND WASHED, PROVIDED THAT NO LIMB OF HIS IS MOVED. THE PILLOW MAY BE REMOVED FROM UNDER HIM, AND HE MAY BE PLACED ON SAND, IN ORDER THAT

---

(1) So that the principle is parallel to the clause upon which it is based.

(2) It is assumed that both accept Samuel's ruling. Hence the permission given by the first Tanna to go to the end of the tehum to watch over produce would be included in Abba Saul's principle, and all other permitted cases likewise, and there is no need for the first Tanna to give a specific instance.

(3) It is axiomatic that when a general principle is stated it is to add a case that is not explicitly taught.

(4) Which includes calling an animal from beyond the tehum.

(5) He may authorize him to pay a high price if he cannot buy them cheaply. but must not state the exact figures.

(6) For playing at a Jew's funeral, which formed part of the obsequies, cf. B.M. VI, 1 and note a.I. in Sonc. ed.

(7) I.e., within the tehum.

(8) Either for his own use or in order to sell. — The reference is to the Sabbath.

(9) [According to Maim. the reference is to the Israelite for whom the grave was dug. He may not, that is to say, be buried even **בכדי שיעשו** i.e., after sufficient time has elapsed after the termination of the Sabbath for the grave to be dug.]

(10) We must know this for certain, having seen that he had them in his house within the city.

(11) Even if they were not in his house we may assume that they were only just without the city wall, yet within the tehum, unless we know to the contrary. Lit., 'we apprehend lest', The phrase is also used with lenient implications, v. Hag. 15a (Rashi). Normally the more stringent possibility is acted upon, but here it is the reverse, for the sake of the dead.

(12) So text as emended by Bah.

(13) For he might actually have made it for a Jew. [Tosaf. a.l. deletes this passage as in this Mishnah the question of doubt does not arise as explained in the Gemara infra.]

(14) V. supra 122a, for notes.

(15) Which shows that in a case of doubt we are stringent, and this agrees with Rab.

(16) In the city.

(17) Jast.: a Roman official.

(18) As the water may have been thus prepared after the Sabbath.

(19) For the Gentile may have had a Jew in mind.

(20) Aliter: in the broad open street. It is unusual for Jews to be buried there.

(21) Sc. the Gentile's grave dug in the camp.

## **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 151b**

HE MAY BE ABLE TO KEEP.<sup>1</sup> THE JAW MAY BE TIED UP, NOT IN ORDER THAT IT SHOULD CLOSE<sup>2</sup> BUT THAT IT SHOULD NOT GO FURTHER [OPEN]. AND LIKEWISE, IF A BEAM IS BROKEN, IT MAY BE SUPPORTED BY A BENCH OR BED STAVES, NOT IN ORDER THAT IT [THE BREAK] SHOULD CLOSE UP, BUT THAT IT SHOULD GO NO FURTHER.

GEMARA. But Surely Rab Judah related in Samuel's name: It once happened that a disciple of R. Meir followed him into the baths and wished to swill the ground for him, [but] he said to him, One may not swill; then he wished to oil the ground for him, but he said to him, One may not oil?<sup>3</sup> — Ground may be confused with ground. but a corpse cannot be confused with ground.<sup>4</sup>

What does ALL add? It adds the following, which our Rabbis taught: Cooling vessels and metal vessels may be brought and placed on his [the corpse's] stomach, in order that he should not swell, and his apertures may be stopped up, in order that the air should not enter. And [thus] said Solomon too in his wisdom: 'Or ever the silver cord be snapped asunder' — this refers to the spinal cord; 'and the golden bowl be broken' — this alludes to the membrum; 'and the pitcher be broken at the fountain' — that means the stomach; 'and the wheel broken, at the cistern' — this refers to the excrements.<sup>5</sup> And thus it is said, and I will spread dung on your faces, even the dung of your feasts.<sup>6</sup> R. Huna — others state, R. Haga- said: This refers to people who abandon study<sup>7</sup> and spend all their days at feasts. R. Levi said in R. Pappi's name in R. Joshua's name: After three days [from death] the stomach bursts and it [its contents] lies cast out before his face and exclaims, 'Take what you have put in me.'

MISHNAH. ONE MAY NOT CLOSE [THE EYES OF] A CORPSE ON THE SABBATH, NOR ON WEEKDAYS WHEN HE IS ABOUT TO DIE, AND HE WHO CLOSES THE EYES [OF A DYING PERSON] AT THE POINT OF DEATH<sup>8</sup> IS A MURDERER.<sup>9</sup>

GEMARA. Our Rabbis taught: He who closes [the eyes of a dying man] at the point of death is a

murderer. This may be compared to a lamp that is going out: If a man places his finger upon it, it is immediately extinguished. It was taught, R. Simeon b. Gamaliel said: If one desires that a dead man's eyes should close, let him blow wine into his nostrils and apply oil between his two eyelids and hold his two big toes; then they close of their own accord.

It was taught, R. Simeon b. Gamaliel said: For a day-old infant the Sabbath is desecrated; for David, King of Israel, dead, the Sabbath must not be desecrated. 'For a day-old infant the Sabbath is desecrated': the Torah ordered, Desecrate one Sabbath on his account so that he may keep many Sabbaths. 'For David, King of Israel, dead, the Sabbath must not be desecrated': Once man dies he is free from [all] obligations, and thus R. Johanan interpreted: Among the dead I am free:<sup>10</sup> once a man is dead he is free from religious duties. It was further taught, R. Simeon b. Eleazar said: A day-old infant, alive, need not be guarded from weasels or mice, but Og, king of Bashan,<sup>11</sup> dead, needs guarding from weasels and mice, as it is said, and the fear of you and the dread of you shall be upon every beast of the earth:<sup>12</sup> as long as a man is alive, his fear lies upon dumb creatures; once he dies his fear ceases. R. Papa said: We hold [as tradition] that a lion does not attack two persons [together]. But we see that it does? — That is [explained] as Rami b. Abba. For Rami b. Abba said: A beast has no power over man until it appears to it as an animal, for it is said, Man that is in honour, and understandeth not, is like the beasts that perish.<sup>13</sup>

R. Hanina said: One may not sleep in a house alone,<sup>14</sup> and whoever sleeps in a house alone is seized by Lilith.<sup>15</sup>

It was further taught, R. Simeon b. Eleazar said: Perform [righteousness and charity] whilst thou canst find [an object for thy charity], hast the opportunity,<sup>16</sup> and it is yet in thy power,<sup>17</sup> and Solomon in his wisdom too said: 'Remember also thy creator in the days of thy youth, or ever the evil days come' — this refers to the days of old age; 'and the years draw nigh, when thou shalt say, I have no pleasure in them'<sup>18</sup> — this refers to the Messianic era, wherein there is neither merit nor guilt. Now he disagrees with Samuel, who said: The only difference between this world and the Messianic era is in respect of servitude to [foreign] powers, for it is said, For the poor shall never cease out of the land.<sup>19</sup>

It was taught, R. Eleazar ha-Kappar said: Let one always pray to be spared this fate [poverty], for if he does not descend [to poverty] his son will, and if not his son, his grandson, for it is said, because that for [bi-gelal] this thing, [etc.].<sup>20</sup> The School of R. Ishmael taught: It is a wheel [galal] that revolves in the world.<sup>21</sup> R. Joseph said: We hold [as tradition] that a Rabbinical student will not suffer poverty. But we see that he does suffer poverty? Even if he suffers poverty, he [nevertheless] does not engage in begging.<sup>22</sup> R. Hiyya said to his wife: When a poor man comes, be quick to offer him bread, so that others may be quick to offer it to your children. You curse them! she exclaimed. A verse is written, he replied: 'because that for [bi-gelal] this thing', whereon the School of R. Ishmael taught: It is a wheel that revolves in the world. It was taught R. Gamaliel Beribbi<sup>23</sup> said: And he shall give<sup>24</sup> thee mercy, and have compassion upon thee, and multiply thee:<sup>25</sup> he Who is merciful to others, mercy is shown to him by Heaven, while he who is not merciful to others, mercy is not shown to him by Heaven.<sup>26</sup>

'Or ever the sun and the light be darkened',<sup>27</sup> this refers to the forehead and the nose; 'and the moon' — this is the soul; 'and the stars' these are the cheeks; 'and the clouds return after the rain' — this is the light of man's eyes [his eyesight], which is lost after weeping.<sup>28</sup> Samuel said: For tears, until the age of forty there is a recovery, but thenceforth there is no recovery.<sup>29</sup> And R. Nahman said: As for kohl,<sup>30</sup> until the age of forty it improves [the eyesight], but thereafter, even if the paint-stick is as thick [with paint] as a weaver's pin, it may indeed stay [the ravages of time], but will certainly not improve [the eyesight]. What does he inform us? That the thicker the paint-stick the more beneficial it is.

R. Hanina's daughter died, [but] he did not weep for her. Said his wife to him, 'Hast thou sent out a fowl from thy house?'<sup>31</sup> '[Shall I suffer] two [evils],' he retorted, 'bereavement and blindness?' He held as R. Johanan said in the name of R. Jose the son of a laundress: There are six kinds of tears, three being beneficial and three harmful: those caused by smoke, weeping,<sup>32</sup>

- 
- (1) Until the funeral without putrefying.
  - (2) Lit., 'go up' — to meet the top jaw.
  - (3) v. supra 40b. This shows that whatever may not be handled may not be oiled.
  - (4) The reason there is not because handling is forbidden, but lest he make ruts (v. p. 189, n. 3); and though that is impossible, since baths are provided with stone flooring. yet it is forbidden lest it be thought that it may likewise be done to an earth flooring. But no one will think that if a corpse may be oiled ground may be oiled too.
  - (5) Eccl. Xli, 6. He translates galgal (E.V. wheel) as galal (dung).
  - (6) Mal. II, 3.
  - (7) Lit., 'words of the Torah'.
  - (8) Lit., 'with the departure of the soul'.
  - (9) Lit., 'he sheds blood' — because he hastens death.
  - (10) Ps. LXXXVIII, 6 (E.V. 5: cast off among the dead).
  - (11) V. Ber. 54b.
  - (12) Gen. IX, 2.
  - (13) Ps. XLIX, 14 and 21 (E.V. 20). He appears to translate:... not, he is ruled over (by wild beasts) when he appears (to them) like a beast. — This is a punishment for misdeeds.
  - (14) Aliter: He who sleeps in a lonely (situated) house.
  - (15) The night demon. V.J.E. art. Lilith,
  - (16) Lit., 'it is found with thee' — sc. the means.
  - (17) I.e., during thy lifetime.
  - (18) Eccl. XII, 1.
  - (19) Deut. XV, 11; v. supra 63a for notes.
  - (20) Ibid. 10.
  - (21) Coming to all people or their descendants; Gelal is thus connected with galgal.
  - (22) Lit., 'going about the doors' (of houses).
  - (23) V. p. 564, n. 6.
  - (24) E.V. show.
  - (25) Deut. XIII, 17.
  - (26) He translates the verse thus; and he shall give, i.e. Inspire thee with mercy — towards others — then he shall have mercy upon thee.
  - (27) Eccl. XII, 2.
  - (28) The weeping of old age — caused by trouble and sickness — impairs or destroys the eyesight.
  - (29) The eyes recover from the weakening effect of tears until one is forty years old, but not after.
  - (30) An eye-salve.
  - (31) Was she nothing more to you than that?
  - (32) In grief.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 152a

and the privy<sup>1</sup> are harmful; those caused by chemicals, laughter, or plants<sup>2</sup> are beneficial. In the day when the keeper of the house shall tremble; and the strong men shall bow themselves, etc.<sup>3</sup> In the day when the keeper of the house shall tremble' — these are the flanks [sides] and the ribs; 'and the strong men shall bow themselves' — the legs; 'and the grinders cease' — the teeth; 'and those that look out of the windows darkened' — the eyes. The emperor asked R. Joshua b. Hanania,<sup>4</sup> 'Why did you not attend the Be Abedan?'<sup>5</sup> 'The mountain is snowy, it is surrounded by ice,<sup>6</sup> the dog does not bark and the grinders do not grind,' he replied.<sup>7</sup> The School of Rab was wont to say: 'What I did not lose I seek.'<sup>8</sup>

It was taught, R. Jose b. Kisma said: Two are better than three,<sup>9</sup> and woe for the one thing that goes and does not return. What is that? Said R. Hisda: One's youth. When R. Dimi came,<sup>10</sup> he said: Youth is a crown of roses; old age is a crown of willowrods.<sup>11</sup> It was taught in R. Meir's name: Chew well with your teeth, and you will find it in your steps, as it is said, for then we had plenty of victuals, and were well, and saw no evil.<sup>12</sup> Samuel said to Rab Judah: O keen scholar!<sup>13</sup> open your mouth<sup>14</sup> and let your food enter. Until the age of forty food is more beneficial; thenceforth drink is more beneficial.

A certain eunuch [gawzaah] said to R. Joshua b. Karhah [Baldhead]: 'How far is it from here to Karhina [Baldtown]? 'As far as from here to Gawzania [Eunuchtown],' he replied.<sup>15</sup> Said the Sadducee to him, 'A bald buck is worth four denarii.' 'A goat, if castrated, is worth eight,' he retorted. Now, he [the Sadducee] saw that he [R. Joshua] was not wearing shoes, [whereupon] he remarked, 'He [who rides] on a horse is a king, upon an ass, is a free man, and he who has shoes on his feet is a human being; but he who has none of these, one who is dead<sup>16</sup> and buried is better off.' 'O eunuch, O eunuch,' he retorted, 'you have enumerated three things to me, [and now] you will hear three things: the glory of a face is its beard; the rejoicing of one's heart is a wife; the heritage of the Lord is children;<sup>17</sup> blessed be the Omnipresent, Who has denied you all these!' 'O quarrelsome baldhead,' he jeered at him. 'A castrated buck and [you will] reprove!'<sup>18</sup> he retorted.

Rabbi asked R. Simeon b. Halafta: 'Why were we not permitted to receive you on the Festival, as my ancestors used to receive your ancestors?' 'The rocks have grown tall, the near have become distant, two have turned into three, and the peacemaker of the home has ceased,' he replied.<sup>19</sup>

And the doors shall be shut in the streets:<sup>20</sup> this refers to the apertures of man; 'when the sound of the grinding is low' — on account of the stomach's failing to digest;<sup>21</sup> 'and one shall rise up at the voice of a bird', — even a bird will awake him from sleep; 'and all the daughters of the music shall be brought low — even the voices of male singers and female singers sound to him like a whisper. And thus too did Barzillai the Gileadite say to David: 'I am this day fourscore years old: can I discern between good and bad'? This shows that the opinions of old men are changeable [changed]; 'can thy servant taste what I eat or drink'? this shows that the lips of old men grow slack;<sup>22</sup> 'can I hear any more the voice of singing men and singing women'?<sup>23</sup> this proves that the ears of old men are heavy.<sup>24</sup> Rab said: Barzillai the Gileadite was a liar. For there was a servant in Rab's house, ninety-two years old, who could taste the dish[es]. Raba said: Barzillai the Gileadite was steeped in lewdness, and whoever is steeped in lewdness, old age hastens upon him. It was taught, R. Ishmael son of R. Jose said: As for scholars, the older they grow the more wisdom they acquire, for it is said, With aged men is wisdom, and in length of days understanding.<sup>25</sup> But the ignorant, as they wax older, become more foolish, for it is said, He removeth the speech of the trusty, and taketh away the understanding of the elders.<sup>26</sup>

Yea, they shall be afraid of that which is high<sup>27</sup> — even a small knoll looks to him like the highest of mountains; 'and terrors shall be in the way' — when he walks on a road his heart is filled with

fears;<sup>28</sup> and the almond tree shall blossom' — that refers to the coccyx<sup>29</sup> 'and the grasshopper shall be a burden'<sup>30</sup> — the rump; 'and desire shall fail' the passions. R. Kahana was expounding a portion [of scripture]<sup>31</sup> before Rab. When he came to this verse, he [Rab] uttered a long sigh. This shows that Rab's desires have ceased, observed he. R. Kahana said: What is meant by, 'For he decreed, and it was':<sup>32</sup> this refers to a woman;<sup>33</sup> 'he commanded; and it did stand' — this refers to children. A Tanna taught: Though a woman be as a pitcher full of filth and her mouth be full of blood, yet all speed after her.

Because man goeth to his long home.<sup>34</sup> R. Isaac observed: This teaches that every righteous person is given a habitation as befits his honour. This may be compared to a king who enters a town together with his servants. They all enter through the same gate, [yet] when they spend the night [there] each is given a lodging as befits his honour.

R. Isaac also said: What means the verse, For youth and the prime of life are vanity?<sup>35</sup> The things a man does in his youth blacken his face<sup>36</sup> in his old age.<sup>37</sup>

R. Isaac also said: Worms are as painful to the dead as a needle in the flesh of the living, for it is said, But his flesh upon him hath pain.<sup>38</sup> R. Hisda said: A man's soul mourns for him [after death] seven whole [days]. for it is said, And his soul mourneth for him;<sup>39</sup> and it is written, and he made a mourning for his father seven days.<sup>40</sup>

Rab Judah said: If there are none to be comforted for a dead person.<sup>41</sup> ten people go and sit in his place.<sup>42</sup> A certain man died in the neighbourhood of Rab Judah. As there were none to be comforted,

---

(1) I.e., through internal disorders.

(2) E.g., onions or mustard.

(3) Eccl. XII. 2.

(4) V. p. 587. n. 2.

(5) V. supra 116a and notes a.l.

(6) Lit., 'its surroundings are ice'.

(7) My head is snowy white, my beard likewise, my voice feeble and my teeth do not function. — I am too old to attend.

(8) This was their description of old age. One goes about bent and stooping, appearing to seek an article which he has not lost.

(9) The two legs in youth are better than the three — i.e., the additional stick — of old age.

(10) V. p. 12, n. 9.

(11) Heavy to bear.

(12) Jer. XLIV, 17.

(13) Or, man of long teeth.

(14) Lit., 'thy sack'.

(15) Both fictitious places, of course, playfully formed from their names and persons.

(16) Lit., 'one for whom a grave is dug'.

(17) Ps. CXXVII, 3.

(18) Rashi. R. Han.: O castrated goat. I do but rebuke, not quarrel with thee.

(19) I.e., I have grown old, even those near are as difficult to visit as those at a distance, my two legs need an additional stick for walking, and I can no longer exercise a man's functions.

(20) Eccl. XII, 4.

(21) Lit., 'grind'.

(22) I.e., fall apart and cannot enjoy the taste of food.

(23) II Sam. XIX, 35.

(24) They are hard of hearing.

(25) Job XII. 12.

(26) Ibid. 20.

- (27) Eccl. XII, 5.
- (28) Yalkut Koheleth 989 reads: it (the road) becomes for him full of terrors.
- (29) The lowest end of the vertebrae — the extreme weakness of old age causes it to ‘blossom’, i.e., protrude and be moved from its place.
- (30) Or, shall drag itself along.
- (31) פְּסִיֵּק סְדֵרָא, v. supra p. 572, n. 1.
- (32) Ps. XXXIII, 9.
- (33) It is God's decree that man shall desire woman.
- (34) Eccl. XII, 5.
- (35) Ibid. XI. 10.
- (36) Rashi: weaken him, the reference being to sexual indulgence. The passage may also refer to actions in general for which one in old age feels himself blackened with shame.
- (37) He derives shaharuth (E.V. prime of life) from shahor, black, and translates: ‘for youth and the blackening (of old age) are vanity’.
- (38) Job XIV, 22.
- (39) Job XIV, 22.
- (40) Gen. L, 10.
- (41) I.e., there are no mourners. Lit., ‘a dead person for whom there are no comforters’.
- (42) Where he died, and engage in religious exercises such as prayer and study.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 152b

Rab Judah assembled ten men every day and they sat in his place. After seven days he [the dead man] appeared to him in a dream and said to him, ‘Thy mind be at rest, for thou hast set my mind at rest.’ R. Abbahu said: The dead man knows all that is said in his presence until the top-stone [golel] closes [the grave].<sup>1</sup> R. Hiyya and R. Simeon b. Rabbi differ therein: one maintains, until the top-stone closes [the grave]; whilst the other says, until the flesh rots away. He who says, until the flesh rots away. — because it is written, But his flesh upon him hath pain and his soul within him mourneth.<sup>2</sup> He who says, until the top-stone closes [the grave]. — because it is written, and the dust return to the earth as it was, and the spirit return unto God.<sup>3</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: ‘And the dust return to the earth as it was, and the spirit return unto God who gave it’: Render it back to him as He gave it to thee, [viz.,] in purity, so do thou [return it] in purity. This may be compared to a mortal king<sup>4</sup> who distributed royal apparel to his servants. The wise among them folded it up and laid it away in a chest, whereas the fools among them went and did their work in them. After a time the king demanded his garments: the wise among them returned them to him immaculate, [but] the fools among them returned them soiled. The king was pleased with the wise but angry with the fools. Of the wise he said, ‘Let my robes be placed in my treasury and they can go home in peace’; while of the fools he said, ‘Let my robes be given to the fuller, and let them be confined in prison.’ Thus too, with the Holy One, blessed be He: concerning the bodies of the righteous He says, He entereth into peace, they rest in their beds;<sup>5</sup> while concerning their souls He says, yet the soul of my Lord shall be bound up in the bundle of life with the Lord thy God.<sup>6</sup> But concerning the bodies of the wicked He says, There is no peace saith the Lord, unto the wicked;<sup>7</sup> while concerning their souls He says, and the souls of thine enemies, them shall he sling out, as from the hollow of a sling.<sup>8</sup>

It was taught, R. Eliezer said: The souls of the righteous are hidden under the Throne of Glory, as it is said, yet the soul of thine Lord shall be bound up in the bundle of life.<sup>8</sup> But those of the wicked continue to be imprisoned,<sup>9</sup> while one angel stands at one end of the world and a second stands at the other end, and they sling their souls to each other, for it is said, and the souls of thine enemies, them shall he sling out, as from the hollow of a sling. Rabbah asked R. Nahman: What about those who are intermediate? Had I died I could not have told you this, he replied. Thus did Samuel say: Both

these and those [the wicked and the intermediate] are delivered to Dumah;<sup>10</sup> these enjoy rest, whereas the others have no rest. R. Mari said: [Even] the righteous are fated to be dust, for it is written, ‘and the dust return to the earth as it was’. Certain diggers were digging in R. Nahman's ground, [when] R. Ahai b. Josiah<sup>11</sup> snorted at them. So they went and told R. Nahman, ‘A man snorted at us.’ He went and asked him, ‘Who are you?’ ‘I am Ahai b. Josiah.’ ‘But did not R. Mari say. [Even] the righteous are fated to be dust?’ said he. ‘But who is Mari,’ he retorted ‘I do not know him.’ Yet surely a verse is written, ‘and the dust returns to the earth as it was’? he urged. ‘He who taught you Ecclesiastes did not teach you Proverbs,’ he answered, ‘for it is written, But envy is the rottenness of the bones:<sup>12</sup> he who has envy in his heart, his bones rot away. [but] he who has no envy in his heart, his bones do not rot away.’ He then felt him and perceived that there was substance in him. ‘Let my master arise [and come] to my house,’ he invited him. ‘You have thus disclosed that you have not even studied the prophets, for it is written, And ye shall know that I am the Lord, when I open your graves,’<sup>13</sup> said he to him, ‘But it is written, for dust art thou, and unto dust thou shalt return?’<sup>14</sup> ‘That means one hour before the resurrection of the dead’, replied he.

A certain Sadducee said to R. Abbahu:<sup>15</sup> You maintain that the souls of the righteous are hidden under the Throne of Glory: then how did the bone [- practising] necromancer bring up Samuel by means of his necromancy?<sup>16</sup> — There it was within twelve months [of death], he replied. For it was taught: For full [twelve months] the body is in existence and the soul ascends and descends; after twelve months the body ceases to exist

(1) R. Tam. Rashi: until the coffin-lid is closed, v. Nazir, Sonc. ed., p. 302, n. 5’

(2) I.e., he suffers pain and grief — a sign of consciousness — as long as his flesh is upon him.

(3) Eccl. XII, 7. I.e., immediately the dust — sc. the body — returns to the earth, the spirit returns to God, and there is no further consciousness of earthly matters.

(4) Lit., ‘a king of flesh and blood’.

(5) Isa. LVII, 2.

(6) I Sam. XXV, 29.

(7) Isa. XLVIII, 22.

(8) Sam. ibid.

(9) Lit., ‘muzzled’. Marginal translation: are eternally pressed down — sc. in the sling of destruction.

(10) The guardian angel of the deceased. [The name is probably Silence, which is the meaning of Dumah, personified.]

(11) Who was buried there.

(12) Prov. XIV, 30.

(13) Ezek. XXXVII, 13; i.e., God alone can free men from their graves.

(14) Gen. 111,19.

(15) MS.M. min (v. Glos.). This is preferable as there were no Sadducees in the time of R. Abbahu; cf. Sanh., Sonc. ed., p, 706, n. 8.

(16) v. i Sam, XXVIII, 7. Bones were used in necromancy.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 153a

and the soul ascends but descends nevermore.

Rab Judah son of R. Samuel b. Shila said in Rab's name: From the funeral eulogy pronounced over a man it may be known whether the future world is his or not.<sup>1</sup> But that is not so? for Rab said to R. Samuel b. Shilath, ‘Be fervent in my funeral eulogy. for I will be standing there’?<sup>2</sup> — There is no difficulty: in the one case a fervent lament is pronounced and one is deeply moved,<sup>3</sup> in the other a fervent lament is pronounced and one is not moved. Abaye asked Rabbah: ‘You, for instance, whom the whole of the Pumbeditheans hate,<sup>4</sup> who will arouse lamentation for you?’ ‘You and Rabbah b. R. Hanan will suffice,’ he replied.

R. Eleazar asked Rab: Which man has earned [enjoyment of] the future world? Said he to him, And thine ears shall hear a word behind thee, saying, This is the way, walk ye in it,' when, ye turn to the right hand, and when ye turn to the left.<sup>5</sup> R. Hanina said: He with whom his teachers are pleased.<sup>6</sup>

And the mourners go about the streets.<sup>7</sup> The Galileans said: Perform actions [which shall be lamented] in front of thy bier; the Judaeans said: Perform actions [to be lamented] behind thy bier. But they do not differ: each [spoke] in accordance with [the usage in] his locality.<sup>8</sup>

We learnt elsewhere, R. Eliezer said: Repent one day before your death.<sup>9</sup> His disciples asked him, Does then one know on what day he will die? Then all the more reason that he repent to-day, he replied, lest he die to-morrow, and thus his whole life is spent in repentance. And Solomon too said in his wisdom, Let thy garments be always white; and let not thy head lack ointment.<sup>10</sup> R. Johanan b. Zakkai said: This may be compared to a king who summoned his servants to a banquet without appointing a time. The wise ones adorned themselves and sat at the door of the palace. ['for,'] said they. 'is anything lacking in a royal palace?'<sup>11</sup> The fools went about their work, saying, 'can there be a banquet without preparations?'<sup>12</sup> Suddenly the king desired [the presence of] his servants: the wise entered adorned, while the fools entered soiled. The king rejoiced at the wise but was angry with the fools. 'Those who adorned themselves for the banquet,' ordered he, 'let them sit, eat and drink. But those who did not adorn themselves for the banquet, let them stand and watch.' R. Meir's son-in-law said in R. Meir's name: Then they too would [merely] look as being in attendance.<sup>13</sup> But both sit, the former eating and the latter hungering, the former drinking and the latter thirsting, for it is said, Therefore thus saith the Lord God, Behold, my servants shall eat, but ye shall be hungry: behold, my servants shall drink, but ye shall be thirsty: [behold, my servants shall rejoice, but ye shall be ashamed:] behold, my servants shall sing for joy of heart, but ye shall cry for sorrow of heart.<sup>14</sup> Another, interpretation: 'Let thy garments be always white' — this refers to fringes; 'and let not thy head lack ointment' — to tefillin.

## CHAPTER XXIV

MISHNAH. IF DARKNESS FALLS UPON A PERSON ON A ROAD,<sup>15</sup> HE ENTRUSTS HIS PURSE TO A GENTILE;<sup>16</sup> BUT IF THERE IS NO GENTILE WITH HIM, HE PLACES IT ON THE ASS. WHEN HE REACHES THE OUTERMOST COURTYARD<sup>17</sup> HE REMOVES THE OBJECTS WHICH MAY BE HANDLED ON THE SABBATH, WHILST AS FOR THOSE WHICH MAY NOT BE HANDLED ON THE SABBATH, HE UNTIES THE CORDS<sup>18</sup> AND THE SACKS FALL OFF AUTOMATICALLY.

GEMARA. Why did the Rabbis permit him to entrust his purse to a Gentile?<sup>19</sup> — The Rabbis knew for certain<sup>20</sup> that no man will restrain himself where his money is concerned; if you do not permit it to him, he will come to carry it four cubits in public ground.

Raba said: His purse only, but not something found. That is obvious, [for] we learnt HIS PURSE? — You might say, The same law applies even to a find, and why does he mention HIS PURSE — as a natural course:<sup>21</sup> therefore he informs us [that it is not so]. Yet we said this only where it did not come into his possession [before the Sabbath], but if it came into his possession, it is the same as his purse. Others state, Raba asked: What about a find that came into his possession [before nightfall]? since it came into this possession, it is the same as his purse; or perhaps since he had no trouble over it, it is not the same as his purse? The question stands over.

IF THERE IS NO GENTILE WITH HIM, [etc.]. The reason is that there is no Gentile with him, but if there is a Gentile with him he must give it to him:<sup>22</sup> what is the reason? — As for an ass, you are under an obligation that it should rest;<sup>23</sup> but as for a Gentile, you are under no obligation [to

ensure] that he should rest.

[If there is] an ass, and a deaf-mute, imbecile, or minor:<sup>24</sup> he must place it on the ass and not give it to the deaf-mute, imbecile or minor. What is the reason? The latter are human beings whereas the former is not. [In the case of] a deaf-mute and an imbecile: [he must give it] to the imbecile; [in the case of] an imbecile and a minor — to the imbecile. The scholars asked: What of a deaf-mute and a minor? On R. Eliezer's view there is no questions for it was taught: R. Isaac said in R. Eliezer's name: The terumah of a deaf-mute<sup>25</sup>

- 
- (1) If it arouses widespread grief he must have been a good man who earned the enjoyment of the future world.
  - (2) When it is pronounced. But if he felt certain that a funeral lament for a good man is spontaneously fervent and deep, what need of exhortation?
  - (3) Lit., 'warmed'.
  - (4) Rashi: because of his outspokenness, v. Hul. 127a.
  - (5) Isa. XXX, 21. I.e., if one hears a voice proclaiming thus after his death, he has earned the world to come.
  - (6) Var. lec. our teachers.
  - (7) Eccl. XII, 5.
  - (8) In Galilee the professional mourners walked in front of the bier, in Judah behind.
  - (9) A similar thought is expressed in the Book of Ben Sira, V, 8.
  - (10) Eccl. IX, 8.
  - (11) The summons to enter may come at any moment.
  - (12) Lit., 'trouble'.
  - (13) Their punishment would not be so great.
  - (14) Isa. LXV, 13f.
  - (15) The Sabbath commences.
  - (16) V. supra 17b.
  - (17) Of the first town where he arrives.
  - (18) Whereby they are fastened to the saddle.
  - (19) Though that is tantamount to instructing the Gentile to carry it for him, which is forbidden.
  - (20) Lit., 'it was established to the Rabbis'.
  - (21) Finds are rare.
  - (22) In preference.
  - (23) V. Ex. XX, 10
  - (24) These three are frequently linked together as being the same in law.
  - (25) I.e., separated by him.

### **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 153b**

does not revert to hullin, because it is doubtful.<sup>1</sup> The question is on the Rabbis' view. For we learnt: Five must not separate terumah, and if they do their separation is not valid. And these are they: a deaf-mute, imbecile, minor, one who separates terumah on [produce] that is not his,<sup>2</sup> and a Gentile who separates terumah on an Israelite's [produce] even with [the latter's] permission, his separation is not valid. What then? must he give it to the deaf-mute, seeing that the minor will arrive at understanding;<sup>3</sup> or perhaps he must give it to the minor, because a deaf-mute may be confused with an intelligent adult? — Some rule: He must give it to the deaf-mute; others maintain; he must entrust it to the minor.

What if neither a Gentile, an ass, a deaf-mute, an imbecile nor a minor is there? — R. Isaac said: There was yet another [expedient], but the Sages did not wish to reveal it. What was the other [expedient]? — One may carry it in stretches of less than four cubits at a time.<sup>4</sup> Why were the Sages unwilling to reveal it? Because, It is the glory of God to conceal a thing: But the glory of kings is to search out a matter.<sup>5</sup> Yet what glory of God is there here? — Lest one come to carry it four cubits in

public ground.

It was taught, R. Eliezer said: On that day<sup>6</sup> they overfilled the measure;<sup>7</sup> R. Joshua said: On that day they made the measure deficient.<sup>8</sup> It was taught, As an illustration, what does this resemble on R. Eliezer's view? A basket full of cucumbers and gourds: a man puts mustard [grain] therein and it holds it.<sup>9</sup> As an illustration, what does this resemble on R. Joshua's view? A tub full of honey: if one puts pomegranates and nuts therein, it [the tub] overflows.<sup>10</sup>

The Master said: 'If there is no Gentile with him, he places it on his ass'. But he [thereby] leads a [laden] ass, whereas Scripture saith, [In it] thou shalt not do any work, [thou . . . nor thy cattle]?<sup>11</sup> Said R. Adda b. Ahabah: He places it upon her while she is walking.<sup>12</sup> But it is impossible that she shall not stop for the calls of Nature,<sup>13</sup> and so there is removing and depositing? — When she is walking he places it upon her, and when she stops he removes it from her. If so, [the same may be done] even [to] his neighbour too? — R. Papa answered: Where one is liable to a sin-offering in his own case, in the case of his neighbour though he is not culpable nevertheless it is forbidden;<sup>14</sup> and wherever in the case of one's neighbour he is not culpable though it is forbidden, in the case of one's ass it is permitted at the outset.

R. Adda b. Ahabah said: If one's bundle is lying on his shoulder, he must run with it until he arrives home. He may only run, but not walk leisurely. What is the reason? — Since he has nothing to mark a distinction, he will come to perform removing and depositing. Yet after all, when he arrives at the house it is impossible that he shall not stop for a moment, and so he carries it from public to private ground? — He throws it in a 'back-handed manner.'<sup>15</sup>

Rami b. Hama said: If one leads a laden ass on the Sabbath unwittingly, he is liable to a sin-offering; if deliberately, he is liable to stoning.<sup>16</sup> What is the reason? Said Rabbah, because Scripture said, Thou shalt not do any work, — thou, . . . — nor thy cattle: his cattle is assimilated to himself. Just as when he [himself does work], if unwittingly, he is liable to a sin-offering: if deliberately, he is liable to stoning: so [when he works with] his cattle too, if unwittingly, he is liable to a sin-offering; if deliberately, he is liable to stoning. Raba observed, There are two objections to this. Firstly, because it is written, Ye shall have one law for him that doeth aught unwittingly . . . But the soul that doeth aught with a high hand, [etc.]:<sup>17</sup> all laws are assimilated to idolatry: just as in the case of idolatry, he personally performs an action, so here too [one does not incur a sin-offering] unless he personally performs work. Moreover, we learnt: He who desecrates the Sabbath [is stoned], provided that it is an offence punished by stoning<sup>18</sup> if deliberate, and by a sin-offering if unwitting. Hence it follows that there is an offence for which if done unwittingly one does not incur a sin-offering, nor stoning if deliberate: and what is that? Surely leading a laden ass? — No: [the violation of] *tehumim*,<sup>19</sup> in accordance with R. Akiba's view,<sup>20</sup> or kindling, in accordance with R. Jose's view.<sup>21</sup> [

---

(1) Whether his action is valid or not, as his mind may have been clear. On that view a minor stands lower, and the purse must certainly be given to the minor.

(2) Without having been previously authorized.

(3) Thus he is at least potentially an adult of intelligence.

(4) V. supra p. 194, n. 5.

(5) Prov. XXV, 2.

(6) When they entered the upper chambers of Hezekiah b. Garon for the eighteen enactments, v. supra 13b and p. 54, n. 1.

(7) They did well in enacting so many preventive laws, thereby safeguarding Israel from transgression.

(8) Or, they just levelled the measure. I.e., they imposed so many prohibitions as to defeat their own object, for by a reaction Israel would be more likely to sin now than hitherto. — This is mentioned here because the entrusting of one's purse to a Gentile was one of those eighteen laws.

- (9) Though full it is still capable of receiving more.
- (10) Lit., 'it spews forth' — some of the honey itself.
- (11) Ex. XX, 10.
- (12) If one places a burden on a man while he is walking he is not culpable, because there is no 'removal' in a technical sense; v. supra 3a. Hence it does not constitute labour, and therefore the same applies here too.
- (13) And when she recommences there is 'removal', and when she stops again there is 'depositing', which together constitute 'work'.
- (14) For if a man carries an article four cubits in public ground, even if he picks it up while walking, he is culpable. Consequently one must not put a burden upon another person while walking, though there is no culpability.
- (15) V. p. 188, n. 2.
- (16) In theory only. In actual practice the death penalty was restricted by so many conditions as to be non-existent in all but cases of murder (cf. Herzog. Main Institutions of Jewish Law, Vol. I, Introduction, XXI).
- (17) Num. XV, 29f, q.v. The latter refers to idolatry.
- (18) In Sanh. 66a the reading is: kareth.
- (19) Tehum, pl. tehumin, v. Glos.
- (20) Who regards the prohibition as Biblical, v. Sot. 36b.
- (21) V. supra 70a.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 154a

R. Zebid recited it thus: Rami b. Hama said: If one leads a laden ass on the Sabbath: if unwittingly, he does not incur a sin-offering: if deliberately, he is liable to stoning. Raba objected: He who desecrates the Sabbath by an offence for which, if unwitting, a sin-offering is incurred, if deliberate he is liable to stoning. Hence if one does not incur a sin-offering when it is unwitting, there is no stoning when it is deliberate? — Does he [the Tanna] then teach, 'Hence if one does not incur a sin-offering,' etc.? [Surely] he says thus: [Every] offence for which, if unwitting, one is liable to a sin-offering, if deliberate he is liable to stoning. Yet there is an offence for which, if unwitting, a sin-offering is not incurred, nevertheless if deliberate one is liable to stoning. And what is it? Leading a laden ass.

Raba, the brother of R. Mari b. Rachel, others state, the father of R. Mari b. Rachel — (on the second version there is the difficulty that Rab declared R. Mari b. Rachel eligible [to hold office] and appointed him one of the collectors of Babylonia?<sup>1</sup> — perhaps there were two men of the name of Mari b. Rachel)<sup>2</sup> recited this discussion in R. Johanan's name, teaching non-culpability. [Thus:] R. Johanan said: If one drives a laden animal on the Sabbath he is not culpable at all. If it is unwitting he does not incur a sin-offering, because the whole Torah is assimilated to idolatry. If deliberate he is not culpable, because we learnt: He who desecrates the Sabbath [is stoned], provided that it is an offence for which a sin-offering is incurred if it is unwitting and stoning if it is deliberate:<sup>3</sup> hence if the unwitting offence does not involve a sin-offering, the deliberate offence does not involve stoning. Neither is he liable for [the violation of] a negative precept,<sup>4</sup> because it is a negative precept for which a warning of capital punishment at the hands of Beth din may be given, and for such there is no flagellation.<sup>5</sup>

(1) V. Yeb., Sonc. ed., p. 297 and notes. Such positions were only open to men of Jewish parentage, yet Rab declared him eligible because it was sufficient that his mother was a Jewess. That contradicts the present statement that his father too was a Jew.

(2) Bah deletes the bracketed passage, and the same appears from Rashi and Tosaf.

(3) This is the reading in cur. edd., and must be retained if the introductory phrase, 'we learnt', which always precedes a Mishnah, is correct, the Mishnah being that on Sanh. 66a (quoted supra 153b bottom). Bah however emends the text thus: if it is an offence for which a sin-offering is incurred if unwitting, stoning is incurred when deliberate. This suits the context better, this being the Baraita quoted by Raba supra. But in that case the introductory phrase must be emended to 'it was taught'.

(4) The penalty for which is flagellation.

(5) I.e., the offender could be formally warned against driving a laden ass on the grounds that it is punishable by death; in such a case there is no flagellation even if the death penalty is not imposed.

## **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 154b**

And even on the view that we do flagellate [in such a case],<sup>1</sup> let the Divine Law write, 'Thou shalt not do any work nor thy cattle': why state 'thou'? [To teach:] only [when] he personally [works] is he liable, but [if] his animal works, he is not liable.

WHEN HE REACHES THE OUTERMOST COURTYARD, etc. R. Huna said: If his animal is laden with glassware, he brings mattresses and pillows, places [them] under it, unties the cords, and the sacks fall off. But we learnt: HE REMOVES THE OBJECTS WHICH MAY BE HANDLED ON THE SABBATH?<sup>2</sup> — R. Huna spoke of surgeon's horns,<sup>3</sup> which are not fit for him.<sup>4</sup> But he makes a utensil lose its readiness [for use]?<sup>5</sup> — The reference is to small bags.<sup>6</sup>

An objection is raised: If one's animal is laden with tebel or glass balls,<sup>7</sup> he must untie the cords and the sacks fall off, though they are broken? — There it treats of glass lumps.<sup>8</sup> This may be proved too, for it is taught analogous to tebel: just as tebel is of no use to him, so here too [it means something] that is of no use to him. Then why state, 'though they are broken'?<sup>9</sup> — You might say that they [the Sages] were concerned even about a trifling loss: hence he informs us [otherwise].

It was taught R. Simeon b. Yohai said: If the animal is laden with a bag of corn,<sup>10</sup> one places his head under it and moves it to the other side, so that it falls off automatically. R. Gamaliel's ass was laden with honey, but he would not unload it until the termination of the Sabbath. On the termination of the Sabbath it died. But we learnt: HE REMOVES THE OBJECTS WHICH MAY BE HANDLED?<sup>11</sup> — It had gone rancid. If it had gone rancid, of what use was it?<sup>12</sup> — For camels' sores.<sup>13</sup> Then he should have untied the cords so that the sacks would fall off? — The gourds [containers] would burst — Then he should have brought mattresses and pillows and placed them beneath them? — They would become soiled<sup>14</sup> and he would deprive a utensil of its readiness [for use]. But there was suffering of dumb animals? — He holds that the suffering of dumb animals is [only] Rabbinically [forbidden].<sup>15</sup>

Abaye found Rabbah letting his son glide down the back of an ass.<sup>16</sup> Said he to him, You are making use of dumb creatures [on the Sabbath]? — It is but on the sides [of the animal], he replied, and in that case the Rabbis did not impose an interdict.<sup>17</sup> How do you know it? — Because we learnt: HE UNTIES THE CORDS AND THE SACKS FALL OFF AUTOMATICALLY. Does that not refer to a pair of coupled haversacks?<sup>18</sup> No: a balanced load is meant;<sup>19</sup> alternatively, it means where [the sacks are fastened] by a bolt.<sup>20</sup>

He raised an objection: If two [walls] are [made] by man and a third is on a tree, it is valid, but one must not ascend [enter] therein on the Festival.<sup>21</sup> Does that not mean that one made grooves on the tree,<sup>22</sup> so that it is the sides [only that would be used], and thus the sides are forbidden? — No: It means that he bent over [the branches of] the tree and placed the roofing — upon it, so that he makes use of the tree. If so, consider the second clause: If three are made by man and a fourth is in a tree, it is valid, and one may ascend therein on the Festival. But if he bent over the tree, why may he ascend therein on the Festival?<sup>23</sup> — Then what would you: that the sides are forbidden,<sup>24</sup> — then still the question remains: why may one ascend therein on the Festival? But there it treats of spreading branches, and the tree itself was merely made a wall.<sup>25</sup> This may be proved too, for he states, This is the general rule: wherever it [the sukkah] can stand if the tree were removed, one may ascend therein on the Festival.<sup>26</sup> This proves it.

Shall we say that this is dependent on Tannaim? [For it was taught.] One may not ascend therein on the Festival; R. Simeon b. Eleazar said in R. Meir's name: One may ascend therein on the Festival. Is that not [to be explained] that they differ in this, viz., one Master holds: The sides are forbidden; while the other Master holds: The sides are permitted?<sup>27</sup> — Said Abaye, No: All hold that the sides are forbidden, but here they differ in respect of the sides of the sides:<sup>28</sup> one Master holds: The sides of the sides are forbidden; while the other Master holds: The sides of the sides are permitted.

Raba maintained: He who forbids the sides forbids the sides of the sides too, while he who permits the sides of the sides permits the sides too. R. Mesharsheya raised an objection to Raba: If one drives

---

(1) V. Mak. 13b.

(2) Glassware may be handled.

(3) Used in bleeding.

(4) For handling on the Sabbath.

(5) V. supra 43a. These pillows, etc. may be handled, but not when the sacks fall upon them.

(6) The pillows can be pulled away from under them — which is permitted — without hurt, as they have not far to fall.

(7) The word denotes lumps of glass, lanterns, etc.

(8) Which may be broken without loss.

(9) Seeing that no loss is incurred.

(10) Of tebel.

(11) Which includes honey.

(12) Why did he trouble to bring it at all?

(13) Caused by the chafing of the saddle.

(14) If any of the honey were spilt.

(15) This may seem non-humane, but it must be borne in mind that this was held long before other peoples gave the slightest consideration to animals. Cf. p. 640, n. 2 and p. 577, n. 6.

(16) To amuse him.

(17) It is not the normal way of employing an animal.

(18) Coupled or tied together by a cord, a sack hanging down from each side of the animal. To make them fall one would have to lift them off and lean and rub against the animal in doing so which is making use of its sides. Hence this shows that it is permitted.

(19) Each sack being separately attached to a ring by a hook; a slight jerk would suffice. to unhook it, and he would not make use of the animal. V. Jast s.v. **חבר**.

(20) A wooden cross-bar which can easily be pulled out, letting the sacks drop.

(21) V. Suk. 22a. A sukkah (q.v. Glos.) requires three walls only. Now if two are erected in the normal fashion, whilst the third is made of a tree (this may mean either that the tree constitutes the third wall or that the third wall is fastened to the tree), the sukkah is valid. Nevertheless, one may not enter it on the Festival itself but only during the intermediate days. For the roof is attached to the tree and various utensils, etc., were hung on the roof; thus indirectly one would be using the tree itself, which is forbidden on Festivals. 'Ascending' is mentioned because the sukkah was often built above the ground, e.g., on a roof (Rashi).

(22) 'Wherein he fitted the third wall. — This assumes the second of the two meanings in n. 1.

(23) He still makes use of the tree, in spite of the other three walls.

(24) You wish to adhere to your original hypothesis, whence this follows.

(25) I.e., the thick branches were allowed to form a fourth wall, the sukkah coming right up to them, but the roofing rested on the three other walls, not on the branches. The previous answer could have been retained, viz., that he bent over the branches of the tree, but rested the roofing on the other three walls. Since however a fourth wall is not required at all, it is assumed that one would not go to this trouble unless he meant the roofing to rest upon it (Rashi).

(26) That is the reason of the second clause quoted above. Hence it must be assumed that the sukkah is so made that the roofing does not rest on the tree at all, as otherwise it could not stand if the tree were removed.

(27) Assuming that grooves were made in the tree etc., as above.

(28) The laths or canes fitted in the grooves are the sides, whilst the roofing which rests on the laths are the sides of the

sides. I.e., they differ as to whether one may make indirect use of the sides.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 155a

a peg in a tree and hangs a basket thereon<sup>1</sup> above ten handbreadths [from the ground], his 'erub is not an 'erub;<sup>2</sup> below ten handbreadths, his 'erub is an 'erub. Thus it is only because he fixed a peg in the tree, but if he did not, even if it is below ten handbreadths his 'erub is not an 'erub.<sup>3</sup> Thus this Tanna forbids the sides yet permits the indirect use of the sides? — Said R. Papa: Here we treat of a narrow-mouthed basket, so that in taking out the 'erub he sways the tree, and thus makes use of the tree itself. Now the law is that the sides are forbidden, but the sides of the sides are permitted. R. Ashi said: Now that you have ruled that the sides are forbidden, one must not rest the lodge-ladder<sup>4</sup> on the palm tree, because that is tantamount to the [use of the] sides [of the trees;]<sup>5</sup> but he must rest it on pegs without the tree,<sup>6</sup> and when he ascends he should place his foot not on the pegs but on the rungs.<sup>7</sup> MISHNAH. BUNDLES [PEKI'IN] OF SHEAVES MAY BE UNTIED FOR CATTLE AND BUNCHES [KIPPIN] MAY BE SPREAD OUT, BUT NOT SMALL BUNDLES [ZIRIN].<sup>8</sup> NEITHER FODDER<sup>9</sup> NOR CAROBS MAY BE CHOPPED UP FOR CATTLE, WHETHER SMALL OR LARGE;<sup>10</sup> R. JUDAH PERMITS IN THE CASE OF CAROBS FOR SMALL CATTLE.

GEMARA. R. Huna said: PEKI'IN and KIPPIN are identical, [save that] peki'in are two [bunches tied together], while kippin are three; zirin are young shoots of cedar trees.<sup>11</sup> And this is what he [the Tanna] teaches: BUNDLES [PEKI'IN] OF SHEAVES MAY BE UNTIED FOR CATTLE, AND THEY MAY BE SPREAD, and the same applies to KIPPIN, BUT NOT TO ZIRIN, which may neither be spread out nor untied — R. Hisda said, What is R. Huna's reason? He holds that we may indeed take trouble over [natural] foodstuffs,<sup>12</sup> but we may not turn something into foodstuffs.<sup>13</sup> Rab Judah said: Peki'in and zirin are identical, [save that] peki'in are two [bunches tied together], whilst Zirin are three; kippin are young cedar shoots. And this is what he teaches: BUNDLES [PEKI'IN] OF SHEAVES MAYBE UNTIED FOR CATTLE, but not spread out, but as for KIPPIN, [THEY] MAY [INDEED] BE SPREAD OUT; BUT NOT ZIRIN, [which it is not permitted] to spread out but [merely] to untie. Raba said, What is Rab Judah's reason? He holds that we may indeed turn something into fodder, but may not take trouble over fodder.<sup>14</sup>

We learnt: NEITHER FODDER NOR CAROBS MAY BE CHOPPED UP FOR CATTLE, WHETHER SMALL OR LARGE: [Surely it means] carobs like fodder: just as fodder is soft, so are soft carobs meant, thus proving that we may not take trouble over [what is] foodstuff [in any case], which refutes R. Huna? — R. Huna can answer you: No: fodder like carobs: just as carobs are hard, so hard fodder<sup>15</sup> is meant.<sup>16</sup> Where is that possible?<sup>17</sup> In the case of very young foals.

Come and hear: R. JUDAH PERMITS IN THE CASE OF CAROBS FOR SMALL CATTLE. Thus, only for small but not for large: now it is well if you agree that the first Tanna holds that we may not take trouble over foodstuffs, yet we may turn [something] into foodstuffs: hence R. Judah argues [that cutting up] carobs for small cattle is also [an act of] turning [it] into fodder. But if you maintain that the first Tanna holds that we may not turn [aught] into fodder, yet we may take trouble over fodder, then R. JUDAH PERMITS IN THE CASE OF CAROBS FOR SMALL CATTLE [only]? all the more so for large cattle!<sup>18</sup> — Do you think that dakkah [small] is literally meant? [No] By dakkah large cattle is meant, yet why is it called dakkah? Because it grinds [dayyka] its food.<sup>19</sup> But since the first clause states, WHETHER SMALL OR LARGE, it follows that R. Judah means literally small? This is indeed a difficulty.

Come and hear: One may cut up

---

(1) And places his 'erub-an 'erub of boundaries (v. Glos.) — in it, intending to spend the Sabbath under the tree. — An

'erub is not valid unless it is accessible on the Sabbath.

(2) Because a basket is generally four handbreadths square, and if it is ten from the ground it is technically a private domain (cf. supra 6a), whereas the ground below is a public domain, and so one must not take the 'erub from the basket; hence it is not accessible.

(3) I.e., if he merely tied the basket to the tree. The 'erub is invalid because in order to get at it he must make use of the side of the tree; where it is hanging on a peg, however, he only makes indirect use of the sides.

(4) A ladder for ascending to a lodge set high up on poles near a tree.

(5) When he ascends on the Sabbath.

(6) I.e., pegs driven into the tree (Rashi). Jast.: on the branches spreading beyond the circumference of the tree.

(7) Or, on the canes protruding from the poles on which the lodge is built.

(8) The Gemara discusses the exact meaning of the terms used.

(9) Shahath is corn not fully grown as fodder.

(10) 'Small cattle' — sheep, goats, calves, etc.; large — cows and oxen.

(11) Cut from the tree. While yet moist they are fit for fodder, though most people leave them to dry for fuel.

(12) Such as bundles of sheaves.

(13) Such as young shoots which are normally intended for fuel.

(14) When the bundles are tied they are not fit for fodder, therefore they may be untied; but it is superfluous indulgence to spread them out, and that is forbidden. Bunches of young shoots, however, are unfit for fodder unless they are spread out; hence it is permitted.

(15) E.g., if the corn has gone dry.

(16) Without being cut up they are altogether unfit; hence they may not be cut up.

(17) That unless cut up they are unfit. — Generally animals can eat them even when hard.

(18) Since carobs are fit in any case, but are more easily eaten when cut up. 'All the more so' because if they are fit in their present state for small cattle, they are certainly fit for large.

(19) Chewing it until it is finely cut up.

## **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 155b**

gourds for cattle and a carcass for dogs — Surely fit means] gourds like a carcass: just as a carcass is soft, so are soft gourds meant, which proves that we may take trouble over foodstuffs,<sup>1</sup> which refutes Rab Judah? Rab Judah can answer you: No. A carcass like gourds: just as gourds are hard, so a hard carcass [is meant].<sup>2</sup> And where is it possible?<sup>3</sup> In the case of split meat<sup>4</sup> or in the case of very young dogs.<sup>5</sup> Come and hear: For R. Hanan of Nehardea recited: 'One may break up straw and corn fodder<sup>6</sup> and mix them together' . This proves that we may take trouble over fodder? — Straw means putrefying straw;<sup>7</sup> as for corn fodder [the reference is] to young foals.

**MISHNAH. ONE MUST NOT STUFF A CAMEL. [WITH FOOD] NOR CRAM [IT]. BUT ONE MAY PUT FOOD INTO ITS MOUTH; AND ONE MUST NOT FATTEN CALVES,<sup>8</sup> BUT ONE MAY PUT FOOD INTO THEIR MOUTH. AND FOWLS MAY BE MADE TO TAKE UP FOOD. WATER MAY BE Poured INTO BRAN, BUT WE MAY NOT MIX IT [INTO A MASS]. AND WATER MAY NOT BE PLACED FOR BEES OR FOR DOVES IN A DOVE-COTE, BUT IT MAY BE PLACED BEFORE GEESE, FOWLS AND HARDISIAN DOVES.<sup>9</sup>**

**GEMARA.** What does ONE MUST NOT STUFF [OBSIN] mean? — Said Rab Judah: One must not make a manger [ebus] in its stomach.<sup>10</sup> Is such possible? — Even so, and as R. Jeremiah of Difti<sup>11</sup> related: I myself saw a certain Arab feed it with a kor and load it with a kor.<sup>12</sup>

**ONE MUST NOT FATTEN, [MA'AMIRIN].** What is hamra'ah and what is hal'atah?<sup>13</sup> — Said Rab Judah: Hamra'ah [is forcing the food] so far that it cannot return; hal'atah is [only] so far that it can return. R. Hisda said: Both mean so far that it cannot return, but hamra'ah is [done] with a utensil, [while] hal'atah is by hand.<sup>14</sup> R. Joseph objected: One may force fowls to take food [mehalkitin], and it is superfluous to state that we may fatten [malkitin] them; but one may not fatten

[malkitin] the doves of the dove-cote or of the loft, and it is superfluous to state that we may not force them [mehalkitin]. What is mehalkitin and what is malkitin? Shall we say that mehalkitin is hand feeding, while malkitin is throwing [grain, etc.] in front of them? Whence it follows that one may not even cast [grain] before the doves of the dove-cote or of the loft!<sup>15</sup> Hence mehalkitin is surely [forcing food] so far down that it cannot return, while malkitin is [only] so far that it can return. From this it follows that hamra'ah means [stuffing] with a utensil, which refutes Rab Judah?<sup>16</sup> — Rab Judah can answer you: In truth mehalkitin means feeding by hand, while malkitin means casting [the food] before them, but as to your difficulty, Is it then not even permitted to cast [food] before the doves of the dove-cote and of the loft, [that indeed is so, for] you are responsible for the food of the former [sc. fowls], but not for that of the latter.<sup>17</sup> Even as it was taught: Food may be placed before a dog but not before a swine. And what is the difference between them? You are responsible for the food of the one, but you are not responsible for the food of the other. R. Ashi said, Our Mishnah too implies this: WATER MAY NOT BE PLACED FOR BEES OR FOR DOVES IN A DOVECOTE, BUT IT MAY BE PLACED BEFORE GEESE, FOWLS, AND HARDISIAN DOVES. What is the reason? Is it not because you are responsible for the food of the former, but you are not responsible for the food of the latter? — But according to your reasoning, why particularly water: even wheat and barley too may not [be placed before them]? Rather [say] water is different, because it is found in pools.

R. Jonah lectured at the entrance to the Nasi's academy.<sup>18</sup> What is meant by the verse, The righteous knoweth the cause of the poor?<sup>19</sup> The Holy One, blessed be He, knoweth that a dog's food is scanty,<sup>20</sup> therefore He makes him retain his food in his stomach for three days. As we learnt: How long shall the food remain in its stomach and yet defile? In the case of a dog, three full days of twenty-four hours; while in the case of birds or fish, as long as it would take for it [the food] to fall into the fire and be burnt.<sup>21</sup> R. Hamnuna said: This proves<sup>22</sup> that it is the proper thing<sup>23</sup> to throw raw meat to a dog. And how much? Said R. Mari: Measure its ear and the stick [straight] after!<sup>24</sup> But that is only in the fields but not in town, because it will come to follow him. R. Papa said: None are poorer than a dog and none richer than a swine.<sup>25</sup>

It was taught in accordance with Rab Judah: What is hamra'ah and what is hal'atah? Hamra'ah: one makes it [the animal] lie down, opens the mouth wide, and forces it to swallow vetches and water simultaneously; hal'atah: he feeds it standing and waters it standing, and puts vetches separately and water separately [into its mouth].<sup>26</sup>

FOWLS MAY BE MADE TO TAKE UP FOOD. Abaye said, I asked this before the Master [Rabbah]: With whom does our Mishnah agree?<sup>27</sup> And he answered me, With R. Jose b. Judah. For it was taught: If one pours in flour and another water, the second is liable: this is Rabbi's view. R. Jose b. Judah said: He is not liable unless he kneads [them].<sup>28</sup> Yet perhaps R. Jose b. Judah ruled thus only there, in respect of flour, which is used for kneading; but as for bran, which is not used for kneading, even R. Jose b. Judah may admit [that he is liable]? — You cannot think so, because it was explicitly taught: Water must not be poured into bran: this is Rabbi's view. R. Jose b. Judah ruled: Water may be poured into bran.

Our Rabbis taught: Parched corn may not be mixed,<sup>29</sup> but others maintain, It may be mixed. Who are the 'others'? — Said R. Hisda:

- 
- (1) For the gourds can be eaten even if not cut up.
  - (2) They are uneatable unless cut up.
  - (3) Cf. n. 3.
  - (4) Meat that has gone so hard and dry that there are splits in it.
  - (5) They cannot eat any flesh unless it is cut up.
  - (6) I.e., shahath, v. p. 792, n. 2.

- (7) Though not quite putrid, for that would be unfit and mukzeh.
- (8) By stuffing them with food against their will.
- (9) A species of domesticated doves, probably so named from the manner of their fructification (Jast. s.v. **הרדסיות**). Aliter: Herodian doves, a species of domesticated doves supposed to have been bred by Herod, v. Hul. 139b. — The Gemara discusses the various terms used in the Mishnah.
- (10) By excessively stuffing it.
- (11) V. p. 35, n. 5.
- (12) Of fodder for the journey—this is a very great quantity indeed.
- (13) Mal'itin is the term used in the Mishnah for putting food into their mouth.
- (14) Hence not so forcible.
- (15) Surely that is incorrect!
- (16) For the Mishnah employs mehalkitin in respect of fowls and mal'itin i.e., hal'atah in respect of calves as parallel terms, and both are permissible. Hence hamra'ah, which is forbidden, must refer to feeding with a utensil.
- (17) Because doves can fly about in the fields and find their own food.
- (18) Or, house. It would appear that popular lectures were given there in the open.
- (19) Prov. XXIX, 7.
- (20) Few people trouble about dogs. — Many of the dogs in the East are semi-savage, and this 'would account for their neglect; v. J.E. art. Dog.
- (21) If an animal consumes flesh of a corpse and then dies in a house before it is completely digested, the contents of the house are unclean. The Mishnah quoted states how long we are to regard the flesh as undigested.
- (22) Sc. the care that the Almighty takes over a dog's food.
- (23) Lit., 'the way of the world'.
- (24) Give it a little, only as large as its ear, then immediately drive it off.
- (25) Rashi: because the swine eats anything, and it is also given much food.
- (26) Obviously in the former case the food can be forced down so far that it will not return, but not in the latter case.
- (27) That the mere pouring in of water does not constitute kneading.
- (28) V. supra 18a.
- (29) With water and oil to make of it a beverage.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 156a

It is R. Jose son of R. Judah. But that is only if one does it in an unusual manner. How does one do it in an unusual manner? Said R. Hisda: Little by little.<sup>1</sup> Yet they agree that shatith<sup>2</sup> may be stirred round on the Sabbath, and Egyptian beer may be drunk.<sup>3</sup> But you said that we must not mix?<sup>4</sup> — There is no difficulty: the one treats of a thick mass;<sup>5</sup> the other of a loose [one].<sup>6</sup> And that is only if he does it in an unusual manner. How does one do it in an unusual manner? — Said R. Joseph: During the week the vinegar is [first] poured in and then the shatith, whereas on the Sabbath the shatith is [first] poured in and then the vinegar.

Levi son of R. Huna b. Hiyya found [on Sabbath] the mixer of his father's household<sup>7</sup> mashing [up bran] and feeding the oxen. Thereupon he rebuked him — Then his father came and found him [there]. Said he to him. Thus did your maternal grandfather, viz., R. Jeremiah b. Abba, say in Rab's name: One may mash [bran] but not force it [on the animal]; and if it [the animal] cannot take it [the fodder] up with its tongue one may feed it;<sup>8</sup> provided, however, that it is done in an unusual manner. How does one do it in an unusual manner? — Said R. Yemar b. Shalmia in Rab's name: [By stirring it] crosswise.<sup>9</sup> But he cannot mix it well [then]? — Said Rab Judah: He shakes up the vessel [itself]. It was recorded in Ze'iri's notebook: I asked my teacher, viz., R. Hiyya. What about kneading?<sup>10</sup> It is forbidden, replied he. What about emptying?<sup>11</sup> It is permitted, he answered. R. Menassia said: It is well [to place] one [measure of food] for one animal, and two for two; but [to place] three [measures] for two [animals] is forbidden.<sup>12</sup> R. Jose said: A kab and even two kabs [may be set]. 'Ulla said: A kor and even two kor.<sup>13</sup>

It was recorded in Levi's notebook: I spoke to my teacher, viz., our holy Master,<sup>14</sup> about those who mix shatitha in Babylonia, and my teacher, viz., our holy Master, protested [vociferously] against the practice of mixing shatitha, but none heeded him, and he lacked the power to forbid it, on account of R. Jose b. Judah.<sup>15</sup>

It was recorded in R. Joshua b. Levi's notebook: He who [is born] on the first day of the week [Sunday] shall be a man without one [thing] in him — What does 'without one [thing] in him' mean? Shall we say, without one virtue?<sup>16</sup> Surely R. Ashi said: I was born on the first day of the week! Hence it must surely mean, one vice. But Surely R. Ashi said: I and Dimi b. Kakuzta were born on the first day of the week: I am a king<sup>17</sup> and he is the captain of thieves!<sup>18</sup> — Rather it means either completely virtuous or completely wicked.<sup>19</sup> [What is the reason? Because light and darkness were created on that day.]<sup>20</sup> He who is born on the second day of the week will be bad-tempered — What is the reason? Because the waters were divided thereon.<sup>21</sup> He who is born on the third day of the week will be wealthy and unchaste. What is the reason? Because herbs were created thereon.<sup>22</sup> He who is born on the fourth day of the week will be wise and of a retentive memory.<sup>23</sup> What is the reason? Because the luminaries were suspended [thereon] — He who is born on the fifth day of the week will practise benevolence. What is the reason? Because the fishes and birds were created thereon.<sup>24</sup> He who is born on the eve of the Sabbath will be a seeker. R. Nahman b. Isaac commented: A seeker after good deeds.<sup>25</sup> He who is born on the Sabbath will die on the Sabbath, because the great day of the Sabbath was desecrated on his account. Raba son of R. Shila observed: And he shall be called a great and holy man.<sup>26</sup>

R. Hanina said to then, [his disciples]: Go out and tell the son of Levi, Not the constellation of the day but that of the hour is the determining influence. He who is born under the constellation of the sun<sup>27</sup> will be a distinguished<sup>28</sup> man: he will eat and drink of his own and his secrets will lie uncovered; if a thief, he will have no success. He who is born under Venus will be wealthy and unchaste [immoral]. What is the reason? Because fire was created therein.<sup>29</sup> He who is born under Mercury will be of a retentive memory and wise. What is the reason? Because it [Mercury] is the sun's scribe. He who is born under the Moon will be a man to suffer evil, building and demolishing, demolishing and building. eating and drinking that which is not his and his secrets will remain hidden: if a thief, he will be successful.<sup>30</sup> He who is born under Saturn will be a man whose plans will be frustrated.<sup>31</sup> Others say: All [nefarious] designs against him will be frustrated. He who is born under Zedek [Jupiter] will be a right-doing man [zadkan] R. Nahman b. Isaac observed: Right-doing in good deeds. 'He who is born under Mars will be a shedder of blood. R. Ashi observed: Either a surgeon, a thief, a slaughterer, or a circumciser. Rabbah said: I was born under Mars.<sup>32</sup> Abaye retorted: You too inflict punishment and kill.<sup>33</sup>

It was stated. R. Hanina said: The planetary influence gives wisdom, the planetary influence gives wealth, and Israel stands under planetary influence. R. Johanan maintained: Israel is immune from planetary influence.<sup>34</sup> Now, R. Johanan is consistent with his view, for R. Johanan said: How do we know that Israel is immune from planetary influence? Because it is said, Thus saith the Lord, Learn not the way of the nations, and be not dismayed at the signs of heaven, for the nations are dismayed at them:<sup>35</sup> they are dismayed but not Israel.<sup>36</sup> Rab too holds that Israel is immune from planetary influence. For Rab Judah said in Rab's name: How do we know that Israel is immune from planetary influence? Because it is said, and he brought him forth from abroad.<sup>37</sup> Abraham pleaded before the Holy One, blessed be He, 'Sovereign of the Universe! one born in mine house is mine heir.'<sup>38</sup> 'Not so,' He replied, 'but he that shall come forth out of thine own bowels.'<sup>39</sup> 'Sovereign of the Universe!' cried he, 'I have looked at my constellation and find that I am not fated to beget child.' 'Go forth from [i.e., cease] thy planet [gazing], for Israel is free from planetary influence. What is thy calculation?

---

(1) Lit., 'by hand, by hand'.

- (2) A drink prepared of flour and honey.
- (3) Though sometimes taken for medicinal purposes it is also imbibed as an ordinary beverage, and hence permitted; cf. supra 109b.
- (4) Stirring shatith is the same.
- (5) Such as a dough that is forbidden.
- (6) Such as shatith.
- (7) It was his duty to mix the fodder for his father's cattle.
- (8) E.g., food may be put into the mouth of a young calf.
- (9) Instead of round and round.
- (10) Or, mashing — bran.
- (11) A mash from one vessel into another, in order to mix it (Tosaf.). Rashi: from the vessel standing in front of one animal and pouring it out for another animal.
- (12) One may set its usual quantity of food before an animal on the Sabbath, — i.e., as much as it generally consumes; similarly, a double quantity for two, if they both feed out of the same manger. But one may not set a treble quantity for two animals, since they do not eat so much during the week.
- (13) There is no limit.
- (14) R. Judah the prince.
- (15) Who permits it supra.
- (16) Lit., 'one (thing) in (his) favour'.
- (17) I.e., the head of the academy.
- (18) An anticipation of gangsterdom?
- (19) I.e., he shall be a man complete in his mode of life, without any opposing principle within him.
- (20) Hence his nature shall be the one or the other. — Rashal, for some reason which is not clear, deletes the bracketed passage.
- (21) Division or disunity is caused by bad temper. — Rashi: so will he be estranged from other people (through his temper).
- (22) Herbs multiply very rapidly and also continually intermingle with other herbs.
- (23) 'Aruk. Rashi: bright, lustrous.
- (24) Which are fed by God's lovingkindness.
- (25) Just as on the eve of the Sabbath one seeks to complete the details necessary for the proper observance of the Sabbath.
- (26) Maharsha: Not all born on the Sabbath die on the Sabbath, but only those who are very holy.
- (27) I.e., when the sun, as one of the planets, wields its influence on man.
- (28) Or: bright, handsome.
- (29) During the hours ruled over by Mercury.
- (30) Just like the moon, which waxes and wanes, has no light of its own but merely reflects the sun's light, and is in general dark.
- (31) **בטל** (to frustrate) is the Chaldaic equivalent of **שבת**. (10) Rash: charitable.
- (32) And am none of these.
- (33) Not to be taken literally. of course. V. supra 153a.
- (34) Lit., there is no mazzal (planetary influence) to Israel.
- (35) Jer. X, 2.
- (36) Israel being uninfluenced by 'the signs of heaven'.
- (37) Gen. XV, 5, q.v.
- (38) Ibid. 3.
- (39) Ibid. 4.

## Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 156b

Because Zedek [Jupiter]<sup>1</sup> stands in the West?<sup>2</sup> I will turn it back and place it in the East.' And thus it is written, Who hath raised up Zedek from the east?<sup>3</sup> He hath summoned it for his sake.<sup>4</sup>

From Samuel too [we learn that] Israel is immune from planetary influence. For Samuel and Ablat were sitting, while certain people were going to a lake.<sup>5</sup> Said Ablat<sup>6</sup> to Samuel: ‘That man is going but will not return, [for] a snake will bite him and he will die.’ ‘If he is an Israelite,’ replied Samuel. ‘he will go and return.’<sup>7</sup> While they were sitting he went and returned. [Thereupon] Ablat arose and threw off his [the man's] knapsack, [and] found a snake therein cut up and lying in two pieces — Said Samuel to him, ‘What did you do?’<sup>8</sup> ‘Every day we pooled our bread and ate it; but to-day one of us had no bread, and he was ashamed. Said I to them, "I will go and collect [the bread]"’.<sup>9</sup> When I came to him, I pretended to take [bread] from him, so that he should not be ashamed.’ ‘You have done a good deed,’ said he to him. Then Samuel went out and lectured: But charity<sup>10</sup> delivereth from death;<sup>11</sup> and [this does not mean] from an unnatural death, but from death itself.

From R. Akiba too [we learn that] Israel is free from planetary influence. For R. Akiba had a daughter. Now, astrologers<sup>12</sup> told him, On the day she enters the bridal chamber a snake will bite her and she will die. He was very worried about this. On that day [of her marriage] she took a brooch [and] stuck it into the wall and by chance it penetrated [sank] into the eye of a serpent. The following morning, when she took it out, the snake came trailing after it. ‘What did you do?’ her father asked her. ‘A poor man came to our door in the evening.’ she replied, ‘and everybody was busy at the banquet, and there was none to attend to him. So I took the portion which was given to me and gave it to him. ‘You have done a good deed,’ said he to her. Thereupon R. Akiba went out and lectured: ‘But charity delivereth from death’: and not [merely] from an unnatural death, but from death itself.

From R. Nahman b. Isaac too [we learn that] Israel is free from planetary influence. For R. Nahman b. Isaac's mother was told by astrologers, Your son will be a thief. [So] she did not let him [be] bareheaded, saying to him, ‘Cover your head so that the fear of heaven may be upon you, and pray [for mercy]’. Now, he did not know why she spoke that to him. One day he was sitting and studying under a palm tree; temptation<sup>13</sup> overcame him, he climbed up and bit off a cluster [of dates] with his teeth.<sup>14</sup> MISHNAH. GOURDS MAY BE CUT UP FOR CATTLE,<sup>15</sup> AND A CARCASE FOR DOGS. R. JUDAH SAID: IF IT WAS NOT NEBELAH BY THE EVE OF THE SABBATH IT IS FORBIDDEN, BECAUSE IT IS NOT MUKAN.<sup>16</sup>

GEMARA. It was stated: (Mnemonic: ‘arel SHahaz).<sup>17</sup> ‘Ulla said; the halachah is as R. Judah. And Rab too holds [that] the halachah is as R. Judah; [this follows] from ship mattings,<sup>18</sup> which Rab forbids while Samuel permits. And Levi too holds [that] the halachah is as R. Judah. For when a terefah was brought before him on a Festival,<sup>19</sup> he would not inspect it save when he sat by a dunghill, for he said, perhaps it will not be found fit, in which case it is of no use even for dogs. But Samuel maintained: The halachah is as R. Simeon.<sup>20</sup> And Ze'iri too holds [that] the halachah is as R. Simeon, for we learnt: If an animal dies, it must not be moved from its place: and Ze'iri interpreted this as referring to a sacred animal,<sup>21</sup> but in the case of an ordinary animal it is permitted.<sup>22</sup> R. Johanan too said, The halachah is as R. Simeon. Yet did R. Johanan say thus: Surely R. Johanan ruled, The halachah is as an anonymous Mishnah. and we learnt:

- 
- (1) Which is thy constellation.
  - (2) Which is an unpropitious combination for begetting children.
  - (3) E.V. ‘righteousness’.
  - (4) Sc. for the sake of Abraham: Isa. XLI. 2.
  - (5) Or, meadow.
  - (6) V. supra p. 644, n. 11.
  - (7) prayer can counteract his fate as determined by the planets (Rashi).
  - (8) To escape your fate.
  - (9) Lit., ‘throw into the basket’.
  - (10) E.v. righteousness. From the Jewish point of view the two are identical: One merely performs his duty (i.e., righteousness) in giving charity.

- (11) Prov. X, 2.  
 (12) Lit., 'Chaldeans'.  
 (13) Lit., 'the evil inclination'.  
 (14) The tree did not belong to him. — This story shows that head-covering was not de rigeur, though regarded as conducive to piety. — From these stories we see that belief in planetary influence was not entirely rejected, but that these Rabbis held that it might be counteracted by good deeds.  
 (15) Though normally they are for human consumption.  
 (16) V. Glos.  
 (17) V. p. 110, n. 1. ' = 'Ulla; R = Rab; L = Levi; SH = SHemuel (Samuel); H = Johanan; Z = Ze'iri.  
 (18) V. supra 19b.  
 (19) I.e., when a doubt arose whether an animal was terefah (v. Glos.).  
 (20) Who permits mukzeh.  
 (21) I.e., one sanctified for a sacrifice. When it dies all benefit thereof is forbidden and it may not even be thrown to the dogs. Hence it is mukzeh on Festivals, with which this deals.  
 (22) It can be thrown to the dogs. and is therefore not mukzeh.

### **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 157a**

One may not chop up wood from planks,<sup>1</sup> nor from a plank that is broken on a Festival?<sup>2</sup> R. Johanan recited that as [the ruling of] R. Jose b. Judah.<sup>3</sup> Come and hear: One may commence with a heap of straw [for fuel supplies] but not with the timber stored in the shed?<sup>4</sup> — The reference there is to cedar and ashuhe<sup>5</sup> planks, for in the case of mukzeh on account of monetary loss even R Simeon agrees.<sup>6</sup>

Come and hear: Pasture animals may not be watered and killed, but home animals may be watered and killed?<sup>7</sup> — R. Johanan found another [opposing] anonymous [Mishnah]: Beth Shammai say: One may remove bones and nutshells from the table; but Beth Hillel rule: One must take away the whole board and shake it. Whereon R. Nahman said: As for us, we have no other [view] but that Beth Shammai agree with R. Judah, and Beth Hillel with R. Simeon.<sup>8</sup>

R. Aha and Rabina differ therein: One maintains: In all [discussions on] the Sabbath the halachah is as R. Simeon, save in mukzeh on account of repulsiveness: and what is that? An old lamp.<sup>9</sup> While the other maintains: In respect of mukzeh on account of repulsiveness too the halachah is as R. Simeon, the exception being mukzeh on account of an interdict, and what is that? A lamp wherein a light had been lit on that self-same Sabbath.<sup>10</sup> But in the case of mukzeh on account of monetary loss even R. Simeon agrees, for we learnt: All utensils may be handled on the Sabbath, except a large saw and the pin of a plough.<sup>11</sup>

**MISHNAH. VOWS CAN BE ANNULLED BY A HUSBAND ON THE SABBATH, AND ABSOLUTION MAY BE GRANTED<sup>12</sup> FOR VOWS WHEN THESE ARE NECESSARY FOR THE SABBATH. A SKYLIGHT MAY BE CLOSED UP,<sup>13</sup> AND A RAG MAY BE MEASURED,<sup>14</sup> AND A MIKWEH MAY BE MEASURED.<sup>15</sup> AND IT ONCE HAPPENED IN THE DAYS OF R. ZADOK'S FATHER AND THE DAYS OF ABBA SAUL THE SON OF BOTNITH THAT THEY CLOSED UP THE WINDOW WITH A PITCHER AND TIED AN [EARTHENWARE] POT TO ASCERTAIN WHETHER THERE WAS THE OPENING OF A HANDBREADTH OR NOT IN THE BARREL.<sup>16</sup> AND FROM THEIR WORDS WE LEARN THAT WE MAY CLOSE [A SKYLIGHT] AND MEASURE AND TIE ON THE SABBATH.**

**GEMARA.** The scholars asked: Is annulment [permitted] whether it is required [for the Sabbath] or not, whereas absolution [may be granted] only when it is necessary, but not otherwise, and for that reason they are divided from each other;<sup>17</sup> or perhaps annulment too [is permitted] only when it is necessary [for the Sabbath] but not otherwise; the reason that they are divided being that annulment

does not require a Beth din, whereas absolution requires a Beth din?<sup>18</sup> — Come and hear: For Zuti, of the School of R. Papa, recited: Vows may be annulled on the Sabbath when they are required for the Sabbath: thus, only when required for the Sabbath, but not otherwise.

Another version: The scholars asked: Does WHEN THESE ARE NECESSARY relate to both, but not when they are unnecessary. which proves that [for] the annulment of vows a period of twenty-four hours is given; or perhaps WHEN THESE ARE NECESSARY is stated in reference to absolution only, but the annulment of vows [is permitted] even when it is unnecessary, which proves that [for] the annulment of vows the whole day [only] is given?<sup>19</sup> — Come and hear: For Zuti of the School of R. Papa recited: Vows may be annulled on the Sabbath when they are required for the Sabbath — Only ‘when required for the Sabbath’, but not otherwise, which proves that [for] the annulment of vows a period of twenty-four hours is given. Said R. Ashi, But we learnt: [The period allowed for] annulment of vows is the whole day: this may result in greater stringency or greater leniency.<sup>20</sup> E.g., if she vows on Sabbath eve [Friday night], he can annul on the Sabbath eve and the Sabbath day; if she vows just before nightfall, he can annul only until the night, for if darkness falls and he has not annulled it, he can no longer do so? — It is dependent on Tannaim: [The period for] the annulling of vows is all day; R. Jose son of R. Judah and R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon maintain: Twenty-four hours.

AND ABSOLUTION MAY BE GRANTED FOR VOWS, etc. The scholars asked: Is that only if one had no time [before the Sabbath to seek absolution], or perhaps it holds good even if one had time? — Come and hear: For the Rabbis gave a hearing to R. Zutra b. R. Zera and absolved him of his vow, though he did have time.

THEY CLOSED UP THE WINDOW WITH A PITCHER AND TIED A POT WITH A REED ROPE. Rab Judah said in Rab's name: There was a small passage between two houses and an unclean object lay there,

---

(1) Arranged in piles for building.

(2) Because they are mukzeh, v. Bez. 31a.

(3) But not as an anonymous Mishnah.

(4) It is stored there for winter use and is mukzeh, Bez. 29b. This Mishnah is anonymous and agrees with R. Judah.’

(5) A genus of weak (female) cedar. Aliter: cypress.

(6) Cf. p. 610, n. 12.

(7) V. supra 45b. This prohibits mukzeh.

(8) V. supra 143a, p. 724, n. 5. Beth Hillel's view is the same as an anonymous Mishnah, because it is always halachah.

(9) V. supra 44a.

(10) V. p. 202, n. 9.

(11) These are delicate tools that require careful handling and are not used for any purpose but their own, v. supra 123b.

(12) Lit., ‘may be sought’; sc, from a Sage or court of three laymen.

(13) Cf. supra 125b.

(14) Whether it is large enough to be defiled; v. supra 26b. E.g., if it came into contact with a sherez (q.v. Glos.) and then touched food.

(15) To see whether it has the minimum size for validity, i.e., one cubit square by three in breadth or its cubic equivalent.

(16) This is discussed infra.

(17) In the Mishnah, instead of stating. Vows may be annulled and absolution granted. etc.

(18) A husband annuls his wife's vows and a father his daughter's, while a Sage or Beth din of three laymen can grant absolution to all.

(19) A husband or a father can annul vows only on the day he hears them (Num. XXX, 5,8, q.v.); and the question is whether ‘day’ means a calendar day, i.e., until the evening only, no matter when the vow is made, or full twenty-four hours? Now, where he hears of her vow first on Sabbath day, if annulment is permitted on the Sabbath only when it is necessary, it follows that full twenty-four hours are allowed so that he can annul after the termination of the Sabbath; for

otherwise we deprive him of the right to annul at all.

(20) By fixing a calender day, i.e., a night and a day, the period may be shorter or longer, as the case may be.

### **Talmud - Mas. Shabbath 157b**

and a split barrel[-shaped defective roofing] rested over them, — then they closed the window with a pitcher and tied a fire pot with a reed rope to ascertain whether the barrel[-shaped roofing] had an opening of a handbreadth or not.<sup>1</sup> AND FROM THEIR WORDS WE LEARN THAT WE MAY STOP UP [A SKYLIGHT] AND MEASURE AND TIE ON THE SABBATH. ‘Ulla visited the home of the Resh Galutha and saw Rabbah b. R. Huna Sitting in a bath-tub of water and measuring it. Said he to him: Say that the Rabbis spoke thus of measuring in connection with a precept;<sup>2</sup> did they rule [thus] when it is not in connection with a precept? — I was merely occupying myself, he replied.<sup>3</sup>

---

(1) The ‘unclean object’ was a corpse, which lay in the passage beneath the roofing under its split. Before the person died the window was closed up with the pitcher, for fear that the split was less than a handbreadth in width, in which case the corpse would be lying under a covering which contained no opening through which the uncleanness could pass out, and so it would spread to the rooms on its side through the window opening into the passage. Hence it was closed with an earthen pitcher, the back of which faced the passage; it then bars the progress of defilement. In order to know whether the split was a handbreadth in width they tied a fire-shard of that width with a reed, to see whether it could enter the split (Rashi). Tosaf, explains it differently.

(2) Sc. the measuring of a mikweh.

(3) But had no intention of actually measuring.