

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

12a

The Soncino Babylonian Talmud

Book I

Folios 2a-31b



SHABBOS

TRANSLATED INTO ENGLISH WITH NOTES

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

UNDER THE EDITORSHIP OF
RABBI DR I. EPSTEIN B.A., Ph.D., D. Lit.

Reformatted by Reuven Brauner, Raanana 5771

www.613etc.com

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

FOREWORD

BY

THE VERY REV. THE CHIEF RABBI

Dr J. H. HERTZ

SABBATH, FESTIVAL AND FAST IN JUDAISM

Sabbath and holyday, festival and fast — round these is spun the web of ordinances constituting the Order Mo'ed. What significance did the Rabbis give them for the spiritual life of the Jewish people?

*THE
SABBATH*

The Rabbis made the Sabbath the very centre of the Jewish religion, a perennial fountain of idealism and regeneration in Israel. They instituted the *Kiddush* prayer, praising God for the gift of the Sabbath, to celebrate its coming in; and the *Habdalah* blessing, praising God for the distinction between the Sabbath and the six weekdays, to mark its going out. In addition to being a day of rest, the Sabbath was to be 'a holy day, set apart for the building up of the spiritual element in man' (Philo). Religious worship and religious instruction — the renewal of man's spiritual life in God-form, according to them, an essential part of Sabbath observance. We, therefore, sanctify the Sabbath by a special Sabbath liturgy, by statutory Lessons from the Torah and the Prophets, and by attending to discourse and instruction given by religious teachers. The Sabbath has thus proved the great educator of Israel in the highest subject of all, namely, the laws governing human conduct. The effect of these Sabbath prayers and Synagogue homilies upon the Jewish people has been incalculable. Leopold Zunz, the founder of the New Jewish Learning, has shown that almost the whole of Israel's inner history since the close of the Bible times can be traced in the development of these Sabbath discourses on the Torah. Sabbath worship is still the chief bond which unites Jews into a religious Brotherhood. Neglect of such worship injures the spiritual life of both the individual and the community.

By keeping the Sabbath, the Rabbis tell us, we testify to our belief in God as the Creator of the Universe; in a God who is not identical with Nature, but is a *free Personality*, the Creator and Ruler of Nature. The Talmudic mystics tell that when the heavens and earth were being called into existence, matter was getting out of hand, and the Divine Voice had to resound, 'Enough! So far and no further!' Man, made in the image of God, has been endowed by Him with the power of creating. But in his little universe, too, matter is constantly getting out of hand, threatening to overwhelm and crush out soul. By means of the Sabbath, called [H] 'a memorial of Creation', we are endowed with the Divine power of saying 'Enough!' to all rebellious claims of our environment, and are reminded of our potential victory over all material forces that would drag us down.

The Sabbath, as conceived by the Rabbis, is the supreme example of the hallowing of life under the sanctifying influence of the Law. That sacred day is the

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

perennial fountain of idealism and regeneration in Israel. More than any other institution has it molded Jewish family life with its virtues of chastity, charity, love, peace; virtues nowhere surpassed, rarely equaled. Amid all the misery and slavery that for so many centuries were the lot of Israel, once a week the home of the humblest Jew was flooded with light. The Sabbath banished care and toil, grief and sorrow. On that day, the despised and rejected of men was emancipated from the oppression and tribulation and degradation of this world; he felt himself a prince, a member of a great, eternal, holy people.

The Rabbis attached to the Sabbath a number of minute regulations which make its complete observance a matter of no small difficulty. In all ages — from early Christian times to the present day — ignorant and unsympathetic critics have stigmatized these minutiae as an intolerable burden and asserted that they make the Sabbath not a day of rest but one of sorrow and anxiety. Such a view shows a complete misunderstanding of the spirit in which the Rabbis approached their task. It was their love for the Sabbath which led them to exert all their ingenuity in discovering ways of differentiating it from other days and making it more thoroughly a day of rest, a day in which man enjoys some foretaste of the pure bliss and happiness which are stored up for the righteous in the world to come. And the Jewish people received it from them in the same spirit. Let a hostile witness — a German Protestant theologian of anti-Semitic tendencies — testify what the Rabbinic Sabbath is to the loyal Jew.

'Anyone who has had the opportunity of knowing in our own day the inner life of Jewish families that observe the Law of the fathers with sincere piety and in all strictness, will have been astonished at the wealth of joyfulness, gratitude and sunshine, undreamt of by the outsider, with which the Law animates the Jewish home. The whole household rejoices on the Sabbath, which they celebrate with rare satisfaction not only as the day of rest, but rather as the day of rejoicing. Jewish prayers term the Sabbath a "joy of the soul" to him who hallows it: *he* "enjoys the abundance of Thy goodness". Such expressions are not mere words; they are the outcome of pure and genuine happiness and enthusiasm' (R. Kittel).

By means of the Rabbinic expansion of the kinds of forbidden work on the Sacred Day, and as the outcome of the gigantic intellectual labor on the part of generations, nay centuries, of Sopherim, Tannaim, and Amoraim in the elucidation of these laws, there arose the choicest spiritual edifice in the realm of Judaism — the Sabbath Day of Jewish history. Without the observance of the Sabbath, of the olden Sabbath, of the Sabbath as perfected by the Rabbis, the whole of Jewish life would disappear. And only if the olden Sabbath is maintained by those who have lost or abandoned it, is the permanence of Israel assured.

PASSOVER What epoch-making significance the Rabbis ascribed to the Exodus is clearly shown by the constant recurrence in the prayers of the expression, 'in memory of the going forth from Egypt'. 'The Exodus from Egypt is not only one of the greatest events and epochs in the history of the Jews, but one of the greatest events and epochs in the history of the world. To that successful escape, Europe, America and Australia are as much indebted as the Jews themselves. And the men of Europe, the men of America, and the men of Australia might join with us Jews in celebrating that feast of the Passover'. (C. G. Montefiore). The Rabbis deemed it a sacred task to keep alive the memory of that event, and the full understanding of

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

its significance, in the mind of the Jewish people. And in the performance of this task, with sound psychological insight they began with the mind of the young. Out of a mere hint in the Biblical text, they evolved the wonderful Seder service, with its irresistible appeal to the interest and curiosity of the intelligent child. Of all the ceremonies of the Jewish religion, there is perhaps none so well calculated as the Seder to awaken the Jewish consciousness in the child, at the same time that it brings home to the adult with unique force the unbroken continuity of Jewish history.

One phrase in connection with Passover was the subject of heated controversy in early Rabbinic times between the Pharisees and Sadducees. The latter took the word '*sabbath*' (Lev. XXIII, 15)¹ in its usual sense, and maintained that the '*Omer*' was to be brought on the morrow of the first Saturday in Passover. The Pharisees argued that '*sabbath*' here means, 'the day of cessation from work'; and the context shows that the Feast of Unleavened Bread is intended; therefore, the '*Omer*' was to be brought on the sixteenth of Nisan. This is supported by the Septuagint which renders 'on the morrow of the first day', and by Josephus. The offerings of the sheaf took place on the sixteenth, the first busy work-day of the harvest, in relation to which the preceding day might well be called a *Sabbath* or rest-day, though not all labor was prohibited. This is alone compatible with the context, and is free from the objections to which all the other opinions are open (Kalisch).

FEAST OF WEEKS — SHABU'OTH

One of the three agricultural festivals is the feast of the first harvest [H]. Jewish tradition, however, connects it with the Covenant on Mount Sinai, and speaks of the festival as [H] 'the Season of Giving of our Torah', the date of which is not expressly mentioned in the Torah but is calculated by the Rabbis from statements in the text to have been on the sixth day of the third month. Hence its association with the Feast of Weeks, which became the Festival of Revelation.

Its name in Talmudic literature is not Shabu'oth, but almost invariably '*Azereth*' 'the concluding festival' to Passover. 'We count the days that pass since the preceding Festival, just as one, who expects his most intimate friend on a certain day, counts the days and even the hours. This is the reason why we count the days that pass since the departure from Egypt and the anniversary of the Lawgiving. The latter was the aim and object of the exodus from Egypt' (Maimonides). In other words, the Deliverance from bondage was not an end in itself: it was the prelude to Sinai (Ex. III, 12). Liberty without law is a doubtful boon, whether to men or nations.

FEAST OF TABER- NACLES

In Rabbinic literature, it is known as '*the Feast*', because, as the time of the harvest, it would naturally be a period of rejoicing and holiday-making. It really consists of two groups; the first seven days, Tabernacles proper; and the eighth day, '*Azereth*'. The seventh day of Tabernacles became in later times an echo of the Day of Atonement and was known as Hoshanah Rabbah; and the 'second day' of '*Azereth*' assumed the nature of a separate Festival under the name of Simhath Torah, Rejoicing of the Law, the day on which the annual reading of the Torah was completed and restarted.

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

**ROSH
HASHANAH**

As the seventh day in the week was a holy day, so the seventh month was the holy month in the year. It is, therefore, not surprising that the New Moon of the seventh month should be a Festival of special solemnity. In later times, it was known as Rosh Hashanah, New Year's Day. But unlike the New Year celebrations of many ancient and modern nations, the Jewish New Year is not a time of revelry, but an occasion of the deepest religious import.

'A day of blowing the horn', i.e., *Shofar*, the ram's horn. The sound of *Shofar* consisting, as handed down by Tradition, of three distinctive *Shofar*-notes — *teki'ah*, *shebarim*, *teru'ah* — has been looked upon from times immemorial as a call to contrition and penitence, as a reminder of the *Shofar*-sound of Sinai; and the Day of Memorial, the beginning of the Ten Days of Repentance [H] which culminate in the Day of Atonement, as a time of self-examination and humble petition of forgiveness. 'The Scriptural injunction of the *Shofar* for the New Year's Day has a profound meaning. It says: Awake, ye sleepers, and ponder over your deeds; remember your Creator and go back to Him in penitence. Be not of those who miss realities in their pursuit of shadows and waste their years in seeking after vain things which cannot profit or deliver. Look well to your souls and consider your acts; forsake each of you his evil ways and thoughts, and return to God so that He may have mercy upon you' (Maimonides).

**YOM
KIPPUR**

This Day, set aside for penitence, and moral regeneration, is the only one for which the Torah prescribes fasting — which is the intensest form of devotion and contrition. The Fast is to demonstrate to the sinner that man can conquer all physical cravings, that the spirit can always master the body. The abstention from all food and from gratification of other bodily desires, however, must be accompanied by deep remorse at having fallen short of what it was in our power to be and to do as members of the House of Israel. Without such contrite confession accompanied by the solemn resolve to abandon the way of evil, fasting in itself is not the fulfillment of the Divine command and purpose of the Day of Atonement.

Repentance, Prayer and Beneficence — these can change the whole current of a man's life and destiny, and lead to perfect atonement.

'Happy Israel', Rabbi Akiba exclaimed — 'before Whom do ye purify yourselves, and Who is it that purifieth you? Your Father Who is in Heaven'. Note that the initiative in atonement is with the sinner. He cleanses himself on the Day of Atonement by fearless self-examination, open confession and resolve not to repeat the transgressions of the past year. When our Heavenly Father sees the abasement of the penitent sinner, He — and not the High Priest or any other Mediator — sprinkles, as it were, the clean waters of pardon and forgiveness upon him. 'The whole philosophy of monotheism is contained in this rallying-cry of Rabbi Akiba' (Hermann Cohen).

Confession of sin is the most essential and characteristic element in the services of the Day of Atonement; 'every one entreating pardon for his sins and hoping for God's mercy, not because of his own merits but through the compassionate nature of that Being Who will have forgiveness rather than punishment' (Philo). The Confession is made by the whole Community collectively; and those who have not themselves committed the sins mentioned in the Confession regret that they were

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

unable to prevent them from being committed by others (Friedlander).

'From all your sins before the Lord shall ye be clean'. Thereon Rabbi Eleazar ben Azaryah founded the sublime teaching: 'For transgressions of man against God, the Day of Atonement atones (given repentance on the part of the sinner); but for transgressions against a fellowman the Day of Atonement does not atone, unless and until he has conciliated his fellowman and redressed the wrong he has done him'. The Confession deals almost exclusively with moral trespasses against our fellowmen. Especially numerous are the terms denoting sins committed with the tongue — falsehood, slander, frivolous and unclean speech. The Rabbis, who certainly did not underrate ritual offences, deemed moral shortcomings to be infinitely graver, and hence confined the Confession to them. Repentance can give rebellious sins the character of errors; i.e., by his penitence the sinner shows that his willful sins were largely due to ignorance, and hence are treated by God as if they were 'errors'.

The Day of Atonement survived the High Priesthood; nay, it gained in inwardness and spiritual power with the passing of the sacrificial system. 'The fasting and humiliation before God, the confession of sins and contrition for them, and fervent prayer for forgiveness, were even before the destruction of the Temple the reality in regard to the Day of Atonement, of which the rites in the Temple were but a dramatic symbol' (Moore). The Rabbis had stressed the Prophetic teaching that without repentance no sacrificial rites were of any avail. With the cessation of sacrifices, therefore, repentance was left as the sole condition of the remission of sins. 'In our time when there is no Temple and no Altar for atonement, there is repentance. Repentance atones for all iniquities' (Maimonides). The Day of Atonement, the Rabbis further declare, will never pass away, even if all other Festivals should pass away. And indeed as long as Israel does not lose its soul, so long shall the Day of Atonement remain.

* *
*

The volumes of Seder Mo'ed have again been planned on the same lines as those of the previous Orders in regard to Text, rendering and cultural Notes. The Editor and his collaborators have again performed with consummate skill a task of stupendous difficulty, and the standard of scholarship and accuracy set in the previous volumes has been fully maintained. The Publishers also have left nothing undone to render the Soncino Seder Mo'ed in every way a worthy continuation of their Seder Nezikin and Seder Nashim.

J. H. HERTZ

London, 16 Sivan 5698

15 June 1938

Footnotes

1. E. V. 'day of rest'.

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

INTRODUCTION TO SEDER MO'ED

BY

THE EDITOR¹

GENERAL CHARACTER AND CONTENTS

Mo'ed, which is the name given to the second 'Order' of the Babylonian Talmud, deals with the 'appointed seasons', the feasts and fasts and holy days of the calendar, which have always constituted a highly distinctive feature of Jewish life. The Pentateuch enumerates six such seasons — the Sabbath, the three pilgrimage festivals, and the Days of 'blowing of the trumpet' and atonement. To these were added subsequently, by the religious authorities of the people, certain holidays and fast days of lesser sanctity, instituted to commemorate outstanding occasions of joy or sorrow in later Jewish history. Each of these had its own distinguishing mark or ceremony, the rules and regulations for which are exhaustively discussed in the appropriate tractates of Seder Mo'ed.

The term 'Mo'ed' ('appointed season') by which this Order has always been known is

1. SHABBATH (Sabbath) 24 Chapters. Rules and regulations for observing the Sabbath rest. Includes also the laws of Hanukkah.
2. 'ERUBIN (Blendings) 10 Chapters. Regulations enabling freedom of movement beyond certain prescribed limits on Sabbaths and festivals.
3. PESA'HIM (Paschal Lambs) 10 Chapters. Laws of destroying leaven on Passover, of bringing the Paschal lamb and of the *Seder* service.
4. SHEKALIM (Shekels) 8 Chapters. On the contributions for the upkeep of the Temple and the regular sacrifices.
5. YOMA (The Day) 8 Chapters. Regulations for the Day of Atonement, with an historic description of the ceremonies carried out by the High Priest on that day.
6. SUKKAH (Booth) 5 Chapters. Regulations of the 'booth' on the Feast of Tabernacles and the taking of the four plants.
7. BEZAH (Egg) 5 Chapters. Lays down the limitations within which food may be prepared on Festivals.
8. ROSH HASHANAH (New Year) 4 Chapters. Rules for proclaiming New Moon, for the New Year liturgy and

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

the blowing of the *shofar* (trumpet).

9. TA'ANITH (Fast) 4 Chapters. Rules for the fast days, whether fixed or occasional, whether private or communal.
10. MEGILLAH (The Scroll) 4 Chapters. Rules for reading the Book of Esther on Purim; also the regulations for the reading of the Torah in public worship.

11. MO'ED KATAN (Minor Feast) 3 Chapters. Regulations governing work on the intermediate days of Passover and Tabernacles; also contains the laws of mourning.

12. HAGIGAH (Festival-Offering) 3 Chapters. Regulations regarding voluntary offerings on Festivals. Contains the famous digression on the esoteric teaching of the Torah.

In the printed editions of the Babylonian and Jerusalem Talmud there are deviations from this order of succession.³ In view of these divergencies it is idle to search for any logical sequence in the arrangement of the several tractates within the 'Order'. Significant in this connection is the fact that already in the days of Sherira Gaon there was no uniformity in this respect in the Academies; and the Gaon, in his famous *Epistle*, written in 987 C.E., is at pains to explain why a particular sequence was

followed in his Academy.⁴ Generally speaking the tractates are arranged in accordance with the respective number of chapters in each, the largest taking precedence; and such variations as do occur are in most cases where the number of the chapters in the tractates is equal.

For the eight volume first edition of this publication the order adopted is for practical reasons as follows:

- Vols. I and II. Shabbath.
- Vol. III. 'Erubin.
- Vol. IV. Pesahim.
- Vol. V. Yoma.
- Vol. VI. Sukkah and Bezah.
- Vol. VII. Rosh Hashanah, Ta'anith and Shekalim.
- Vol. VIII. Megillah, Wed Katan and Hagigah.

For the edition deluxe it was found expedient to follow another sequence:

- Vols. I, II and III. Shabbath.
- Vols. IV and V. 'Erubin.
- Vols. VI and VII. Pesahim.
- Vol. VIII. Yoma.
- Vol. IX. Sukkah.
- Vol. X. Bezah and Rosh Hashanah.
- Vol. XI. Ta'amth, Shekahm and Megillah.
- Vol. XII. Mo'ed Katan and Hagigah.

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

RELIGIOUS AND MORAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE 'APPOINTED SEASONS'

The Sabbath, declare the Talmudic Sages, is equal in importance to all the precepts in the Torah.⁵ An evaluation of the Sabbath will accordingly involve as preliminary some explanation of the significance of the Torah. Briefly stated, the foremost meaning of the word Torah is teaching. The primary purpose of the Torah which God gave to Israel is educative. Its aim is the idealization of all earthly action and the bringing of all detail of life into touch with the divine.

The laws of the Torah are divided into two classes — socio-moral and religious. They consist in other words of precepts concerning the relations between man and God and precepts governing the relations between man and man. Precepts that affect directly our fellowman are regarded as socio-moral. Those regulating the cult and ritual are religious. These differences in the laws, however, involve no contradiction in the unity of the Torah. For what is not moral law, is law helping thereto, or means of educating thereto, although the connection may not be evident in all cases.

SABBATH The Sabbath stands at the boundary between the moral and the religious signification of the Torah. In the law of the Sabbath is thus to be found the quintessence of Judaism. It is both 'a memorial of the work of the beginning', and 'of the going out of Egypt'. Its socio-ethical character is well illustrated in Deuteronomy (V, 12-15): *Observe the Sabbath day, to keep it holy as the Lord thy God commanded thee. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is a Sabbath unto the Lord thy God, in it thou shalt not do any manner of work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, nor*

thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thine ox, nor thine ass, nor any of thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates; that thy man-servant and thy maid-servant may rest as well as thou. And thou shalt remember 'that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and the Lord thy God brought thee out thence by a mighty hand and by an outstretched arm; therefore the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath day. Here we have the emphasis on the social significance of the Sabbath as the symbol of the emancipation of the slave who must rest on the day when the Israelites rest. It is further worthy of note that the Hebrew word 'as well as thou' [H] is the same as that used in the injunction to love thy neighbor as thyself⁶ (Lev. XIX, 18). The wording of the Sabbath law in Deuteronomy clearly shows that the Sabbath is designed to make secure the equality of all men in spite of the differences in their social position. This is indeed a clear testimony to the fundamental connection of Sabbath with morality.

The religious significance of the Sabbath is emphasized in Exodus (XX, 8-11) where it is presented as the symbol of the creation as well as the end of creation. This aspect of the Sabbath makes it not merely a day of rest, of cessation of labor, but a Holy Day. *'Therefore the Lord blessed the day of Sabbath and sanctified it'*, a phrase which is conspicuously absent from the Deuteronomic version.

The proper observance of the Sabbath in testimony to the Creator and His creation demands the sanctification of objects as well as of life.⁷ This does not imply a flight from the holy pleasures of life: *Thou shalt call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, honorable* (Isa. LVIII, 13). But it does mean a surrender to the Creator of all such activities as shut in man's outlook during the working days of the week and blind him in consequence to his actual relations to God and to his fellowman.⁸ Hence the many restrictions of the Sabbath day regarding the

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

handling of objects (*Mukzeh*, v. [Glos.](#)) as well as action and movement, which form the major part of the laws discussed in this 'Order'. By such a surrender to God man testifies that the world and all that is therein is God's. 'He who observes Sabbath testifies to Him at Whose word the world came into existence'.⁹ The sanctification of the Day of Rest makes the Sabbath into a day in which man is free to attend to the claims of his relations to God and to his fellowman. *Blessed be the man that keepeth the Sabbath from polluting it and keepeth his hand from doing evil* (Isa. LVI, z). The Sabbath thus becomes a day of religious inwardness and moral regeneration.

FESTIVALS The same twofold significance is found in the Festivals. The three pilgrimage Festivals, Passover, Tabernacles and Pentecost, commemorating the mighty acts at the Exodus that culminated in the Revelation at Sinai and the national experiences of Israel during their wandering in the desert, combine the religious and the social aspects of the Torah. The former finds expression in the special ceremonies and rites attached to each of the Festivals, proclaiming the sovereignty and overruling providence of God, and the latter in the Festival rejoicings in which the stranger, the orphan and the widow were to be invited to participate.¹⁰

DAY OF ATONEMENT AND NEW YEAR But the most striking expression of the close connection between the religious and social aspects of the Law is found in the Day of Atonement. The Day of Atonement is the chief of all Festivals not excepting the Passover Festival. The Bible describes the day as one given up to fasting and solemn sacrifice. The high priest atoned for himself, then for the priests, lastly for all Israel. Yet an old Mishnah¹¹ tells us that the Atonement-day was at the same time a day of national rejoicing. Young men and young women held bride-show. The richer young

women had to dress in plain white linen in order not to outshine the poorer — a piece of consideration, which is as yet conspicuously absent from the polished societies of modern times. In the evening all went to the house of the high priest who made a feast for all his friends. The culminating act was the sending of the scapegoat into the wilderness and the pronouncement of the pardon of the people. In later days when the sacrificial system ceased, the Day of Atonement still retained its twofold significance. While the fasting and abstention from other bodily requirements spelled contrition, confession and repentance for all trespasses both ritual and moral, the liturgy of the day, significantly enough, practically excluded from the confession ritual trespasses. Moreover, the reconciliation of man with God was made dependent on the reconciliation of man with man. Closely linked with the Atonement-day is the New Year day, both being periods of Divine Judgment and days of self-scrutiny and moral regeneration,¹² in which too the socio-moral and religious aspects of the Torah are merged into one.

MINOR FEASTS AND FASTS And not only the appointed seasons prescribed by the Torah possess this twofold signification of Jewish feast and fast; it is found equally in all the holidays and fasts of lesser sanctity instituted by the religious leaders of later generations: Purim with the Megillah reading and the distribution of 'gifts to the poor'¹³ as special features of the feast; and the four minor fasts with their insistent message of the love of 'truth and peace',¹⁴ alike show the inseparableness in the Jewish conception of morals and religion. And similarly the rain-fasts were like the minor fasts on which they were patterned. The various regulations of the rain-fasts described in Ta'amth were primarily designed to rouse the people to contrition and to make amends for any social wrongs of which they might have been guilty.¹⁵ The only feast in which the blending of the moral and

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

religious is absent is Hanukkah (the Feast of Dedication). But Hanukkah is strictly speaking not a Feast. The eight days of Hanukkah, except for the kindling of lights and the recital of *Hallel* and other liturgical additions, are but ordinary working days and do not bear the stamp of *Yom Tob*.¹⁶ Nevertheless, later Jewish piety introduced the moral note characteristic of Jewish festivals in the celebration, and made the distribution of charity a feature also of this festival.¹⁷

METHOD AND SCOPE

TEXT. The Text used for this edition is in the main that of the Wilna Romm Edition. Note has, however, been taken of the most important variants of manuscript and printed editions some of which have been adopted in the main body of the translation, the reason for such preference being generally explained or indicated in the Notes. All the censored passages appear either in the text or in the Notes.

TRANSLATION. The translation aims at reproducing in clear and lucid English the central meaning of the original text. It is true some translators will be found to have been less literal than others, but in checking and controlling *every line* of the work, the Editor has endeavored not to lose sight of the main aim of the translation. Words and passages not occurring in the original are placed in square brackets.

NOTES. The main purpose of these is to elucidate the translation by making clear the course of the arguments, explaining allusions and technical expressions, thus providing a running commentary on the text. With this in view resort has been made to the standard Hebrew commentators, Rashi, the Tosafists, Asheri, Alfasi, Maimonides, Maharsha, the glosses of BaH, Rashal, Straghun, the Wilna Gaon, etc.¹⁸ Advantage has also been taken of the results of modern scholarship, such as represented by the names of Graetz, Bacher,

Weiss, Halevy, Levy, Kohut, Jastrow, Obermeyer, and — happily still with us — Krauss, Buchler, Ginzberg, Klein and Herford among others, in dealing with matters of general cultural interest with which the Talmud teems — historical, geographical, archaeological, philological and social.

GLOSSARY AND INDICES. Each Tractate is equipped with a [Glossary](#) wherein recurring technical terms are fully explained, thus obviating the necessity of explaining them afresh each time they appear in the text. To this have been added a Scriptural Index and a [General Index](#) of contents.

In the presentation of the tractates the following principles have also been adopted:

- i. The Mishnah and the words of the Mishnah recurring and commented upon in the Gemara are printed in capitals.
- ii. [H] introducing a Mishnah cited in the Gemara, is rendered 'we have learnt'.
- iii. [H] introducing a Baraita, is rendered 'it has been (or was) taught'.
- iv. [H] introducing a Tannaitic teaching, is rendered 'Our Rabbis taught'.
- v. Where an Amora cites a Tannaitic teaching the word 'learnt' is used, e.g., [H] 'R. Joseph learnt'.
- vi. The word tanna designating a teacher of the Amoraic period (v. [Glos.](#)) is written with a small 't'.
- vii. A distinction is made between ... [H] referring to a Tannaitic ruling and ... [H] which refers to the ruling of an Amora, the former being rendered 'the *haluchuh* is ...' and the latter, 'the law is ...'
- viii. R. stands either for Rabbi designating a Palestinian teacher or Rab designating a Babylonian teacher, except in the case of the frequently recurring Rab Judah where the title 'Rab' has been written in full to distinguish him from the Tanna of the

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

- same name.
- ix. [H] lit., 'The Merciful One', has been rendered 'the Divine Law' in cases where the literal rendering may appear somewhat incongruous to the English ear.
 - x. Biblical verses appear in italics except for the emphasized word or words in the quotation which appear in Roman characters.
 - xi. No particular English version of the Bible is followed, as the Talmud has its own method of exegesis and its own way of understanding Biblical verses which it cites. Where, however, there is a radical departure from the English versions, the rendering of a recognized English version is indicated in the Notes. References to chapter and verse are those of the Massoretic Hebrew text.
 - xii. Any answer to a question is preceded by a dash (—), except where the question and the answer form part of one and the same argument.
 - xiii. Inverted commas are used sparingly, that is, where they are deemed essential or in dialogues.
 - xiv. The archaic second person 'thou', 'thee', etc. is employed only in *Aggadic* passages or where it is necessary to distinguish it from the plural 'you', 'yours', etc.
 - xv. The usual English spelling is retained in proper names in vogue like Simeon, Isaac, Akiba, as well as in words like *halachah*. *Shechinah*, *shechitah*, etc. which have almost passed into the English language. The transliteration employed for other Hebrew words is given at the end of each tractate.
 - xvi. It might also be pointed out for the

benefit of the student that the recurring phrases 'Come and hear:' and 'An objection was raised:' or 'He objected:' introduce Tannaitic teachings, the two latter in contradiction, the former either in support or contradiction of a particular view expressed by an Amora.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Once again I have the pleasure of expressing my warmest appreciation of the industry and scholarship which the several collaborators have brought to bear upon their work. To Mr. Maurice Simon, M.A., who has assisted in many directions, and to my dear wife for her invaluable help in many ways, I would express my especial thanks. I should also like to pay personal tribute to Mr. J. Davidson, the Governing Director of the Soncino Press, for the care and self-sacrificing devotion with which he has seen Seder Mo'ed through the press.

* *
*

With the publication of this 'Order' we are approaching the completion of the Soncino Edition of the first complete and unabridged English translation of the Babylonian Talmud. Only those who have been closely connected with it can appreciate the exacting and strenuous nature of the task. I tender my humble thanks to the Almighty God for having given me strength to carry through, amidst other labors, my heavy share of the work, and on behalf of all those who have been concerned with this publication I offer the traditional prayer:

I. EPSTEIN

Jews' College, London.
Sivan 24, 5698
23 June, 1938

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

Footnotes

1. V. Baneth, E., *Die sechs Ordnungen der Mischna, Seder Mo'ed*, p. 168.
2. This arrangement rests on the order given by Maimonides in his introduction to his commentary on Zera'im.
3. In the current editions of the Babylonian Talmud the tractates appear in the following order: Shab., 'Er., Pes., Bez., M.K., Hag., R.H., Yoma, Suk., Ta'an., Shek., Meg. In J.T., Yoma precedes Shek.; and Hag., M.K. For other variations v. Strack H., *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash* (Philadelphia 1931) p. 365.
4. The sequence given by him follows that of Maimonides. Though, strange to say, neither in the Spanish nor French Recension of the *Epistle* is there any reference to Megillah, Mo'ed Katan and Hagigah. V. Ed. Lewin, M.B. p. 33.
5. V. Hal. 5a; J. Ber. I, 5; J. Ned. III, 14; Ex. Rab. XXV, 12.
6. V. Cohen H., *Religion der Vernunft aus d. Quellen d. Judentums* (1929) p. 182.
7. V. Bialik, *Sefer ha-Shabbath*, p. 518.
8. Cf. Huxley, A., *Ends and Means*, p. 298: 'We fail to attend to our true relations with ultimate reality and, through ultimate reality, with our fellow beings, because we prefer to attend to our animal nature and to the business of getting on in the world'.
9. Mekilta, *Yithro*, 8.
10. V. Deut. XVI, 11 and 14. Cf. Maimonides, (*Guide for the Perplexed*, III, 53: 'They (the festivals) promote the good feelings that men should have to each other in their social and political relations'.
11. V. Ta'an. 26b.
12. Cf. Sherira Gaon, *Epistle*, *loc. cit.* (French Recension): 'New Year is like the harbinger ([H]) of the Day of Atonement'.
13. V. Esth. IX, 22.
14. Zech. VIII, 19.
15. V. Ta'an. i6a and Buchler, A. *Maimonides VIII Centenary Memorial Volume* (Soncino Press) p. 13ff.
16. The technical term by which a Jewish festival is designated. This term occurs in connection with Purim (Esth. IX, 22) and on this basis Purim was to be treated according to an old Baraita as a day on which all work was prohibited (v. Meg. 5b). Although this restriction was not made absolute, the established custom to the present day is to abstain from non-urgent manual labor on Purim (v. *Shulhan Aruk O.H.* 696, 1). True it is that this term occurs also in connection with Hanukkah, v. Shab. 22b, but the phrasing there makes it quite clear that it is designated as *Yom Tob* only in respect of *Hallel* recital and thanksgiving [H] Cf. with this the phrase [H] in Esth. *loc. cit.* It is a noteworthy fact that but for a bare reference to the Hanukkah light, the Hanukkah feast is ignored by the Mishnah; for the reason v. Naltmanides on Gen. XLIX, 10.
17. V. [H], 670.
18. These names are referred to more fully in the list of Abbreviations at the end of each Tractate.

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

INTRODUCTION

Shabbath is the first treatise of Mo'ed, the second Order of the Talmud. It contains 157 folios divided into 24 chapters, and is the second longest Tractate of the Talmud, being exceeded only by Baba Bathra, which runs to 176 folios.

As its name implies, the Tractate deals with the laws and regulations of the Sabbath. It is obvious that an institution of such far-reaching importance, which is indeed one of the foundations of Judaism and for the violation of which Scripture prescribes the supreme penalty,¹ had to be carefully defined, and its observance precisely determined. To this task the Rabbis devoted themselves in the present treatise.²

The Biblical data are furnished by the following passages: Gen. II, 2-3; Ex. XVI, 22 *seq.*; XX, 8-11 (the Fourth Commandment); XXIII, 12; XXXIV, 21; XXXV, 2-3; Num. XV, 32 *seq.*; Deut. V, 12-15 (the Fourth Commandment in the Deuteronomic revision); Jer. XVII, 21 *seq.*; Amos VIII, 5; Neh. X, 32 and XIII, 15 *seq.* From an analysis and examination of these we learn that the following labors are forbidden: baking and seething; gathering manna and bringing it in; harvesting and plowing (and perhaps the labors associated with these); kindling; bearing burdens and carrying into a town (Jerusalem) or out from a private house; buying and selling; treading winepresses, and lading asses.³ But of course, mere chance references, as many of these are, could not be regarded as exhausting the labors forbidden on the Sabbath, and a scientific investigation was necessary for the full understanding of its observance.

It will help to an understanding of the Tractate to know the principles upon which the Rabbis based their definition of labor, and the various categories of forbidden work

which they distinguished. The *locus classicus* for determining the meaning of 'work' was found by them in Ex. XXXV. There the instructions to build the Tabernacle are preceded by a short passage dealing with the prohibition of labor on the Sabbath which is apparently superfluous. The Rabbis accordingly interpreted it as intimating that whatever work was required in the building of the Tabernacle constituted 'work' which is forbidden on the Sabbath. Acting on this principle they drew up a list of thirty-nine 'principal' labors, which they extended by adding 'derivatives', i.e., such as partook of the nature of the 'principal' labors.

In addition to the foregoing they forbade other actions (*shebuth*) on the Sabbath which while not falling into the categories of either 'principal' labors or 'derivatives' were nevertheless felt not to harmonize with the sacred and restful nature of the Sabbath. And finally, they prohibited the handling of certain articles under the term '*mukzeh*' (lit., 'set apart').

It would be too wearisome to give a detailed summary of each of the twenty-four chapters [see list [above](#)]. Suffice it to say that with the exception of the first Mishnah a definite order of sequence may be discerned. Thus the Tractate commences with the things which may not be done on Friday, goes on to discuss the oils and wicks which may be used in kindling the Sabbath lights; the things in which food may be stored for the Sabbath; the ornaments which may be worn, and then the enumeration of the thirty nine 'principal' labours, in the [seventh chapter](#). The following nine chapters consist of definitions of these labours, while from [Chapter XVII](#) until the end a number of miscellaneous subjects are dealt with, including those things which are forbidden as a '*shebuth*' or under the heading

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

of 'mukzeh'. A special [chapter \(XIX\)](#) is devoted to circumcision on the Sabbath.

A considerable portion of the Tractate consists of *Aggaduh*. It is difficult to make a selection from the rich store of Rabbinic legend, sentence, apologue and aphorism in which the Tractate abounds, but perhaps special attention might be drawn to the following: Prayer must be preceded by preparation; the judge who judges truthfully becomes a partner with God in the Creation; the Sabbath is God's gift to Israel; the story of Hanukkah (the Feast of Lights); the attempt to exclude Ecclesiastes and Ezekiel from the Canon; the heathens who wished to embrace Judaism on certain conditions and Hillel's famous epitome of Judaism — 'What is hateful to thee do not do to thy neighbour'; R. Simeon b. Yohai's criticism of the Roman

Government and his flight; 'truth' is God's seal; Rome was founded when Solomon married Pharaoh's daughter; God's stipulation that the world was to return to chaos unless Israel accepted the Torah; Israel's joy in accepting it and Moses' fight to obtain it — an appreciation of the fact that God's kingdom on earth can be established only after struggle; the Torah is the cause of the nations' hatred of Israel; why Jerusalem was destroyed; schoolchildren are God's anointed; and finally, 'Repent one day before thy death' and the necessity to be ready at all times to appear before God illustrated by the parable of the wise and the foolish men invited to the king's feast. In that desire to be at harmony with God, which is the core and essence of Judaism, the Rabbis found the spiritual significance of the sacredness of the Sabbath.

H. FREEDMAN

Footnotes

1. In actual practice this was hedged about with so many restrictions as to make its application virtually impossible.
2. On the relationship between 'Shabbath' and 'Bezah' (or Yom Tob) v. Halevi, *Doroth Harishonim* I, 3, p. 253.
3. In these texts too the sanctity of the Sabbath is stressed, the persons who benefit by this day of rest, and the reasons

for same. In connection with the last it may be mentioned that while Gen. II, 2-3 and Ex. XX, 8-11 state God's resting after the Creation as the reason, in Deut. V, 12-15 the Sabbath is based on Israel's bondage in Egypt and their eventual liberation. Thus the Sabbath emphasizes God's Creation of the world on the one hand, and freedom as an essential right of man on the other.

The Indices of this Tractate have been compiled by Judah J. Slotki, M. A.

PREFATORY NOTE BY THE EDITOR

The Editor desires to state that the translation of the several Tractates, and the notes thereon, are the work of the individual contributors and that he has not attempted to secure general uniformity in style or mode of rendering. He has, nevertheless, revised

and supplemented, at his own discretion, their interpretation and elucidation of the original text, and has himself added the notes in square brackets containing alternative explanations and matter of historical and geographical interest.

ISIDORE EPSTEIN

Original footnotes renumbered.

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

Shabbath 2a

CHAPTER I

MISHNAH. THE CARRYINGS OUT¹ OF THE SABBATH² ARE TWO WHICH ARE FOUR WITHIN, AND TWO WHICH ARE FOUR WITHOUT.³ 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,⁴ AND THE MASTER OF THE HOUSE IS EXEMPT.⁵ [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.⁶ [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.⁷

GEMARA, We learnt elsewhere:⁸ [False] oaths are two which are four:²

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,' ([H]) instead of the more usual 'carrying out' ([H]) is based on Ex. XVI, 29: *let no man go out of his place on the seventh day.* L. Blau in *MGWJ.*, 1934 (*Festschrift*), P. 122, n. 2 is inclined to reject this, and conjectures that 'outgoings' ([H]) is the original Hebrew for 'carrying out,' and its present use indicates the extreme antiquity of this Mishnah.
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, *op. cit.*, 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.'

Shabbath 2b

the forms of consciousness of uncleanness are two which are four;¹ the appearances of leprosy are two, which are four;² the carryings out of the Sabbath are two which

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

are four.³ 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 labor] and derivatives are taught;⁴ but there, since the main theme is not the Sabbath, principal labors only are taught, but not derivatives. What are the principal labors? — carryings out! But the carryings out are only two?⁵ And should you answer, some of these involve liability, and some do not involve liability⁶ — surely it is taught on a par with the appearances of leprosy: just as there all involve liability,⁷ 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;⁸ there, since the Sabbath is not the main theme, only acts of liability are taught, but not of exemptions.⁹ Now, what are the cases of liability-carryings out? But the carryings out are [only] two?¹⁰ — There are two forms of carrying out and two of carrying in. But 'carryings out' are taught? — Said R. Ashi: The Tanna designates carrying in' too as 'carrying out.'¹¹ 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.¹²

R. Mattenah objected to Abaye: Are there eight?¹³ but there are twelve!¹⁴ — But according to your reasoning, there are sixteen!¹⁵ 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. Labors forbidden on the Sabbath are of two classes: (i) principal labors (aboth, lit., 'fathers') and (ii) derivatives (toledoth, lit., 'offsprings'), which are prohibited as partaking of the nature of the principal labors. Both are regarded as Biblical. Carrying out from private into public ground is a principal labor, while the reverse is a derivative thereof (*infra* 96b).
5. Viz., that of the poor man who takes an article from the house-owner'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

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

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.

Shabbath 3a

he does not teach what involves no liability and is [also] permitted.¹ But the last clause, where no liability is involved, yet it is forbidden, is indeed difficult.² (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,³ the capture of a snake, and the manipulation of an abscess?⁴ — 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-liable 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.⁵

'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.]:⁶ 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 emanated⁷ from the mouth of the company⁸ 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 neighbor loads him with food and drink, and he carries them without, what is the law? Is the removing⁹ 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.¹⁰ What is the reason? — His body is at rest¹¹ whereas his hand is not at rest.¹²

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.

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.¹

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

Still, he has now answered you correctly, for it was taught: If one was laden with food and drink while it was yet day,² and he carries them out after dark, he is culpable, because it is not like his hand.³

Abaye said: I am certain that a man's hand is neither like a public nor like a private domain:⁴ it is not like a public domain [this follows] from the poor man's hand;⁵ it is not like a private domain — [this follows] from the hand of the master of the house.⁶ Abaye propounded: Can a man's hand become as a *karmelith*?⁷ 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 [Baraita] 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].⁸ Alternatively, both [Baraitas 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;⁹ 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,¹⁰ 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,¹¹ you may solve R. Bibi b. Abaye's [problem]. For R. Bibi b. Abaye asked: If a person places a loaf in an oven,¹² do the Rabbis permit him to remove it before he incurs the liability of a sin-offering, or not?¹³ Now you may deduce that they do not permit it!¹⁴ That is no difficulty, and indeed solves it! Alternatively, you cannot solve it,

after all: [and reply thus],¹⁵ The one Baraita refers to an unwitting, the other to a deliberate act. Where it is unwitting, the Rabbis did not punish him¹⁶ for it; where it is deliberate, they punished.¹⁷ Another alternative: both [Baraitas] 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 [Baraita] 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

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

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 Baraithas.
16. V. n. 1.
17. Thus this has no bearing on R. Bibi b. Abaye's problem.

Shabbath 4a

the other, into a different courtyard.¹ Even as Raba asked R. Nahman: If a person holds a handful of produce in his hand and he extends it without,² 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!³ There his intention is not carried out; here his intention is carried out.⁴

[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;⁵ then whom are they to permit?⁶ Hence it must surely mean that he did afterwards become aware thereof,⁷ 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!⁸ — 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 neighbor may gain thereby?'⁹ 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.¹⁰ 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,¹¹ which is absent here?¹² — 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;¹³ 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 neighbor 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.

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

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 fulfill this condition.
13. Hence when it crosses public ground it is as though it rested there, and so liability is incurred.

Shabbath 4b

and when it [crosses the public domain] within ten handbreadths [of the ground]?¹ 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?² 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.³

But perhaps he [R. Akiba] does not require depositing [on a place four handbreadths square], yet he may require removal [from such a place]?⁴ 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]⁵ and it comes to rest upon a projection,⁶ of a small size,⁷ 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,⁸ Rabbi holding, We say, cast the branch after its trunk;² 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:¹⁰ 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 molding, 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.

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,¹ 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?² — Rather, said R.

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

Zera, the authority of this is the 'others.'³ 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.⁴ [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?⁵ 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.⁶ 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];⁷ here it is below ten.⁸ This⁹ 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.¹⁰ But HE STANDS is taught!¹¹ — 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!¹²

Rather, said Raba, A man's hand is accounted to him as [an area] four by four. And thus too, when Rabin came,¹³ 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 neighbor'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,¹⁴ but where he does not account his hand as such,¹⁵ 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.¹⁶ R. Johanan propounded: What if he throws an article and himself moves from his place, and catches it? What is his problem?¹⁷ — 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?¹⁸ The question stands over.

R. Abin said in R. Johanan's name: If he puts his hand into his neighbor's courtyard and receives [some] rain, and then withdraws it, he is liable. R. Zera demurred: What does it matter whether his neighbor loads him¹⁹ or Heaven loads him; he himself did not effect removal? — Do not say, he [passively] receives rain, but, he catches it up.²⁰ 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?²¹ — It is as Raba²² said [elsewhere], It refers to

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

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 neighbor'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.

Shabbath 5b

If he is reading a scroll on a threshold, and it rolls out of his hand,¹ he may rewind it to himself.² If one is reading on the top of a roof,³ and the scroll rolls out of his hand, — before it comes within ten handbreadths [of the ground] he may wind it back himself;⁴ if it comes within ten handbreadths, he must turn the written side inwards.⁵ Now, we pondered thereon: why must he turn the written side inwards, surely it did not come to rest?⁶ and Raba answered: This refers to a sloping wall.⁷ 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?⁸ 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;⁹ [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.¹⁰ Raba propounded: If a nut [lies] in a vessel, and the vessel floats on water,¹¹ do we regard the nut, which is at rest,¹² 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 wine¹³ and a tebul yom¹⁴ touches the oil, he disqualifies the oil only. R.

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

Johanán b. Nuri said: Both are attached to each other.¹⁵

R. Abin said in R. Elai's name in the name of R. Johanán: If one is laden with food and drink and goes in and out all day,¹⁶ he is liable only when he stands still.¹⁷ Said Abaye: Providing that he stands still to rest.¹⁸ 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.¹⁹ What does he [R. Johanán] inform us — that the original removal was not for this purpose?²⁰ But R. Johanán stated it once. For R. Safra said in R. Ammi's name in R. Johanán'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.²¹

Our Rabbis taught: If one carries [an article] from a shop to an open space via a colonnade,²² he is liable; but Ben 'Azzai holds him not liable. As for Ben 'Azzai, it is well: he holds that walking is like standing.²³ 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?²⁴ — Said R. Safra in the name of R. Ammi in R. Johanán'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. Johanán 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. Johanán 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

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

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.

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].¹ 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 others² 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:³ 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],⁴ 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;⁵ but do you know him [to rule thus] where there is fencing?⁶ Hence it⁷ is analogous to this.

R. Johanan said: Yet Ben 'Azzai agrees in the case of one who throws.⁸ 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.⁹ And what is public ground? A highroad,¹⁰ a great public square,¹¹ and open alleys,¹² — 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*¹³ or stoned.¹⁴ But the sea, a plain, a colonnade, or a *karmelith*, ranks neither as public nor as private ground:¹⁵ one must not carry [objects] about¹⁶ 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 owners¹⁷ and blind alleys,¹⁸ if an 'erub is made, they are permitted; if an 'erub is not made, they are forbidden.¹⁹ A man standing on a threshold²⁰ 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;²¹ 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.²²

The Master said: 'That is [absolute] private ground.' What does this exclude?²³ — It excludes the following [view] of R. Judah. For

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

it was taught: Even more than this did R. Judah say: If one owns two houses on the opposite sides of the street,²⁴ 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.

Shabbath 6b

a board or a beam at each side¹ and carry between them.² Said they to him: A street cannot be made fit [for carrying] by an 'erub in this way.³ 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]:⁴ but in respect of throwing⁵ they agree with R. Judah:⁶ 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.⁷ 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.⁸

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. Hiyya⁹ wherein it is written, Issi b. Judah said: There are thirty-nine principal labors, but one is liable only

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

[for] one. Yet that is not so? for we learnt: The principal labors are forty less one: and we pondered thereon, Why state the number?¹⁰ And R. Johanan answered: [To teach] that if one performs all of them in one state of unawareness,¹¹ 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;¹² in winter it is private ground in both respects!¹³ — Said 'Ulla: After all it is a *karmelith*; yet why is it called private ground? Because it is not public ground.¹⁴ 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 travelers 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 Baraitha — that is public ground — is to reject this view of R. Judah.
8. When it is not frequented.

9. [H] 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 Baraitha 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*.

Shabbath 7a

E.g., when it has barriers,¹ 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]² which is not enclosed in attachment to a dwelling place,³ even if it is a *kor* or two *kor* [in area],⁴ 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.⁵ Now, as for R. Ashi, it is well that he does not explain it as 'Ulla;⁶ 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?⁷ — 'Private ground' is taught.⁸

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

'And a *karmelith*.' Are then all these [sea, plain and colonnade] too not *karmelith*? — When R. Dimi came,⁹ he said in the name of R. Johanan: This is necessary only in respect of a corner near a street:¹⁰ though the masses sometimes press and overflow therein,¹¹ 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 pillars¹² is treated as a *karmelith*. What is the reason? Though the general public walk through there, since they cannot proceed with ease,¹³ 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!¹⁴ 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.¹⁵ 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]¹⁶ and it adheres to its side, he is liable; on top, he is not liable.¹⁷ Abaye and Raba both state: Providing that it is three handbreadths high, so that the public do not step on it;¹⁸ but thorns and shrubs, even if not three [handbreadths] high.¹⁹ Hiyya b. Rab maintained: Even thorns and shrubs, but not dung.²⁰ R. Ashi ruled: Even dung.

Rabbah, of the school of R. Shila, said: When R. Dimi came,²¹ he said in the name of R. Johanan: No *karmelith* can be less than four [handbreadths square].²² And R. Shesheth said: And it extends²³ 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;²⁴ 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];²⁵ but within, one may carry only four cubits.²⁶ But what is meant by 'and it extends up to ten?' That only up to ten is it a *karmelith*, but not higher.²⁷ And even as Samuel said to Rab Judah, Keen scholar!²⁸ In matters concerning the Sabbath do not consider²⁹ 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 ground³⁰ 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.

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

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.

Shabbath 7b

But [if it means] that there is no public ground above ten,¹ 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;² if below ten, it is as

though he throws it on to the ground.³ 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]⁴ 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.⁵ For it was stated: The cavities of a private domain constitute private ground. As to the cavities of a public domain,⁶ — Abaye said: They are as public ground; Raba said: They are not as public ground.⁷ 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',⁸ — 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.⁹ Now we discussed this: why 'as though he throws it on to the ground'; surely it does not rest [there]?¹⁰ And R. Johanan answered: This refers to a juicy cake of figs.¹¹ But if you maintain that the cavities of public ground are

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

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;¹² 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?¹³ 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,¹⁴ we come to a controversy of R. Meir and the Rabbis, R. Meir holding, We [imaginarily] hollow it out to complete it,¹⁵ while the Rabbis maintain, We do not hollow it out to complete it.¹⁶ 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?¹⁷ 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.

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.¹

Abaye said: If one throws a bin² into the street, [even] if it is ten [handbreadths] high but not six broad, he is liable; if six broad, he is exempt.³ 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.⁴ If he overturns it,⁵ 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.⁶ 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.⁷

'Ulla said: If there is a column nine [handbreadths high] in the street, and the public rest and rearrange their burdens thereon,⁸ and one throws [an object] and it alights upon it, he is liable. What is the reason? It is less than three, the multitude

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

step upon it;² from three to nine, they neither walk upon it nor arrange their burdens upon it;¹⁰ nine, they certainly re-arrange their burdens upon it.¹¹ Abaye asked R. Joseph: What of a pit?¹² — 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.¹³

R. Adda b. Mattenah raised an objection before Raba: If one's basket is lying in the street, ten [handbreadths] high and four broad,¹⁴ 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?¹⁵ — 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.

Shabbath 8b

If one intends to take up his Sabbath abode in a public ground, and places his 'erub¹ in a pit above ten handbreadths, it is a valid 'erub; if below ten handbreadths, it is not a valid 'erub.² 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;³ and 'below' means that he lowered it⁴ and set it there: what is the difference between above and below? He is in one place and his erub in another!⁵ Hence it must surely refer to a pit not ten deep,⁶ and it is taught, it is a valid 'erub, which proves that use with difficulty is regarded as use?² Sometimes he answered him: Both he and his 'erub were in a *karmelith*,⁸ and why is it called public ground? Because it is not private ground.² 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 shebuth¹⁰ was not forbidden at twilight.¹¹ And do not think that I am merely putting you off, but I say it to you with exactitude.¹² 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,¹³ 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;¹⁴ but in winter I would say [that it is] not [so]. And if we were informed this of

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

winter, [it might be id the reason] is because becoming mud-stained¹⁵ 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 difficulties¹⁶ is regarded as a [public] passage, whereas use under difficulties is not regarded as [public] use.¹⁷ This proves it. Rab Judah said: In the case of a bundle of canes: if one repeatedly throws it down and raises it,¹⁸ he is not liable unless he lifts it up.¹⁹

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?²⁰ [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*,²¹ — [how state that] 'he may take or give' [implying] even at the very outset? But after all, the prohibition does exist.²² 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,²³ 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.²⁴

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 cubits²⁵ 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.'

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

Shabbath 9a

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

'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.'⁴ Even if it has no stake?⁵ But R. Hama b. Gorias said in Rab's name: That which lies within the opening requires another stake to permit it.⁶ And should you answer that [the reference is to a threshold which] is not four square: surely R. Hama b. Gorias 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.⁷ 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.⁸

'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. Meir⁹ 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.¹⁰

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. [H] and in 'Er. 98a s.v. [H])

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

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

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.

Shabbath 9b

MISHNAH. ONE MUST NOT SIT DOWN BEFORE A BARBER NEAR MINHAH¹ UNTIL, HE HAS PRAYED: NOR MAY HE ENTER THE BATHS OR A TANNERY, NOR TO EAT NOR FOR A LAWSUIT,² YET IF THEY BEGAN, THEY NEED NOT BREAK OFF.³ ONE MUST BREAK OFF FOR THE READING OF THE *SHEMA*, BUT NOT FOR PRAYER.⁴

GEMARA. Near what *minhah*?⁵ 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 eat⁶ 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' Elasah.⁷ [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]:⁸ 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.⁹ [Similarly] NOR TO THE BATHS [means] merely for sweating; [and] why not [do this] in the first place? For fear lest he faint [there].¹⁰ NOR A TANNERY,

merely to inspect it:¹¹ [and] why not at the very outset? Lest he see his wares being spoilt, which will trouble him.¹² 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.¹³

What is the beginning of a hair-cut?¹⁴ — 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.¹⁵ 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].¹⁶ Abaye said: These Babylonian scholars, on the view that the evening service is voluntary,¹⁷ once they have undone their girdle [to eat], we do not trouble them;¹⁸ 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.'

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

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.

Shabbath 10a

— There¹ drinking is rare; here it is usual.² Alternatively, as for *minhah*, since it has a fixed time, one is afraid³ 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!⁴ moreover, let him stand thus [ungirdled] and pray? Because it is said, prepare to meet thy God, O Israel.⁵ Raba son of R. Huna put on stockings and prayed, quoting, 'prepare to meet, etc.' Raba removed his cloak,⁶ 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.'⁷

Raba saw R. Hammuna prolonging his prayers.⁸ Said he, They forsake eternal life and occupy themselves with temporal life.⁹ But he [R. Hammuna] 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.¹⁰

When is the beginning of a lawsuit? R. Jeremiah and R. Jonah one maintains: When the judges wrap themselves round;¹¹ 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;¹² the former, when they are not already engaged in judging.

R. Ammi and R. Assi were sitting and studying between the pillars;¹³ 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,¹⁴ [whereat] R. Hiyya b. Rab of Difti¹⁵ recited to them, and the people stood about Moses from the morning into the evening;¹⁶ 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 fairness¹⁷ 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.¹⁸ [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.¹⁹

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

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!²⁰ [i.e.,] in the strength of the Torah and not in the drunkenness of wine.²¹

Our Rabbis taught: The first hour [of the day]²² is the mealtime for gladiators;²³ the second, for robbers;²⁴ the third, for heirs;²⁵ the fourth, for labourers,²⁶ 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] laborers, and the sixth for scholars. After that it is like throwing a stone into a barrel.²⁷ 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.²⁸

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,²⁹ both reading [the *shema*] and prayer [the Eighteen Benedictions] are permissible, and a greeting of 'Peace'³⁰ goes without saying; and one may don the phylacteries there,³¹ and it goes without saying that he need not remove them [if already wearing them]; in the place where people stand undressed,³² a greeting of 'Peace' is not permissible there³³ 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 spoke³⁴ means even such as contains no

excrement? — Rather, when R. Adda stated [his ruling] it was in reference to new [baths].³⁵ But surely [this is just what] Rabina propounded: What if a place is designated for a privy closet; is designation recognized or not?³⁶ and it was not solved. Now did not the same [query of his] apply to baths?³⁷ 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: [H] and [H] 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 showing 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

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

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.

Shabbath 10b

a privy is different, because it is offensive.¹

'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 neighbor in the baths, because it is said, And he called it, The Lord is peace.² If so, let it also be forbidden to mention, By faith!³ in a privy, for it is written, the faithful God?⁴ And should you answer, that indeed is so: but R. Hama b. Goria 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.⁵

Raba b. Mehasia also said in the name of R. Hama b. Goria in Rab's name: If one makes a

gift to his neighbor, he must inform him [beforehand], as it is written, that ye may know that I the Lord sanctify you:⁶ 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?⁷ — Said Abaye, He must rub him with oil and paint⁸ him with kohl.⁹ But nowadays that we fear witchcraft what [shall be done]?¹⁰ — Said R. Papa: He must rub him with the self-same kind.¹¹ But that is not so, for R. Hama son of R. Hanina said: If one makes a gift to his neighbor, 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?¹² — 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.¹³

R. Hisda was holding two [priestly] gifts of oxen in his hand.¹⁴ 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 neighbor 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.¹⁵ 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 out¹⁶ 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.¹⁷

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

Raba b. Mehasia also said in the name of R. Hama b. Gorias 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.¹⁸ 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 populated¹⁹ its sins are few. R. Abin said: What verse [supports this]? Oh, let me [na] escape thither:²⁰ the numerical value of na is fifty-one;²¹ 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. [H]; every letter in Hebrew is also a number.

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.¹

Raba b. Mehasia also said in the name of R. Hama b. Gorias 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.² 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 Mehasia³ that it was not destroyed.⁴ But it was destroyed!⁵ — It was not destroyed as a result of that sin.

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

Raba b. Mehasia also said in the name of R. Hama b. Gorias 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. Gorias 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.⁹

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

R. Joshua son of R. Idi chanced on the home of R. Ashi. A third grown calf¹² 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?'¹³ 'It is a fast on account of a dream,' he answered, 'and Raba b. Mehasia said in the

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

name of R. Hama b. Gorias 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.¹⁴ 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 we¹⁵ 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.¹⁶ For R. Adda b. Ahabah said, and the Elders of Hagraunia¹⁷ recited likewise: R. Eleazar b. Zadok said: When we were engaged in intercalating the year at Yabneh,¹⁸ we made no break for the reading of the *shema'* or prayer.

MISHNAH. A TAILOR MUST NOT GO OUT WITH HIS NEEDLE NEAR NIGHTFALL,¹⁹ LEST HE FORGET AND GO OUT,²⁰ NOR A SCRIBE WITH HIS QUILL; AND ONE MAY NOT SEARCH HIS GARMENTS [FOR VERMIN, NOR READ BY THE LIGHT OF A LAMP.²¹ IN TRUTH IT WAS SAID, THE HAZZAN²² MAY SEE WHERE THE CHILDREN READ,²³ BUT HE HIMSELF MUST NOT READ. SIMILARLY IT WAS SAID, A ZAB MUST NOT DINE TOGETHER WITH A ZABAH,²⁴ AS IT MAY LEAD TO SIN.²⁵

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;²⁶ 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 Hagraunia, as shown by the phrase, the Elders (i.e., the leading scholars) of Hagraunia. 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.

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

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.

Shabbath 11b

and the same applies to a wine vat.¹ The scholars propounded: What of a *karmelith*?² — Abaye said: It is precisely the same. Raba said: That itself³ is only a preventive measure:⁴ are we to arise and enact a preventive measure⁵ to safeguard⁶ another preventive measure!⁷

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.⁸

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?⁹ — No: it means that he holds it in

his hand.¹⁰ 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.¹¹ 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,¹² nor a [wool] corder with the cord in his ear, nor a weaver with the cotton¹³ in his ear, nor a dyer with a [color] sample round his neck, nor a money-changer with a *denar*¹⁴ in his ear; and if he does go forth, he is not liable, though it is forbidden: this is R. Meir's view.¹⁵ 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;¹⁶ 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?¹⁷ Rather, said R. Hamnuna, there is no difficulty; the one refers to a *zab* who has had two attacks,¹⁸ the other to a *zab* who has had three attacks.¹⁹ Now, why does a *zab* of two attacks differ in that he is liable? [Presumably] because he requires it for examination!²⁰ But then a *zab* of three attacks also requires it for counting?²¹ It holds good only for that very day.²² Yet still he needs it to prevent the soiling of his garments? — Said R. Zera, This agrees with the following Tanna,

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

who maintains, The prevention of soiling has no [positive] importance.²³ 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 labor.
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 labor 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.

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.]'¹ But how compare! There he does not want that fluid at all, whereas here he needs this pouch to receive the discharge.² This can only be compared to the second clause: If a tub³ 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

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

[water] be put!⁴ — Rather, said both Abaye and Raba, There is no difficulty: the one is according to R. Judah; the other agrees with R. Simeon.⁵

The School of R. Ishmael taught: A man may go out with his tefillin⁶ on the eve of Sabbath near nightfall.⁷ 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] head-plate. If in the case of the head-plate, which contained the Divine Name⁸ only once, yet the Torah said, and it shall always be on his forehead,⁹ [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.¹⁰

It was taught: Hanania said: One must examine¹¹ his garments on Sabbath eve before nightfall. R. Joseph observed: That is a vital¹² law for the Sabbath.¹³

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);¹⁴ 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]?¹⁵ — Come and hear: One may not search [his garments] nor read by the light of a lamp. But is it stronger than our Mishnah?¹⁶ 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.¹⁷ 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;¹⁸ but those of country folk¹⁹ are easily distinguished. And [even] in the case of townspeople this was stated only of old women;²⁰ 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.²¹ 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.'²²

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],²³ nor for a boy, to teach him the book²⁴ and to teach him a trade,²⁵ nor may mourners be comforted, nor may the sick be visited on the Sabbath:²⁶ 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.'²⁷

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

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

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 labor, 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.
20. Whose garments were more like those of men.
21. Even on the Sabbath (Rashi).
22. Of their death?
23. On marrying young v. T.A. II, pp, 28f.
24. 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.

25. This was definitely obligatory upon the father; Kid. 29a.
26. Both are too sad for the Sabbath.
27. The due observance of the Sabbath will bring recovery in its wake.

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?¹ 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.²

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?³ — 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.⁴ 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

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

about⁵ and sit in front of him,⁶ 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-goats [height],⁷ or even as ten houses on top of each other.⁸

One alone may not read, but for two [together] it is well?⁹ 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.¹⁰ R. Huna said: But by [the light] of an open fire even ten people are forbidden.¹¹ Said Raba: If he is an important man,¹² 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.'¹³ — 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.¹⁴ Alternatively, both refer to a permanent attendant yet there is no difficulty: one refers to [a lamp fed with] oil, the other to naphtha.¹⁵

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.¹⁶ R. Jeremiah b. Abba said: There is the *halachah* and we teach it so. R. Jeremiah b. Abba chanced to visit R. Assi. Now, his¹⁷ attendant arose and examined [the glasses] by candlelight.¹⁸ 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.'¹⁹

IN TRUTH IT WAS SAID, THE HAZZAN, etc. But you say in the first clause, [HE] MAY SEE; Surely that means to read?²⁰ — No: to arrange the beginnings of the sections.²¹ 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, 13a. 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.

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

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 odor, 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.

Shabbath 13a

An objection is raised: R. Simeon b. Gamaliel said: School children used to prepare their [Biblical] portions and read by lamplight?¹ — 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.**² Similarly, a *zab*, a parush³ may not dine with a *zab*, who is an 'am ha-arez,⁴ 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?⁵ — Said Abaye: For fear lest he provide him with unfit food.⁶ 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.⁷

The scholars propounded: May a *niddah*⁸ sleep together with her husband, she in her garment and he in his?⁹ — 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]!¹⁰ — There it is different, because there are no [separate] minds.¹¹ It is reasonable too that where there are [separate] minds it is different, because the second clause teaches, R. Simeon b. Gamaliel said: Two boarders¹² eating at the same table, one may eat meat and the other cheese, and we have no fear.¹³ 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;¹⁴ 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;¹⁵ but here there are [separate] minds and an unusual feature.¹⁶

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!**¹⁷ — 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 neighbor's wife, neither hath come near to a woman who is a *niddah*:¹⁸ thus a woman who is a *niddah* is assimilated to his neighbor's wife: just as his neighbor's wife, he

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

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.¹⁹

'Ulla, on his return from the college,²⁰ 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,²¹ because we say, 'Take a circuitous route, O nazirite, but do not approach the vineyard.'²²

[It is taught in the] Tanna debe Eliyahu:²³ It once happened that a certain scholar who had studied much Bible and Mishnah²⁴ and had served scholars much,²⁵ 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:²⁶ 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 travelers 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 neighbor'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, *Monatsschrift*, XXIII, 267 et seq.; 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.

Shabbath 13b

and served scholars much, why did he die in middle age? and no man could answer her. On one occasion I¹ was a guest at her house,² and she related the whole story to me. Said I to her, 'My daughter! how was he to thee in thy

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

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]?'¹ '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!² For lo! the Torah hath said, And thou shalt not approach unto a woman as long as she is impure by her uncleanness.'³ When R. Dimi came,⁴ he said, It was a broad bed. In the West [Palestine] they said, R. Isaac b. Joseph said: An apron interposed between them.⁵

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.⁶

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?⁷ — 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;⁸ this proves it.

Our Rabbis taught: Who wrote Megillath Ta'anith?⁹ Said they, Hananiah b. Hezekiah and his companions, who cherished their troubles.¹⁰ 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.¹¹ Another reason is: a fool is not assailed.¹² 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?¹³ 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;¹⁴ but for him, the Book of Ezekiel would have been hidden,¹⁵ for its words contradicted the Torah.¹⁶ What did he do? Three hundred barrels of oil were taken up to him and he sat in an upper chamber and reconciled¹⁷ them.

AND ON THAT DAY THEY ENACTED EIGHTEEN MEASURES. What are the eighteen measures? — For we learnt: The following render *terumah* unfit:¹⁸ one who eats food of the first degree or the second degree, or who drinks unclean liquid;¹⁹ one who enters with head and the greater part of his body into drawn water;²⁰ a clean person upon whose head and the greater part of his body there fell three logs²¹ of drawn water; a Book;²² one's hands;²³ a tebul yom;²⁴ and food or utensils which were defiled by a liquid.²⁵

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 niddah'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 favors the last generation before the destruction,

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

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. centimeters; 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.

Shabbath 14a

but does not defile?¹— 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.² R. Joshua said: One who eats food of the first or of the second degree is [defiled in] the second degree;³ of the third degree, [he enters] the second degree in respect of hekdesch,⁴ but not in respect of *terumah*,⁵ this referring to hullin subjected to the purity of *terumah*.⁶

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.⁷ 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!⁸ — You might argue, The first is usual but not the second:⁹ 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 tebillah¹⁰ in collected pit water, which was stagnant [noisome], and so they poured drawn water upon them selves.¹¹ [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

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

maintained, Not this [the pit water] purifies but that [the drawn water].¹²

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.¹³

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.¹⁴ But when it was seen that they [the Sacred Books] came to harm,¹⁵ the Rabbis imposed uncleanness upon them.¹⁶

'And the hands'? — Because hands are fidgety.¹⁷ It was taught: Also hands which came into contact with a Book¹⁸ 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 naked¹⁹ will be buried naked. 'Naked!' can you really think so? Rather said R. Zera, [It means] naked without good deeds.²⁰ 'Without good deeds!' can you really think so?²¹ Rather say, naked, without that good deed [to his credit].²²

Which was first enacted? Shall we say that the former was first enacted?²³

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 *hekdesch* 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.

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,¹ i.e., *terumah*]? — Delete *tebul yom* from here.

'And food which was defiled through liquid'. Through liquid of which [uncleanness]?² Shall we say, through liquid which was defiled by a

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

[dead] reptile:³ then its law is Biblical,⁴ for it is written, and all drink that may be drunk [in every such vessel shall be unclean]?⁵ – Rather it means through liquid defiled by the hands, and it is a preventive measure on account of liquid defiled by a reptile.⁶

'And vessels which were defiled by liquid'. Vessels which were defiled by liquid of which [uncleanness]?⁷ 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],⁸ [meaning] what is in the clean man's hand have I declared unclean unto thee!⁹ Rather it refers to liquid defiled by a reptile, and it is a preventive measure on account of the fluid of a *zab*.¹⁰

'And the hands'. Did then the disciples of Shammai and Hillel¹¹ decree this: [Surely] Shammai and Hillel [themselves] decreed it! For it was taught, Jose b. Jo'ezer of Zeredah¹² and Jose b. Johanan of Jerusalem¹³ decreed uncleanness in respect of the country of the heathens and glassware.¹⁴ Simeon b. Shetah instituted the woman's marriage settlement¹⁵ and imposed uncleanness upon metal utensils.¹⁶ 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];¹⁷ surely Rab Judah said in Samuel's name: They enacted eighteen measures, and they differed on eighteen measures,¹⁸ 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,¹⁹ while their disciples came and decreed that it be burnt;²⁰ 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.²¹

But still, Solomon decreed it? For Raba Judah said in Samuel's name, When Solomon

instituted 'erubin²² 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';²³ and 'My son, be wise, and make my heart glad, That I may answer him that reproacheth me'?²⁴

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. [H]) 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,

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

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, Dorothe, I, 3, pp. 584 seq.
22. V, [Glos.](#) and p. 18, n. 7.
23. Prov. XXIII, 15.
24. Ibid. XXVII, 11.

Shabbath 15a

— Solomon came and decreed in respect of holy things,¹ 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.'²

[To revert to] the main text: R. Huna said: In three places Shammai and Hillel differed: Shammai said: *Hallah*³ 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.⁴

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 weavers⁵ 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.⁶

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 day⁷ reduces [the time] between examination and examination, and [the time] between examination and examination reduces a full day.⁸

And are there no more? But there is [this]: Hillel said: One shall lay [hands]; while Shammai ruled that one must not lay [hands]?⁹ — R. Huna spoke only of those concerning which there is no dispute of their teachers in addition.¹⁰ 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.¹¹ — That is excepted, for there Hillel was silenced by Shammai'.¹²

'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

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

over Israel.¹³ 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 exile¹⁴ and took its seat in the trade Halls.¹⁵ (in respect to what law [is this stated]? — Said R. Isaac b. Abdimi, To teach that they did not adjudicate in laws of fines.¹⁶ 'The laws of fines' can you think so!¹⁷ But say: They did not adjudicate in capital cases.¹⁸) 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;¹⁹ whereas Jose b. Jo'ezer of Zeredah and Jose b. Johanan were much earlier!²⁰

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 centers 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.

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

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.

Shabbath 15b

Rather say they came and decreed in respect to a clod, that it be burnt,¹ but nothing at all in respect to the atmosphere;² while the Rabbis of the eighty years came and decreed in respect to the atmosphere that it [*terumah*] be suspended.³ 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, that⁴ was decreed in Usha?⁵ For we learnt: *Terumah* is burnt on account of six doubtful cases [of uncleanness]: — [i] The doubt of Beth ha-Peras;⁶ [ii] The doubt of earth which comes from the land of the heathens;⁷ [iii] The doubt attached to the garments of an 'am ha-arez;⁸ [iv] the doubt of vessels which are found;⁹ [v] doubtful saliva;¹⁰ and [vi] the doubtful human urine near cattle urine.¹¹ On account of their certain contact, which is doubtful defilement, *terumah* is burnt.¹² R. Jose said: It is burnt even on account of their doubtful contact in a private domain.¹³ 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!¹⁴ — 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 from¹⁵ sand, the Rabbis declared it the same as earthenware.¹⁶ If so, let them be incapable of purification in a mikweh?¹⁷ Why then did we learn, And the following interpose in utensils: pitch and myrrh gum in the case of glass vessels?¹⁸ — The circumstances here¹⁹ 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.²⁰ 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.²¹ If so,²²

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 plowed 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

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

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. [H] is inclined to agree with the second interpretation.
22. Since they are treated as earthenware vessels.

Shabbath 16a

let them not become unclean through their [flat or convex] backs.¹ Why did we learn, Earthen vessels and nether vessels² are alike in regard to their uncleanness: they become defiled and defile [other objects] through their air space;³ they become unclean through their outside,⁴ but they cannot be defiled through their backs;⁵ and their breaking renders them clean.⁶ Thus, only earthen and nether vessels

are alike in regard to their uncleanness, but not other things?⁷ — I will tell you: since they can be repaired when broken,⁸ they were assimilated to metal utensils.⁹

If so, let them revert to their former uncleanness, like metal utensils? For we learnt: Metal vessels, both flat and hollow,¹⁰ are subject to defilement. If broken, they become clean; if remade into utensils, they revert to their former uncleanness. Whereas in respect to glass vessels we learnt: Wooden, skin, bone and glass utensils, if flat, they are clean;¹¹ if hollow, they are unclean;¹² 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.¹³

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.

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

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.

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.¹

'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.]² — This [the Rabbinical law] was necessary only in respect of former uncleanness.³ For Rab Judah said in Rab's name: It once happened that Queen Shalzion⁴ 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 provide⁵ a fence against the water of separation.⁶

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:⁷ 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.⁸ Raba said: As a preventive measure lest it be said that *tebillah*⁹ of that very day is effective for it.¹⁰ Wherein do they differ? — They differ where a smith refashioned it.¹¹

And what is another?¹² 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, earth¹³ 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 clean¹⁴ if he forgets them.¹⁵ 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,¹⁶ it is clean.¹⁷ R. Jose said: The controversy still stands in its place.¹⁸

R. Mesharsheya said: The scholars of Rab¹⁹ said: All agree that, if he places them [under the spout] when clouds are massing, they²⁰ are unclean;²¹ [if he places them there] when the clouds are dispersed, all agree that they are clean.²² They differ only if he places them there when the clouds were massing, but they then dispersed, and subsequently massed together again:²³ one Master [Beth Hillel] holds that his intention was nullified,²⁴ 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]?²⁵ — Said R. Nahman b. Isaac: On that same day they also enacted that the daughters of Cutheans²⁶ are niddoth²⁷ from their cradles.²⁸

And what is another? For we learnt: All movable objects induce uncleanness by the thickness of an ox-goad.²⁹ 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.

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

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 disfavor.
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* 17a.

Shabbath 17a

May I bury my children,¹ 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.² R. Akiba said, I will rectify [it] so that the words of the Sages³ 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 width⁴ 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.⁵ 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]⁶ he agrees with R. Meir.⁷

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

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.⁸ Said Hillel to Shammai: Why must one vintage [grapes] in purity, yet not gather [olives] in purity?⁹ 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!'¹⁰ And on that day Hillel sat submissive before Shammai, like one of the disciples,¹¹ and it was as grievous to Israel¹² 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 came¹³ and enacted it, and it was accepted from them.¹⁴

[Now,] what is the reason?¹⁵ — Said Ze'iri in R. Hanina's name: For fear lest he vintage it into unclean baskets.¹⁶ Now, that is well on the view that an unclean vessel renders fluid effective;¹⁷ 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.¹⁸ Raba said: It is a preventive measure on account of tightly cleaving, [clusters].¹⁹ 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, Dorothe, 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, Dorothe, 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.

Shabbath 17b

Tabi the hunter in Samuel's name: That the produce of *terumah* is *terumah* was also enacted on that day.¹ What is the reason? — R. Hanina said: It was a preventive measure, on account of undefiled *terumah* [being

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

retained] in the hand of an Israelite.² Raba observed: If they are suspected of this, they would not separate [*terumah*] at all: [and furthermore]³ since he can render one grain of wheat [as *terumah* for the whole], in accordance with Samuel,⁴ and does not, he is indeed trusted.⁵ 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.⁶

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.⁷

And another? — Bali said in the name of Abimi of Senawta:⁸ [The interdict against] their bread, oil, wine and daughters⁹ all these are of the eighteen measures.¹⁰

Now, this is well according to R. Meir; but according to R. Jose, there are only seventeen?¹¹ — 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.¹² 'Their bread on account of their oil'!-wherein is [the interdict of] oil stronger than that of bread?¹³ 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,'¹⁴ 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,¹⁵ so that an Israelite child should not associate with him for sodomy.¹⁶ 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 PLANTS¹⁷ MAY NOT BE STEEPED UNLESS THEY CAN BE DISSOLVED WHILE IT IS YET DAY;¹⁸ 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;¹⁹ 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.
3. The text is in slight disorder.
4. V. Kid. 58b.
5. Not to retain the *terumah*, by resowing it.
6. 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).
7. *Infra* 153a; and not carry it along short distances of less than four cubits each.
8. In A.Z. 36a the reading is Niwte, i.e., the Nabatean. Senawta is probably a dialect form of the same.
9. Sc. of Gentiles.
10. They are counted as one.
11. V. *supra* 16b. This seems a repetition of the question there.
12. 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.
13. For this implies that there was greater reason for prohibiting their oil than their bread.
14. Lit., 'something else', viz., idolatry.

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

15. Even if he is not suffering therewith.
16. Thus this is the eighteenth.
17. Jast. Rashi: horse beans, used for cattle.
18. 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.
19. i.e., his destination must be near enough to be reached before the Sabbath.

Shabbath 18a

BEFORE SUNSET.¹ 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.² AND BOTH [SCHOOLS] AGREE THAT THE BEAM OF THE [OIL] PRESS AND THE CIRCULAR WINE PRESS MAY BE LADEN.³

GEMARA. Which Tanna [holds that] pouring water into ink constitutes its steeping?⁴ — Said R. Joseph, It is Rabbi. For it was taught: If one pours in flour and another water, the second is liable:⁵ this is Rabbi's view.⁶ 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?⁷ — 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.⁸ Yet perhaps what is [meant by] ashes? Earth [dust],⁹ which does require kneading.¹⁰ But both ashes and earth [dust] were taught? — Were they then taught together?¹¹

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 salve¹² may be placed on the eye and a plaster on a wound and the process of healing continues all day.¹³ 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.¹⁴ 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:¹⁵ this includes the resting of utensils!¹⁶ 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,¹⁷ 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,¹⁸ Why are they permitted? — There too [it means] with a fish hook and a trap made with little joists,¹⁹ 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 labor forbidden on the Sabbath, for otherwise there would be no controversy in respect to Friday.
5. For desecrating the Sabbath.

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

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*, [G] 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.

Shabbath 18b

why are a perfume brazier and sulphur permitted?¹ — There it lies upon the earth.² What of a tank [for brewing beer], a lamp, a pot and a spit—why do Beth Shammai permit [them]?³ — Because their ownership is renounced.⁴

Who is the author of the following, which our Rabbis taught: A woman must not fill a pot with pounded wheat⁵ 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.⁶ 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?⁷ — 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.⁸ Let us decree in respect of wet bundles of flax too? — There, since a draught is injurious to them, he will not uncover it.⁹ 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?¹⁰ — This refers to [a kettle] removed from [the fire] and sealed down.¹¹

And now that the Master said: 'It is a preventive measure, lest one rake the coals', a raw dish¹² 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,¹³ he withdraws his mind from it and will not come to rake the coals.¹⁴ Again, if it is [quite] boiled, it is well.¹⁵ If partly boiled,¹⁶ it is forbidden. Yet if a raw bone is thrown into it, it is permitted.¹⁷

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,¹⁸ it is well;¹⁹ 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 Difti²⁰ 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

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

sunset? — There the reference is to meat on the coals [direct].²¹ Rabina said: As for a raw gourd, it is well:²² 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.²³ 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:²⁴ R. Akiba comes only to explain the words of Beth Hillel.²⁵

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 Baraitha 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.

Shabbath 19a

Babylonian kutah¹ and any [other] kind of kutah may not be sold thirty days before Passover.²

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.³ 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:⁴ therefore we are informed [otherwise].⁵

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.⁶ 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.

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

Jose the Pious—that his handwriting was never found in a Gentile's hand.⁷

Our Rabbis taught: Letters may not be sent by Gentiles on the eve of Sabbath unless a fee is stipulated.⁸ **Beth Shammai maintain:** There must be time to reach his [the addressee's] house [before the Sabbath];⁹ while **Beth Hillel rule:** There must be time to reach the house nearest the [city] wall.¹⁰ But has he not stipulated?¹¹ — 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]?¹² — There is no difficulty: in the one case a post office is permanently located in the town,¹³ in the other case a post office is not permanently located in the town.¹⁴

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,¹⁵ it is well; and he stipulates with him¹⁶ that it is on condition that he will rest [on the Sabbath], yet he does not rest:¹⁷ this is Rabbi's view. R. Simeon b. Gamaliel said: It is unnecessary. But from Tyre to Sidon¹⁸ it is permitted even on the eve of Sabbath.¹⁹

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 it fall,²⁰ 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 colored garments even on the eve of the Sabbath. And from their usage²¹ we learn that white [garments] are more difficult to wash than colored ones. Abaye was giving a colored

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.²²

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.²³

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.²⁴

Which **Tanna** [maintains] that everything which comes automatically is well?²⁵ — 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.

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

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 labor.
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.

Shabbath 19b

One may not finish them [at night].¹ 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,² it is forbidden;³ 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;⁴ but here⁵ it was originally food and now a liquid.⁶ And R. Eleazar [b. Pedath]?⁷ — 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;⁸ R. Eleazar and R. Simeon permit it. And R. Jose b. R. Hanina? — He did not know this Baraitha.⁹

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:¹⁰ where they lack crushing there is no controversy at all;¹¹ they differ only where pounding is lacking;¹² and these too¹³ are similar to those that lack crushing. R. Jose son of R. Hanina gave a practical decision in accordance with R. Ishmael.¹⁴

As to the oil belonging to the pressers, and the mats of the pressers:¹⁵ Rab forbade it,¹⁶ and Samuel permitted it.¹⁷ As to coupled mattings¹⁸ Rab forbids them,¹⁹ 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 plowing and dates for trading: Rab forbids, and Samuel permits [them],²⁰ and they differ in the controversy of R. Simeon and R. Judah.²¹ A certain disciple gave a practical decision in Harta of Argiz²² in accordance with R. Simeon;²³ thereupon R. Hammuna banned him.²⁴ But do we not hold as R. Simeon? — It was in the place of Rab,²⁵ 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;²⁶ and they differ in the same dispute as that of Rabbah b. Zabda and R. Huna.²⁷

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

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

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;²⁸ AND THE FIRE MAY BE LIGHTED WITH CHIPS²⁹ IN THE PILE IN THE CHAMBER OF THE HEARTH;³⁰

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 *infra* 44a *et passim* whether such may be handled on the Sabbath. Rab and Samuel differ on the same question.
18. Keroke ([H]) 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: [H] 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.

Shabbath 20a

BUT IN THE COUNTRY¹ THERE MUST BE TIME FOR THE FIRE TO TAKE HOLD OF ITS GREATER PART.² R. JUDAH SAID: IN THE CASE OF CHARCOAL, JUST A LITTLE [SUFFICES].³

GEMARA. And how much?⁴ — R. Eleazar said in Rab's name: That it may be roasted before sunset as the food of the son of Derusai.⁵ 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.⁶ It was taught: Hanina said: Whatever is as the food of the son of Derusai may be kept on the stove,⁷ though it is not swept [clear of the cinders] and besprinkled with ashes.⁸

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?² — Come and hear: R. Eleazar said: There must be time for the surface adhering to the oven to form a crust.

THE PASSOVER SACRIFICE MAY BE LOWERED, [etc.]. What is the reason? —

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

Because the members of the company are extremely careful.¹⁰ 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?¹¹ — There it is cut up, whereas here it is not cut up.¹²

AND THE FIRE IS LIGHTED WITH CHIPS, etc. Whence do we know this? — Said R. Huna: Ye shall kindle no fire throughout your habitations:¹³ [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!¹⁴ Rather, said R. Hisda: The verse, when it comes, conies to permit [the burning of] limbs and the fat;¹⁵ while the priests are very particular.¹⁶

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.¹⁷ R. Hiyya taught [a Baraitha which affords] support to Samuel: That the flame should ascend of its own accord, and not with the help of something else.¹⁸

As to a single *log*, Rab said: The greater part of its thickness;¹⁹ 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;²⁰ R. Judah b. Bathyra said: That the fire should take hold on both sides.²¹ 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.²²

And there was a fire in the *ah*²³ burning before him,²⁴ What is 'ah?' — Rab said, Willow-fire;²⁵ 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,²⁶ [but] if they are tied together, the greater part is required;²⁷ 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,²⁸ 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 Baraitha, and so he mentions that other scholars relate it immediately to this Mishnah, whereof it is an explanation.

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

19. The fire must take hold of the greater part of its thickness before the Sabbath.
20. I.e., the fire must take hold of the greater part of its thickness.
21. I.e., the greater part of its circumference.
22. Ezek. XV, 4.
23. A.V. hearth; R.V. brazier.
24. Jer. XXXVI, 22.
25. [H]; willow twigs used for kindling a fire.
26. 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.
27. To be burning before the Sabbath, because the air has no access and it may otherwise require attention.
28. And fail to catch alight from each other, thus necessitating attention.

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.¹

R. Joseph learned: Four fires do not require the greater part, [viz.] of pitch, sulphur, cheese,² and grease.³ In a Baraitha it was taught: straw and rakings too.⁴ R. Johanan said: Babylonian woods do not require the greater part. R. Joseph demurred: To what does this refer? Shall we say, To chips?⁵ But if [concerning] a wick 'Ulla said, He who kindles must kindle the great part of what protrudes,⁶ is there a question of chips!⁷ Rather, said R. Joseph: [It refers to] the bark of cedar.⁸ 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?² 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,¹⁰ 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.¹¹

GEMARA. Lekesh is cedar bark. But cedar bark is simply wood!¹² — It means the woolly substance [bast] within it.

NOR WITH HOSEN [TOW]. R. Joseph said: [That is,] hatchelled flax. Abaye demurred: But it is written, And the hason shall be as ne'oreth?¹³ 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.¹⁴ R. Isaac b. Ze'ira said: Gushkera.¹⁵ Rabin and Abaye were sitting before Rabana¹⁶ Nehemiah the brother of the Resh Galutha.¹⁷ Seeing that he was wearing metaksa,¹⁸ Rabin said to Abaye, That is the kallak of which we learnt. We call it *peranda* silk,¹⁹ he answered him. An objection is raised: [Garments of] silk, kallak and corded [silk], are liable to fringes.²⁰ This refutes it.²¹ 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,²² 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.²³

NOR WITH SEAWEED. What is this? Shall we say, The black moss of pits? But that is crumbly!²⁴ 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.²⁵ And our Tanna? — Wool shrinks [and] hair smoulders.²⁶

NOR WITH PITCH [ZEFETH]. ZEFETH is pitch; SHA'AWAH is wax. A Tanna taught: Thus far the unfitness of wicks [is taught]; from here onwards it is the unfitness of oils.²⁷

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

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].²⁸

Rami b. Abin said: 'Itrona²⁹ 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 (hatched 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 [H] ([G]): 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. [G], silk.
19. Sachs, Beitr. II, p. 185 refers to late Greek [G] ([G], fillet) from which he derives French frange, Eng. fringe (Jast.).
20. V. Num. XV, 38. — This shows that *kallak* is not identical with silk.
21. Raban's observation.
22. Or perhaps, in a secluded valley.
23. A tall, woolly weed.
24. A wick cannot be made from it in any case.
25. As being unfit for use.
26. When lit; hence they are unfit in any case.
27. I.e., from PITCH.
28. A waxen wick (i.e., a wax candle) is permitted. V., however, Tosaf. a.l.,
29. A sort of resin.

Shabbath 21a

What is the practical bearing of this? — In respect of buying and selling.¹

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;² 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.³ R. Isaac son of Rab Judah said: It is cotton-seed oil; Resh Lakish said: Oil from Jonah's kikayon.⁴ 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;⁵ 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.⁶ The oils which the Sages said you must not kindle therewith is because they do not flow [freely] to the wick.⁷ 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.⁸

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!⁹ — 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.¹⁰ Thus the

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

difficulty still remains, [for] surely it was for lighting?¹¹ — No: for floating.¹² If for floating, what is the reason of the first Tanna?¹³ — 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]?¹⁴ — These flow [freely] in their natural state, while those [in the Mishnah] do not flow [freely] in their natural state,¹⁵ 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.¹⁶ 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?¹⁷ — That itself is [merely] a preventive measure, and are we to arise and enact one preventive measure to safeguard¹⁸ 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.¹⁹ — He recited and he interpreted it: the flame must ascend of itself, and not through something else.²⁰ We learnt: The outworn breeches and girdles of priests were unraveled, and with these they kindled [the lights]?²¹ — The rejoicing of the Water-Drawing²² was different.²³ Come and hear: Worn out priestly garments were unraveled, and of these wicks were made for the Temple. Surely that means [the garments] of composite materials?²⁴ — No: [the garments] of linen [are meant].²⁵

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,²⁶ 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,²⁷ and one may make use of its light.²⁸ 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.

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

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 unraveled 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.

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.¹ The Rabbis stated this before Abaye in R. Jeremiah's name, but he did not accept it. [But] when Rabin came,² the Rabbis stated it before Abaye in R. Johanan's name, whereupon he accepted it.³ Had I, he observed, merited the great fortune,⁴ I would have learnt this dictum originally. But he learnt it [now]? — The difference is in respect of the studies of one's youth.⁵

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 in⁶ 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;⁷ or, in respect of the statutory period.⁸

'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.⁹

Our Rabbis taught: The precept of Hanukkah [demands] one light for a man and his household;¹⁰ 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;¹¹ but Beth Hillel say: On the first day one is lit and thereafter they are progressively increased.¹² 'Ulla said: In the West [Palestine] two amoraim,¹³ 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,¹⁴ 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,¹⁵ 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 men¹⁶ in Sidon:¹⁷ 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;¹⁸ if one dwells in an upper chamber, he places it at the window nearest the street. But in times of danger¹⁹ it is sufficient to place it on the table. Raba said:

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

Another lamp is required for its light to be used;²⁰ yet if there is a blazing fire it is unnecessary. But in the case of an important person,²¹ 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 Kislev²² [commence] the days of Hanukkah, which are eight on which a lamentation for the dead and fasting are forbidden.²³ 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,²⁴ 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] Hallel²⁵ and thanksgiving.²⁶

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.²⁷ R. Judah said: In the case of a Hanukkah lamp he is exempt.²⁸ Rabina said in Rab's name: This proves that the Hanukkah lamp should [in the first instance] be placed within ten.²⁹ 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'.³⁰

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;

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

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.

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.¹

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?² 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.³ And where is it placed? — R. Aha son of Raba said: On the right hand side: R. Samuel⁴ of Difti⁵ said: On the left hand side.⁶ And the law is, on the left, so that the Hanukkah lamp shall be on the left and the *mezuzah*⁷ on the right.

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

not appear contemptible to him. So here too¹³ 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?¹⁴ He answered him [the questioner], Behold! it was said, One must not count money by the Hanukkah light.¹⁵ 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,¹⁶ it is all according to his stipulation. — Rather, said R. Joseph: The basis¹⁷ of all is [the law relating to] blood.¹⁸

It was stated: Rab said: One must not light from lamp to lamp;¹⁹ but Samuel maintained, You may light from lamp to lamp. Rab said: Fringes²⁰ may not be detached²¹ 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,²² 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 reason²³ is on account of the cheapening of the precept. Said

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

he to them, Do not heed him: Rab's reason is because he impairs the precept.²⁴ Wherein do they differ? — They differ where he lights from lamp to lamp;²⁵ on the view that it is because of the cheapening of the precept, one may light from lamp to lamp;²⁶ 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*'²⁷ 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.](#)

Shabbath 22b

second tithe,¹ one may not weigh by it gold *denarii*,² 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.³ 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 leaves⁴ them hullin.⁵

R. Shesheth objected: Without the vail of testimony ... shall [Aaron] order it:⁶ 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 mankind⁷ that the Divine Presence rests in Israel. What is the testimony?⁸ — 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.⁹ Now here, since the branches are immovable, it is impossible other than that he take [a chip] and kindle [it],¹⁰ 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.¹¹ 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:¹² but if the placing [of the lamp]

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

fulfils the precept,¹³ one may not light from lamp to lamp.¹⁴ 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:¹⁵ this proves that the placing constitutes the precept! — [No:] There a spectator may think that he is holding it for his own purposes.¹⁶ 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,¹⁷ [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 fulfill the precept.
16. Whereas the essence of the Hanukkah lamp is to advertise the miracle.
17. Sc. outside; *supra* 21b.

Shabbath 23a

With regard to a lantern which was burning the whole day [of the Sabbath],¹ at the conclusion of the Sabbath it is extinguished and then [re-]lit.² 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 minor³ 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.⁴

R. Shesheth said: The [precept of the] Hanukkah lamp is incumbent upon a guest.⁵ R. Zera said: Originally, when I was at the academy, I shared the cost⁶ with mine host;⁷ 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.⁸

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]

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

used to seek poppy-seed oil, saying, The light of this is more lasting;² 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 fit¹⁰ for ink, and olive oil is of the best. The scholars propounded: for kneading or for smoking?¹¹ — 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;¹² thereafter, he who lights pronounces two, and he who sees pronounces one. What is omitted?¹³ — The 'season' is omitted.¹⁴ Yet let the 'miracle' be omitted?¹⁵ The miracle holds good for every day.¹⁶

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

R. Amram objected: Dem'ai²² can be employed for an 'erub²³ and for a joint ownership;²³ a benediction is pronounced over it, and grace in common is recited after it,²⁴ and it²⁵ may be separated by a naked person, and at twilight.²⁶ 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],²⁷ which is absent? — Said Abaye, A certain Rabbinical law²⁸ requires a benediction, whereas a doubtful Rabbinical law does not.²⁹ But what of the second day of Festivals, which is a Rabbinical [institution] based on doubt,³⁰ and yet it requires a benediction?³¹ — There it [was instituted] in order that it should not be treated slightly.³² Raba said: The majority of the 'amme ha-arez tithes³³ [their produce].³⁴

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?³⁵ Shall we say, because of suspicion?³⁶ Whose suspicion? Shall we say, that of strangers?³⁷ then let it be necessary even on the same side?³⁸ Whilst if the suspicion of townspeople, then even [if] on two different sides it is still unnecessary?³⁹ — 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 know⁴⁰ that we pay regard to suspicions? Because it was taught, R. Simeon said: On account of four considerations the Torah ordered *pe'ah*⁴¹ to be left at the end of the field:⁴² [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].⁴³ [As a precaution] against the robbing of the poor: lest the owner see a free hour⁴⁴ and say to his poor relations, 'This is *pe'ah*;⁴⁵

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

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

- 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.

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

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'?¹ — Said Raba, [It means, as a precaution] against cheats.²

R. Isaac b. Redifah said in R. Huna's name: A lamp with two spouts is credited to two people.³ Raba said: If one fills a dish with oil and surrounds it with wicks, and places a vessel over it,⁴ it is credited to many people; if he does not place a vessel over it, he turns it into a kind of fire,⁵ 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,⁶ the former is preferable, on account [of the importance] of the peace of the home;⁷ [between] the house light and [wine for] the Sanctification of the Day,⁸ 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;⁹ 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 practices [the lighting of] the lamp will possess scholarly sons; he who is observant of [the precept of] *mezuzah*¹⁰ will merit a beautiful dwelling; he who is observant of fringes¹¹ will merit a beautiful garment; he who is observant of the Sanctification of the Day will be privileged to fill barrels of wine.¹²

R. Huna was accustomed frequently to pass the door of R. Abin the carpenter.¹³ 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.¹⁴ 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.¹⁵ [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;¹⁶ this teaches that the pillar of cloud overlapped¹⁷ 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 early¹⁸ or too late.

Raba said: He who loves the Rabbis will have sons who are Rabbis; he who honors 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.¹⁹

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].²⁰ Abaye objected: if so, let it be permitted on Festivals.²¹ Why did we learn: One must not kindle [the lamp] on Festivals with oil of burning!-Festivals are forbidden on account of the Sabbath.²² 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 food²³ must not be burnt on Festivals.²⁴ But since the second clause²⁵ 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

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

reason that one must not light [the lamp] on Festivals with oil of burning? Because sacred food must not be burnt on Festivals.²⁶

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 Rabbinat 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 honor 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].

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,¹ 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].² R. Huna b. Judah chanced to visit Raba's academy [and] thought to mention it [Hanukkah] in [the benediction] 'he will rebuild Jerusalem.'³ Said R. Shesheth to them [the scholars], It is as the Prayer:⁴ Just as [it is inserted in] the Prayer in the [benediction of] 'Thanks,'⁵ So [is it inserted in] grace after meals in the [benediction of] 'Thanks'.⁶

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,⁷ 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 fast⁸ to Rab's [ruling], because R. Oshaia supports him. For R. Oshaia taught: On those days when there is an additional offering,⁹ viz., New Moon and the weekdays of Festivals¹⁰ at the Evening, Morning and Afternoon [services] the Eighteen [Benedictions] are recited, and the nature of the occasion is inserted in the 'Abodah,'¹¹ and if one does not insert it, he is turned back;¹² and there is no Sanctification over wine,¹³ and mention thereof is made in grace after meals. On those days when there is no additional offering, viz., Mondays, Thursdays,¹⁴ Fasts,¹⁵ and Ma'amadoth¹⁶ — What business have Mondays and Thursdays [here]?¹⁷ — Rather [say thus:] on the Mondays, Thursdays and the [following] Mondays of Fasts¹⁸ — and of Ma'amadoth¹⁹ — 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';²⁰ yet if one does not insert it he is not made to

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

repeat it,²¹ and no reference is made on these [days] in grace after meals.²²

The scholars propounded: Should one refer to Hanukkah in the Additional Services?²³ 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?²⁴ — 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 Haftarah²⁵ in the prophetic lesson need not mention New Moon,²⁶ since but for the Sabbath there is no prophetic lesson on New Moon.²⁷ 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 Service²⁸ 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.

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

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 Service¹ must refer to the Sabbath:² it is a day when four services are obligatory.³ 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 Reader⁴ who descends before the desk⁵ at the Evening Service⁶ need not make mention of the Festival,⁷ since but for the Sabbath the Reader would not descend [before the desk] at the Evening Service on Festivals.⁸ — How compare! There, by ritual law it is not required even on the Sabbath,⁹ and it was the Rabbis who instituted it on account of danger;¹⁰ 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?¹¹ — They differ in respect to R. Beruna's dictum in Rab's name,¹² but it is not clearly defined.¹³

MISHNAH. ONE MAY NOT KINDLE [THE SABBATH LAMP] WITH OIL OF BURNING ON FESTIVALS.¹⁴ R. ISHMAEL SAID: ONE MAY NOT LIGHT [IT] WITH 'ITRAN,¹⁵ 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.¹⁶ 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]:¹⁷ 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.¹⁸ Abaye said: Scripture saith, 'the burnt-offering of the Sabbath [shall be burnt] on its Sabbath',¹⁹ but not the burnt-offering of weekdays on the Sabbath, nor the burnt-offering of weekdays on Festivals.²⁰ 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:²¹ 'that', but not its preliminaries;²² 'only', but not circumcision out of its proper time, which might [otherwise] be inferred a minori.²³ R. Ashi said: on the first day shall be a solemn rest [Sabbathon]²⁴

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; subsequently, 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.

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

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.

Shabbath 25a

is an affirmative precept:¹ 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.²

Thus it [the burning of defiled *terumah*] is forbidden only on Festivals, but on weekdays it is well.³ 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:⁴ the Writ refers to two *terumoth*,⁵ 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:⁶ 'thereof' you may not 'put away',⁷ 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*⁸ which is defiled? — Does it [the reverse] not follow a *fortiori*: if tithe, which is light,⁹ 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*?¹⁰ — Surely thereof' is written!¹¹ And why do you prefer it thus?¹² — It is logical that I do not exclude *kodesh*, since it is [stringent] in respect of (Mnemonic: *Pa NaK'aKaS*):¹³ [i] *Piggul*, [ii] *Nothar*, [iii] sacrifice [*Korban*], [iv] *Me'ilah*, [v] *Kareth*, and [vi] 'it is forbidden [*asur*] to an *onen*.¹⁴ 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

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

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.

Shabbath 25b

[iii] it cannot be redeemed [*Pidyon*], and [iv] it is forbidden to *Zarim*?¹ 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:² to 'him', but not for its light;³ hence it can be used for light [if defiled].⁴

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,⁵ 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.⁶ 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,⁷ and was like an angel of the Lord of Hosts. But his disciples hid the corners of their garments from him.⁸ 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.⁹

*And thou hast removed my soul far off from peace; I forgot prosperity.*¹⁰ 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.¹¹ *I forgot prosperity;*¹² 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 Nappaha¹³ said: This refers to a beautiful bed and beautiful bedclothes upon it.¹⁴ 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*).¹⁵ R. Tarfon said: He who possesses a hundred vineyards, a hundred fields and a hundred slaves working in them.¹⁶ R. Akiba said: He who has a wife comely in deeds.¹⁷ R. Jose said: He who has a privy near his table.¹⁸

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.¹⁹ 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?

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

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 fulfill 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. Honor 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.

Shabbath 26a

Let the Master say, because it is volatile?¹ — 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.'² 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].³ 'Kornim:' R. Joseph learnt: This means balsamum gatherers from the En Gedi to Ramah. Yogbim: These are those which catch hilazon⁴ from the promontory of Tyre as far as Haifa.⁵

Our Rabbis taught: One must not feed a lamp with unclean *tebel*⁶ 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]:⁷ the Writ refers to two terumoth, clean and unclean *terumah*:⁸ just as you enjoy nought of clean *terumah* save from its separation and onwards,⁹ So also unclean *terumah*, you may enjoy nought thereof save from its separation and onwards.¹⁰

[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.¹¹ 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

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

only nut oil? And what shall the Alexandrians do, who have only radish oil? And what shall the people of Cappadocia¹² 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].¹³ And one may kindle with fish oil and 'itran.¹⁴ R. Simeon Shezuri¹⁵ 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?¹⁶ — They differ in respect to R. Beruna's dictum in Rab's name,¹⁷ but it is not clearly defined.¹⁸

It was taught, R. Simeon b. Eleazar said: Whatever comes forth from trees is not subject to the law of three by three fingerbreadths,¹⁹ and one may cover [a booth] therewith,²⁰ except flax.²¹ 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. [H] is derived from [H] '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.

Shabbath 26b

R. Simeon b. Eleazar and the Tanna of the School of R. Ishmael¹ 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.² 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],³ whilst the Tanna of the School of R. Ishmael rejects it.⁴

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:⁵ I know it only of a [complete] garment; whence do I learn it of [cloth] three [fingerbreadths] square? From the verse, and the garment.⁶ Yet say that it is to include three [handbreadths] square?⁷ — Does that not follow a *minori*: if a warp and a woof become unclean,⁸ is there a question of three [handbreadths] square?⁹ If so, if it is three [fingerbreadths] square, let it also be deduced a *minori*?¹⁰ — Rather, [this is the reply]: three [handbreadths] square, which is of use¹¹ both to the wealthy and to the poor, can be deduced a *minori*¹² three [fingerbreadths] square, which is of use to the poor only, but not to the

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

rich,¹³ 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?¹⁴ — Scripture saith, a woolen garment, or a linen garment:¹⁵ only a woolen 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 woolen garment or a linen garment',¹⁶ [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 cloths, 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 woolen 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.

Shabbath 27a

— He deduces it from, or raiment.¹ For it was taught:² 'raiment': I only know [it] of raiment,³ how do I know [it of] three [handbreadths] square of other materials?⁴ 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.⁵ And Raba?⁶ — The Merciful One revealed this in reference to leprosy,⁷ and the same holds good of reptiles. And Abaye?⁸ — 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.⁹ And the other?¹⁰ — Should you think that leprosy is stricter, let the Divine Law write [it]¹¹ with reference to reptiles,¹² 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.¹³

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 woolen or a linen garment: whence do I know to include camel hair,¹⁴ rabbit wool, goat hair,¹⁵ silk, kallak,¹⁶ and seritim?¹⁶ 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

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

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.¹⁷

R. Papa said: 'So all [are of wool or flax],¹⁸ is to include kil'ayim.¹⁹ But of kil'ayim it is explicitly stated, Thou shalt not wear a mingled stuff, wool and linen together?²⁰ — I might argue, That is only in the manner of wearing,²¹ but to place it over oneself²² 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,²³ 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.²⁴

R. Nahman b. Isaac said: 'So all, etc.'

1. Lev. XI, 32, q.v. 'Or' (Heb. [H]) is an extension.
2. This phrase always introduces a Baraitha, 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 Baraitha.
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. [H].
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.

is to include fringes.¹ [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?² 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,³ [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'?⁴ How is this [to be reconciled]? Wool and linen fulfill [the precept]⁵ both in their own kind and not in their own kind;⁶ 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:⁷ therefore we are informed [otherwise].⁸

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 too⁹ let us say that other garments are included from [the verse] wherewith thou coverest thyself?¹⁰ — That comes to include a blind person's garment. For it was taught: That ye may look upon it:¹¹ this excludes a

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

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 interpret¹² 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,¹³ while I exclude night garments, which are not seen by others. Yet say [rather] that it¹⁴ is to include other garments?¹⁵ 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?¹⁶

Abaye said: R. Simeon b. Eleazar and Symmachos said the same thing. R. Simeon b. Eleazar, as stated.¹⁷ 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;¹⁸ this is R. Meir's ruling. But R. Judah maintained: The warp, when it is removed;¹⁹ the wool, immediately; and bundles of [wet] flax,²⁰ after bleaching.²¹

MISHNAH. WHATEVER COMES FORTH FROM A TREE ['EZ] YOU MAY NOT LIGHT [THE SABBATH LAMP] THEREWITH,²² SAVE FLAX; AND WHATEVER COMES FORTH FROM A TREE CANNOT BE DEFILED WITH THE UNCLEANNES OF TENTS,²³ EXCEPT LINEN.²⁴

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.²⁵

AND WHATEVER COMES FORTH FROM A TREE CANNOT BE DEFILED WITH THE UNCLEANNES 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., 'fulfill'.
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.

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

Shabbath 28a

from the Tabernacle. Here it is written, This is the law when a man dieth in a tent [ohel];¹ and there it is written, and he spread the tent [ohel] over the Tabernacle:² just as there [the covering] of linen is designated tent, so here too, [a covering] of linen is designated tent.³ If so, just as there it was twisted and the thread was doubled sixfold,⁴ so here too it must be twisted and its thread doubled sixfold?⁵ — The repetition of tent⁶ is an extension.⁷ If the repetition of tent is an extension, then everything else⁸ too should be included? — If so, what avails the *gezerah shawah*?² 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:¹⁰ the tabernacle¹¹ is called tabernacle, but the boards are not designated tabernacle. If so, [when it is stated,] and thou shalt make a covering¹² for the tent [ohel],¹³ is the covering indeed not designated tent [ohel]? But when R. Eleazar propounded: Can the skin of an unclean animal¹⁴ be defiled by overshadowing¹⁵ the dead? — [What doubt was there] seeing that the skin of a clean animal cannot be defiled,¹⁶ is there a question of the skin of an unclean animal¹⁷ — There it is different, because Scripture restored it,¹⁸ 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:¹⁹ thus the upper [covering]²⁰ is assimilated to the lower:²¹ just as the lower is designated tent,²² so is the upper designated tent.

[To revert to] the main text: 'R. Eleazar propounded: Can the skin²³ of an unclean animal be defiled with the defilement of tents?'²⁴ What is his problem?²⁵ — Said R. Adda b. Ahabah: His question relates to the tahash which was in the days of Moses,²⁶ — 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 covering²⁷ and it was like a squirrel['s].²⁸ But the squirrel is unclean!-This is its meaning: like a squirrel['s], which has many colors, 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.²⁹

Raba said: That the skin of an unclean animal is defiled by overshadowing³⁰ the dead [is inferred] from the following. For it was taught: [Scripture could state] skin; [by stating or in] skin³¹ it extends [the law to] the skin of an unclean animal and to one which was smitten [with leprosy] in the priests hand.³² If one cuts off [pieces] of all these³³ and makes one [piece] out of them, how do we know [it]?³⁴ From the verse, 'or in any thing [meleketh] made of skin'.³⁵ But this [Raba's statement] can be refuted: as for leprosy, [the reason³⁶ is] because the warp and the wool is defiled in their case?³⁷ Rather it is learnt from leprosy. For it was taught: Skin:³⁸ 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.³⁹ But this may be refuted: as for reptiles, [the reason is] they defile by the size of a lentil.⁴⁰ Let leprosy prove it.⁴¹ 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,⁴² and the skin of an unclean animal is assimilated to that of a clean animal.

Raba of Barnesh⁴³ 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:⁴⁴ 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.

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

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 ram-skins (Ex. XXVI, 14; the ram is a clean animal), is not a tent, hence excluded from Num. XIX, 14.
17. 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'*.
18. To be included in the term 'tent' (*ohel*).
19. Num. IV 25.
20. The covering of animal skins.
21. Viz., the eleven curtains of goats' hair, v. Ex. XVI, 7.
22. The 'tent of meeting' is understood to refer not to the Tabernacle as a whole but to these curtains.
23. It is so designated in verse 7.
24. The wording is not exactly as above, but the sense is.
25. 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?
26. 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.
27. Consisting half of rams' skin and half of tahash skins.- I.e., apart from the coverings of linen, etc. and of goats' hair.
28. 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 colors is referred to.
29. *Sas*, it rejoices, *be-gawwanim*, in colors. R. Joseph was an expert in the Targumim (Aramaic translations of the Bible), and given to quoting them.
30. Lit., 'by the tent of a dead'.
31. Lev. XIII, 48.
32. In Heb. [H] 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.
33. Materials mentioned in the verse, q.v.
34. That it is liable to defilement.
35. Meleketh, melakah, work, suggests a manufactured article, and is therefore applied to a combination Of materials.
36. Sc. the defilement of the skin of an unclean animal.
37. Which is not the case with corpse defilement, v. *infra* 64a.
38. *Ibid*. XI, 32. This refers to the materials liable to defilement by reptiles.
39. Or is an extension. By analogy the same applies to the defilement of the dead.
40. 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.
41. The minimum for leprosy is the size of a bean.
42. I.e., if it forms a tent,
43. 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.
44. A bean too is less.

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]?¹ — In respect of phylacteries.² Of phylacteries it is explicitly stated, that the law of the Lord may be in thy mouth,³ [meaning] of that which is permitted in thy mouth?⁴ Rather in respect of their hide.⁵ But Abaye said, The skin of phylacteries is a law of Moses from Sinai?⁶ — Rather, it is in respect of tying it with hair and sewing it with its tendons.⁷ But that is a law of Moses from Sinai. For it was taught: Rectangular phylacteries⁸ are a law of Moses from Sinai: they must be tied

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

with their hair and sewn with their tendons.² — Rather it is in respect of their straps.¹⁰ But R. Isaac said, Black straps are a law of Moses from Sinai? Granted that black is traditional, is clean traditional?¹¹

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,¹² 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.¹³ But makrin¹⁴ implies two? — Said R. Nahman b. Isaac: Mikerin¹⁵ is written.¹⁶ Then let us solve thence that it was a genus of domestic animal?¹⁷ — Since there is the keresh,¹⁸ 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.¹⁹

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;²⁰ 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;²¹ 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.²² 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,²³ and when he goes on kindling it,²⁴ 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.²⁵ 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,²⁶ 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 (א) is stamped out of the leather itself at the side of the capsule. This is part of the Name Shaddai (יהוה) 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.

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

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., [H] which is normally punctuated [H] (mikerin), but here [H] 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.
19. The reasons are discussed in the Gemara,
20. 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.
21. This is the smallest size liable to defilement (*supra* 26b); in that sense it is regarded as a whole garment (or utensil).
22. 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.
23. Since it was the minimum size originally.
24. Until the greater part is alight.
25. I.e., this twisted rag is just like a piece of wood,
26. That nolad (v. n. 3) is forbidden.

Shabbath 29a

If a Gentile hollows out a *kab*¹ in a *log*, an Israelite may heat [the oven] therewith on a Festival.² 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.³ 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.⁴

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.⁵ One may fire [it] with dates;⁶ but if they are eaten, one may not fire [it] with their stones:⁷ 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.⁸

Now, this [ruling] of Rab was stated not explicitly but by implication. For Rab ate dates and threw the stones into a pan;⁹ whereupon R. Hiyya said to him, 'Son of great ancestors!¹⁰ 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,¹¹ he ate dates¹² and threw the stones to animals. Surely this means Persian [dates]?¹³ No: this means Syrian [dates], since they are fit [for handling] on account of their flesh.¹⁴

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

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

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.¹⁵

R. Hamnuna said: The reference here [in our Mishnah] is to [a rag] less than three [handbreadths] square,¹⁶ 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,¹⁷ or cleaning a mill therewith, whether it is of prepared [material] or not,¹⁸ it is unclean:¹⁹ 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,²⁰ it is universally agreed that it is clean;²¹

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 (begeg), 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.

Shabbath 29b

if one placed it in a chest, all agree that it is unclean.¹ 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'?² Because relatively to [placing it in] a chest it is not prepared.³ While R. Joshua maintains: Since he did not place it in a chest, he has indeed accounted it as nought;⁴ 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 favor of R. Joshua [his 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.⁵

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;⁶ 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

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

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 loathsome⁷ he will come to take supplies therefrom;⁸ but as for an earthen [shell], which is loathsome,⁹ I might argue that they agree with R. Judah.¹⁰ 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.¹¹ And if we were told of these two: R. Judah rules [thus] of these because nothing interposes;¹² but as for a dish, which interposes,¹³ 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?**¹⁴ — What is meant by POTTER? After the manner of a potter.¹⁵

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.¹⁶ Said they [the Sages] to him, Thence [you adduce] proof? The house of Nithzeh is different, because they were most heedful.¹⁷

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,¹⁸ as his companions kept silent before R. Judah, harm will ensue: a stone-paved chamber is forbidden on account of an ordinary chamber.¹⁹ The synagogue overseer²⁰ of Bazrah²¹ dragged a bench in front of R. Jeremiah Rabbah. Said he to him, in accordance with whom?²² [Presumably] R.

Simeon!²³ Assume that R. Simeon ruled [thus] in the case of larger ones, since it is impossible otherwise;²⁴ did he say thus of small ones?²⁵ 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,²⁶ which is a difficulty on both views.²⁷ — '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.²⁸ While R. Jeremiah Rabbah reconciles it according to his: the chair is like the couch.²⁹

Rabbah objected: Clothes merchants sell in their normal fashion, providing that one does not intend [to gain protection] from the sun in hot weather³⁰ or from the rain when it is raining;³¹ but the strictly religious³² sling them on a staff behind their back.³³ 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,³⁴ OR FOR THE SAKE OF AN INVALID, THAT HE SHOULD SLEEP, HE IS NOT CULPABLE.³⁵ 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.³⁶

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.

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

5. The suggested reading [H] implies that a portion of a *beqed* (cloth) is taken, viz., such as itself is not a cloth (in the sense stated in p. 127, n. 9). The actual reading [H] 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. [H] '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.

Shabbath 30a

GEMARA. Since the second clause teaches, **HE IS CULPABLE**, it may be inferred that it is R. Judah.¹ Then to what does the first clause refer? if to an invalid dangerously ill, [the Tanna] should have stated, 'it is permitted'?² While if to an invalid who is not in danger, he should have stated, He is liable to a sin-offering?³ — 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.⁴

This question was asked before R. Tanhum of Neway:⁵ What about extinguishing a burning lamp for a sick man on the Sabbath? — Thereupon he commenced and spake:⁶ 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;⁷ whilst thou saidest, Wherefore I praised the dead which are already dead⁸ but yet again thou saidest, for a living dog is better than a dead lion.⁹ 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?¹⁰ Once a man dies, he becomes free of the Torah and good deeds. And as to what Solomon said,

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

'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!'¹¹ 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, Show me a token for good, that they which hate me may see it, and be ashamed?¹² David prayed before the Holy One, blessed be He, 'Sovereign of the Universe! Forgive me for that sin!'¹³ 'It is forgiven thee,' replied He. 'Show 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,¹⁴ 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.'¹⁵ They rushed upon him to swallow him up, crying, 'Who is the king of glory?' 'The Lord, strong and mighty,'¹⁶ 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';¹⁷ 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,'¹⁸ 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 showed unto David his servant, and to Israel his people.¹⁹ 'And they went unto their tents' [means] that they found their wives clean; 'joyful', because they had enjoyed the luster 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 showed 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.²⁰

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.²¹ 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 mortal²² 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.'²³ Said He to him. 'Thou wilt die on the Sabbath.' 'Let me die on the first day of the week!'²⁴ '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':²⁵ 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.'²⁶

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

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 labor 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. [H] songs. In Solomon's prayer (I Kings VIII, 23-53) expressions of entreaty ([H] song; [H], prayer; and [H], 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.

Shabbath 30b

Now, every Sabbath day he would sit and study all day.¹ On the day that his soul was to be at rest,² 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.³ Did then not Solomon well say, for a living dog is better than a dead lion?⁴ And as for the question which I asked before you,⁵ — a lamp is designated lamp, and the soul of man is called a lamp:⁶ better it is that the lamp of flesh and blood be extinguished before the lamp of the Holy One, blessed be He.⁷

Rab Judah son of R. Samuel b. Shilath said in Rab's name: The Sages wished to hide the Book of Ecclesiastes,⁸ because its words are self-contradictory; yet why did they not hide it? Because its beginning is religious teaching⁹ and its end is religious teaching. Its beginning is religious teaching, as it is written, What profit hath man of all his labor wherein he laboureth under the sun?¹⁰ And the School of R. Jannai commented: Under the sun he has none, but he has it [sc. profit] before the sun.¹¹ 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.¹² 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;¹³ but it is written, I said of laughter, It is to be praised.¹⁴ It is written, Then I commended joy;¹⁵ but it is written, and of joy [I said] What doeth it?¹⁶ There is no difficulty: 'anger is better than laughter': the anger which the

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

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.¹⁷ '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.¹⁸ 'And of joy [I said], what doeth it': this refers to joy [which is] not in connection with a precept.¹⁹ This teaches you that the Divine Presence rests [upon] man] neither through gloom,²⁰ nor through sloth, nor through frivolity, nor through levity, nor through talk, nor through idle chatter,²¹ 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.²²

Rab Judah said: And it is likewise thus for a matter of *halachah*.²³ Raba said: And it is likewise thus for a good dream.²⁴ 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,²⁵ they shall be burnt, for it is said, his lips are as lilies [shoshanim], dropping liquid myrrh [mor'ober]:²⁶ read not mor'ober, but mar'ober [dropping bitterness]; read not shoshanim but sheshonin [that study]?²⁷ 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;²⁸ yet it is also written, Answer a fool according to his folly?²⁹ There is no difficulty: the one refers to matters of learning;³⁰ 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.'³¹ '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.³² 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.³³

'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.³⁴ But a certain disciple scoffed at him, quoting, 'there is no new thing under the sun.'³⁵ Come, and I will show you its equal in this world,³⁶ 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:³⁷ 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.³⁸ 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.³⁹ 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

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

truffles;⁴⁰ and for silk robes [he showed him] the bark of a young palm-shoot.⁴¹

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.
16. *Ibid.* II, 2.
17. 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.
18. The celebrations of such, e.g., a marriage.
19. 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,
20. Judaism does not encourage asceticism; cf. Ned. 10a.
21. Or, vain pursuits.
22. 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.
23. Serious study must be preceded by some light-hearted conversation.
24. If one goes to sleep in good spirits, he has happy dreams.
25. Caused by his awe and reverence.
26. Cant. V, 13.
27. Translating: the lips of those who study drop bitterness.—This shows that one must not study light-heartedly.
28. Prov. XXVI, 4.
29. *Ibid.* 5.
30. Then he may be answered.
31. Thus accusing his wife of adultery and his children of illegitimacy,
32. 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].
33. Private prayers were added after the Eighteen Benedictions (v. p. 32, n. 3); Elbogen, *Der Jüdische 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.
34. Jer. XXXI, 7. (E.V. 8: the woman with child and her that travaileth with child, together).
35. Eccl. I, 9.
36. '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.'
37. Ezek. XVII, 23.
38. Jast: of which the various products are eaten successively; v. B.B. 28b.
39. 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'.
40. Which resemble cakes.
41. This has a downy, silk-like substance on the inside.

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

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

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?'¹ 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?'² '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 Palmyreans³ 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.'⁴ '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 nasi⁵ 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 Torah⁶ have you?' 'Two,' he replied: 'the Written Torah and the Oral Torah.'⁷ '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].⁸ [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;⁹ 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?'¹⁰ Then rely upon me with respect to the Oral [Torah] too.'¹¹

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.¹² When he went before Hillel, he said to him, 'What is hateful to you, do not to your neighbour:¹³ 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 teacher¹⁴ reciting, And these are the garments which they shall make; a breastplate, and an ephod.¹⁵ 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!'¹⁶ He went and read. When he came to, and the stranger that cometh nigh shall be put to death,¹⁷ 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,¹⁸ and who in His love for them He designated them, Israel is my son, my firstborn,¹⁹ yet it is written of them, 'and the

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

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*!'²⁰ Sometime 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*.²¹

Resh Lakish said, What is meant by the verse, and there shall be faith in thy times, strength, salvation, wisdom and knowledge?²² 'Faith' refers to the Order of Seeds; thy times, the Order of Festivals; strength, the Order of Women; salvation, the Order of Nezikin;²³ wisdom, the Order of Sacrifices; and knowledge, to the Order of Purity.²⁴ Yet even so the fear of the Lord is his treasure.²⁵

Raba said, When man is led in for Judgment²⁶ 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.²⁷ 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?'²⁸ 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.²⁹

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 [H], '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 neighbor 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 neighbor'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

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

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*.

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!¹ Rab Judah said, The Holy One, blessed be He, created His world only that men should fear Him,² for it is said, and God hath done it, that men should fear before Him.³

R. Simon and R. Eleazar⁴ 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.⁵ 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:⁶ The Holy One, blessed be He, has nought else in His world but⁷ 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?⁸ 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.⁹ That proves it.¹⁰

R. 'Ulla expounded: Why Is it written, Be not much wicked?¹¹ 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?¹²

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]?¹³ 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.¹⁴ And that is what Raba said, What is meant by, This their way is their confidence [kesel]?¹⁵ The wicked know that their way is to death, but they have fat on their loins [kislam].¹⁶ But lest you think that it is their forgetfulness, therefore it is stated, and they approve their end with their own mouths.¹⁵

IF HE WOULD SPARE THE LAMP, etc. With whom does R. Jose agree? If with R. Judah,¹⁷ then one should be liable for the others too; and if with R. Simeon,¹⁸ 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.¹⁹ Said Rabbah to him, Consider; all forms of labor are derived from the Tabernacle,²⁰ yet there it was taking down in order to rebuild elsewhere?²¹ 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],²² 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,²³ and in such a case even R. Simeon agrees since he renders an object fit.²⁴ Raba said, This may be inferred too, for it is stated, BECAUSE HE MAKES CHARCOAL, and not, because a charcoal is formed.²⁵ This proves it.

MISHNAH. FOR THREE SINS WOMEN DIE IN CHILDBIRTH: BECAUSE THEY ARE NOT OBSERVANT OF [THE LAWS OF] *NIDDAH*, *HALLAH*,²⁶ AND THE KINDLING OF THE [SABBATH] LIGHTS.²⁷

SHABBOS – 2a-31b

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;²⁸ therefore I commanded you concerning blood.²⁹

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 labor 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.