

**SHABBOS – 101a-129b**

12d

**The Soncino Babylonian Talmud**

**Book IV**

**Folios 101a-129b**



# 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](http://www.613etc.com)

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

## Shabbath 101a

R. Judah said: If it is ten [handbreadths] deep [internally] but not ten high,<sup>1</sup> one may transport from it into the sea, but not from the sea into it. Why not from the sea into it: because we [thus] transport from a *karmelith* into private ground? Then from it into the sea, one also transports from private ground to a *karmelith*? Hence it must surely mean on its edge.<sup>2</sup> which proves that they do not forbid one's force in connection with a *karmelith*: this proves it.

R. Huna said: As for the canal boats of Mesene,<sup>3</sup> we may carry in them only within [a distance of] four cubits.<sup>4</sup> But we say this only if they lack [a breadth of] four [handbreadths] at less than three [from the bottom edge]; but if they have [a breadth of] four at less than three, we have no objection; or if they are filled with canes and bullrushes,<sup>5</sup> we have no objection.<sup>6</sup> R. Nahman demurred to this: But let us say, Stretch and bring the partitions down.<sup>7</sup> Was it not taught, R. Jose son of R. Judah said: If one plants a rod in the street, at the top of which is a basket, and throws [an article] and it comes to rest upon it, he is liable: this proves that we say. Stretch and bring the partitions down,<sup>8</sup> so here too let us say, Stretch and bring the partition down? R. Joseph demurred to this, Yet did they not hear what was said by Rab Judah in Rab's name, which some trace to R. Hiyya: And it was taught thereon, But the Sages exempt [him]?<sup>9</sup> Said Abaye to him: And do you not hold thus? But it was taught: If a pillar in the street [is] ten [handbreadths] high and four broad, but its base is not four, and this narrow portion is three [in height],<sup>10</sup> and one throws [an article] and it alights upon it, he is liable: this proves that we say, Stretch and bring the partitions down;<sup>11</sup> so here too, stretch and bring the partition down. Hence [Abaye continues].<sup>12</sup> this is surely [not] an argument; there<sup>13</sup> it is partition through which goats can pass;<sup>14</sup> but here<sup>15</sup> they are partitions through which goats cannot pass.<sup>16</sup>

R. Aha son of R. Aha said to R. Ashi: But in the case of a ship too, there is the passing through of fish? The passing through of fish is not designated passing through, he replied. And whence do you say this? For R. Tabla asked Rab: Can a suspended partition make a ruin permissible [for carrying therein]?<sup>17</sup> And he answered him: A suspended partition makes [something] permissible only

1. From the edge of the water.
2. In the latter case the water is not poured directly into the sea but on to the ship's edge, whence it descends into the sea.
3. V. p, 174, n. 8.
4. So MS.M. These boats are very narrow and taper to a knife edge in the water. Being thus less than four handbreadths wide at the bottom they do not count as private ground (v. *supra* 6a), and therefore one may not carry in them.
5. Up to the height where they have a breadth of four.
6. Providing in both cases that they are ten high above the level which gives the breadth of four.
7. I.e., adopt the legal fiction that the sides of the boat drop vertically down to the water, which gives the necessary breadth to make it rank as private ground.
8. For only if we assume imaginary partitions descending from the sides of the basket, which is not ten handbreadths deep itself have we the necessary conditions for culpability.
9. Which proves that the majority reject this legal fiction.
10. So that the principle of being accounted as joined to the ground from the level which gives a breadth of four does not operate.
11. Otherwise the base would be disregarded, and the sides above would count as partitions suspended in the air, which cannot form a private domain.
12. R. Joseph's question.
13. In the case of the basket set on top of a rod.
14. I.e., even if one adopts that fiction, such imaginary partitions cannot keep goats out! and that is the legal test of a barrier; therefore the Rabbis exempt him.
15. In the case of the boat.
16. Being in the water.
17. E.g. the ruins of a hut which has part of a wall hanging from the roof: does this wall make it as though enclosed, so that it ranks as a private domain?

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

## Shabbath 101b

in water, this being a leniency which the Rabbis permitted in connection with water. But why so: surely there is the passing through of fish? Hence infer from this that the passing through of fish is not designated passing through.

**IF SHIPS ARE TIED TOGETHER, etc.** This is obvious? — Said Raba. This is necessary only to permit [carrying via] a small boat [lying] between them.<sup>1</sup> Said R. Safra to him, By Moses!<sup>2</sup> do you say right? We learnt, **ONE MAY CARRY FROM ONE TO ANOTHER!**<sup>3</sup> — Rather said R. Safra. It is necessary only to [teach that one may] combine them<sup>4</sup> and carry from one to another, and as it was taught: If ships are tied to each other, one may combine them and carry from one to another. If they are separated, they become prohibited. If they are rejoined, whether in ignorance<sup>5</sup> or willfully, accidentally or erroneously,<sup>6</sup> they revert to their original permitted condition. Likewise, if mats are spread [i.e., hung up].<sup>7</sup> one may combine them and carry from one to another. If they are rolled up, they become prohibited. If they are respread,<sup>8</sup> whether in ignorance or willfully, accidentally or erroneously, they revert to their original permitted condition. For every partition that is made on the Sabbath, whether ignorantly or willfully, is designated a partition, But that is not so? For did not R. Nahman say: They learnt this only in respect of throwing,<sup>9</sup> yet it is forbidden to carry [therein]?<sup>10</sup> — R. Nahman's [dictum] was stated in reference to willful [erection].<sup>11</sup>

Samuel said: Even if they are tied by a cloak ribbon. How is that: if it can hold them together, it is obvious? If it cannot hold them together, why [does it suffice]? — In truth, it is one that can hold them together, but Samuel comes to discount his own [dictum]. For we learnt: If one ties it [a ship]<sup>12</sup> with something that holds it still, it brings defilement to it; with something that does not hold it still, it does not bring defilement to it.

Whereon Samuel observed: Providing that it is fastened with iron chains.<sup>13</sup> Now, it is only with respect to defilement where it is written, one that it slain with a sword,<sup>14</sup> [teaching.] the sword is like the slain,<sup>15</sup> that that [Samuel's dictum] is so. But with respect to the Sabbath, since it can hold it still, even [if it be] with the ribbon of a cloak, [it is sufficient].

1. The larger ships being fastened to the opposite sides of the boat,
2. Or, Scholar, great as Moses!
3. Not via a third.
4. By means of an 'erub (q.v. [Glos.](#)), if they belong to different owners.
5. Either of the fact that it is the Sabbath, or that this is interdicted on the Sabbath.
6. While engaged in fastening something else one tied the boats instead.
7. Forming tents, all belonging to separate owners.
8. On the Sabbath.
9. The space enclosed by partitions erected on the Sabbath is private ground only in so far that throwing an object therein from public ground is a culpable offence.
10. By Rabbinical law.
11. In which case the Rabbis have imposed the interdict as penalty.
12. If it is a ship that can be defiled (v. *supra* 83b).
13. Rashi: If a ship is moored by a chain to a wharf where a corpse is lying and touching the chain. Tosaf. explains the passage quite differently but with emendation of the text.
14. Num. XIX, 16.
15. I.e., metal that touches a corpse has the same degree of uncleanness as the corpse itself (v. Pes. 14b). and therefore the chain defiles the ship.

## Shabbath 102a

**MISHNAH.** IF ONE THROWS [AN ARTICLE] AND RECALLS [THAT IT IS THE SABBATH] AFTER IT LEAVES HIS HAND, AND ANOTHER CATCHES IT,<sup>1</sup> OR A DOG CATCHES IT. OR IT IS BURNT, HE IS NOT LIABLE.<sup>2</sup> IF ONE THROWS [AN ARTICLE] IN ORDER TO INFLICT A WOUND. WHETHER IN MAN OR IN BEAST, AND HE RECALLS [THAT IT IS THE SABBATH] BEFORE THE WOUND IS INFLICTED. HE IS NOT LIABLE THIS IS THE GENERAL PRINCIPLE: ALL WHO ARE LIABLE TO SIN-OFFERINGS ARE LIABLE ONLY IF THE BEGINNING AND THE

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

END [OF THE FORBIDDEN ACTION] ARE UNWITTING. IF THEIR BEGINNING IS UNWITTING WHILE THEIR END IS WILFUL, IF THEIR BEGINNING IS WILFUL WHILE THEIR END IS UNWITTING. THEY ARE NOT LIABLE, UNLESS THEIR BEGINNING AND END ARE UNWITTING.

*GEMARA.* Hence if it alighted, he is liable:<sup>3</sup> But surely he did not remind himself, and we learnt, ALL WHO ARE LIABLE TO SIN-OFFERINGS ARE LIABLE ONLY IF THE BEGINNING AND THE END [OF THE FORBIDDEN ACTION] ARE UNWITTING? Said R. Kahana: The last clause is applicable to a bolt and a cord.<sup>4</sup> [You say.] 'A bolt and a cord!' But is not its tie in his hand?<sup>5</sup> — It means, e.g., that he intended to inflict a wound. But this too we learnt:<sup>6</sup> IF ONE THROWS [AN ARTICLE] IN ORDER TO INFLICT A WOUND, WHETHER IN MAN OR IN BEAST, AND HE RECALLS [THAT IT IS THE SABBATH] BEFORE THE WOUND IS INFLICTED, HE IS NOT LIABLE? — Rather said Raba: It refers to one who carries.<sup>7</sup> But the statement, THIS IS THE GENERAL PRINCIPLE, is stated with reference to throwing? Rather said Raba: Two [contingencies] are taught. [Thus:] IF ONE THROWS [AN ARTICLE] AND RECALLS [that it is the Sabbath] after it leaves his hand, or even if he does not recall [it], but ANOTHER CATCHES IT, OR A DOG CATCHES IT, OR IT IS BURNT, HE IS NOT LIABLE' — R. Ashi said: It [the Mishnah] is defective, and teaches this: 'IF ONE THROWS [AN ARTICLE] AND RECALLS [THAT IT IS THE SABBATH] AFTER IT LEAVES HIS HAND, AND ANOTHER CATCHES IT, OR A DOG CATCHES IT, OR IT IS BURNT, HE IS NOT LIABLE.'<sup>8</sup> But if it alights, he is liable. That, however, is said only if he forgot again;<sup>2</sup> but if he did not forget again, he is not liable, because ALL WHO ARE LIABLE TO SIN-OFFERINGS ARE LIABLE ONLY IF THE BEGINNING AND THE END [OF THE FORBIDDEN ACTION] ARE UNWITTING'.

THIS IS THE GENERAL PRINCIPLE: ALL WHO ARE LIABLE TO SIN-OFFERINGS, etc. It was stated: [If the object travels] two cubits unwittingly, two cubits deliberately, and two cubits unwittingly.<sup>10</sup> — Rabbah ruled, He [the thrower] is not liable; Raba said: He is liable. 'Rabbah ruled, He is not liable': even according to R. Gamaliel. who maintained. Knowledge in respect of half the standard is of no consequence,<sup>11</sup> that is [only] there, because when he completes the standard, he completes it unwittingly, but here that [he completes it] willfully, it is not so. But to what [does this refer]? If to one who throws, [surely] he is an unwitting offender?<sup>12</sup> — Rather it must refer to one who carries. 'Raba said, He is liable': even according to the Rabbis, who maintained, Knowledge in respect of half the standard is of consequence: that is [only] there, because it is in his power,<sup>13</sup> but here that it is not in his power, it is not so. But to what [does this refer]? If to one who carries, surely it is in his power? Rather it must refer to one who throws.<sup>14</sup>

Raba said: If one throws [an article] and it falls into the mouth of a dog or a furnace, he is culpable. But we learnt, AND ANOTHER CATCHES IT, OR A DOG CATCHES IT, OR IT IS BURNT, HE IS NOT LIABLE? — There that is not his intention; here this is his intention. R. Bibi b. Abaye said, We too have learnt [thus]: A person may eat once, and be liable to four sin-offerings and one guilt-offering on account thereof, [viz.:] All unclean person who eats heleb, which is nothar<sup>15</sup> of sacred food [sacrifices] on the Day of Atonement.<sup>16</sup> R. Meir said: If in addition it is the Sabbath, and he carries it out in his mouth, he is liable.<sup>17</sup> Said they to him, That does not fall under this designation.<sup>18</sup> Yet why so? Surely this is not the normal way of carrying out?<sup>19</sup> But [what you must say is.] since he intends it this, his design renders it [his mouth] the [right] place;<sup>20</sup> so here too, since he intends [it this].<sup>21</sup> his design renders it [the mouth of the dog or of the furnace] a place [for depositing]

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

1. Before it falls to the ground.
2. The exact meaning is discussed *infra*.
3. This assumes that the Mishnah means, AND RECALLS, and, ANOTHER CATCHES, etc.
4. Tied together. I.e., the second clause can refer only to one who throws a bolt whilst retaining the cord in his hand. If he recollects before it reaches the ground, he can pull it back; hence if he does not pull it back the end (sc. its alighting) is deliberate. But if the article has left his hand entirely and he cannot prevent its falling, the end too is regarded as unwitting, whether he recollects or not.
5. That is not throwing at all.
6. Rashi reads: But we learnt this explicitly why then intimate it in the general principle?
7. Sc. the last clause: if he recollects, he can stop before he has traversed four cubits.
8. This is all one, not as Raba interprets it.
9. Before it alighted.
10. The thrower or carrier (v. *infra* to which this actually refers) was unaware of the Sabbath (or that throwing is prohibited) during the first two cubits of its passage, recollected for the next two, and forgot again for the last two. — Of course, this is a most unlikely hypothesis almost impossible in fact. Many similar unlikely contingencies are discussed in the Talmud, and their purpose is to establish the principles by which they are governed and which may then be applied to normal possibilities.
11. Cf. p. 341. n. 8. Here too' two cubits is half the standard.
12. Even if he recollects, since it has left his hand and he cannot bring it back.
13. Not to complete the action.
14. Thus there is no controversy, each referring to a different case.
15. For heleb and nothar v. [Glos.](#)
16. He is liable to separate sin-offering because he has violated the interdicts of heleb, nothar, eating on the Day of Atonement, and the prohibition against an unclean person's consumption of sacred food. Again, since the heleb of a sacrifice belongs to the altar, he is liable to a guilt-offering for trespass.
17. On account of carrying.
18. Sc. eating, for this liability is on account of carrying, not of eating; v. Ker. 13b.
19. One is not liable for performing an action in an abnormal manner.
20. For holding the food in to carry it out. R. Han.: his design renders his mouth the equivalent of a place four handbreadths square, whence and whither removal and depositing can take place.
21. Sc. that the dog should catch it, etc.

## Shabbath 102b

### CHAPTER XII

**MISHNAH.** IF ONE BUILDS HOW MUCH MUST HE BUILD TO BE CULPABLE? HE WHO BUILDS HOWEVER LITTLE, AND HE WHO CHISELS, AND HE WHO STRIKES WITH A HAMMER OR WITH AN ADZE, AND HE WHO BORES [A HOLE], HOWEVER LITTLE,<sup>1</sup> IS CULPABLE. THIS IS THE GENERAL PRINCIPLE: WHOEVER DOES WORK ON THE SABBATH AND HIS WORK ENDURES,<sup>2</sup> IS CULPABLE. R. SIMEON B. GAMALIEL SAID: HE TOO IS CULPABLE WHO BEATS WITH THE SLEDGE HAMMER ON THE ANVIL AT THE TIME OF HIS WORK, BECAUSE HE IS AS ONE WHO IMPROVES HIS WORK.<sup>3</sup>

**GEMARA.** 'HOWEVER LITTLE' — what is that fit for? — Said R. Jeremiah: Because a poor man digs a hole to hide his perutoth therein.<sup>4</sup> Similarly in connection with the Tabernacle<sup>5</sup> such a labor was performed because those who sewed the curtain dug holes to put away their needles therein. Said Abaye. Since they would rust, they would not do so! Rather [say]: because a poor man makes the feet of a small stove to place a pot upon it. Similarly in connection with the Tabernacle, [such a labor was performed] because those who boiled the dyes for dyeing the curtains, when their materials [the finished dyes] were insufficient, they made the feet of a small stove to place a small kettle upon it. Said R. Aha b. Jacob: There is no poverty in the place of wealth.<sup>6</sup> Rather [say] because a householder who finds a hole in his dwelling closes it up. Similarly in connection with the Tabernacle, [such a labor was performed] because when a board was attacked by wood-worms, one dropped molten lead into it and closed it.<sup>7</sup>

Samuel said: He who arranges a building stone<sup>8</sup> is culpable.<sup>9</sup> An objection is raised: If one places the stone and another the mortar, he who places the mortar is culpable?<sup>10</sup> — But according to your view, consider the

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

second clause: R. Jose said:<sup>11</sup> Even if one lifts up [the stone] and sets [it] on the row of stones, he is liable? Rather [the fact is that] there are three modes of building, [viz., in connection with] the lower, the middle, and the upper [rows]. The lower requires arranging in place and [filling] earth [around it];<sup>12</sup> the middle<sup>13</sup> requires mortar too; whilst the top merely [requires] placing.<sup>14</sup>

**AND HE WHO CHISELS.** On what score is a chiseller culpable? — Rab said: On the score of building; while Samuel said: On the score of beating with a hammer.<sup>15</sup> If one makes a hole in a hencoop,<sup>16</sup> — Rab said: [He is culpable] on account of building; while Samuel said: On account of beating with a hammer. If one inserts a pin through the eyelet of a spade,<sup>17</sup> — Rab said: [He is liable] on account of building; while Samuel said: On account of beating with a hammer. Now, these are [all] necessary. For if we were informed of the first, [I would argue]: in that case Rab rules [so], because such is a mode of building,<sup>18</sup> but if one makes a hole in a hencoop, seeing that this is not a mode of building, I would maintain that he agrees with Samuel. And if we were informed of this [latter one only], — here does Rab rule [thus], because it is similar to a building, since it is made for ventilation; but [as for inserting] a pin through the eyelet of a spade, which is not a mode of building, I would say that he agrees with Samuel. And if we were told of this [latter one], only here does Samuel rule [thus], but in the former two I would maintain that he agrees with Samuel:<sup>19</sup> [hence] they are necessary.

R. Nathan b. Oshaia asked R. Johanan: On what grounds is a chiseller culpable? He intimated to him with his hand, On account of beating with a hammer. But we learnt, **HE WHO CHISELS AND HE WHO BEATS WITH A HAMMER?** — Say, 'HE WHO CHISELS, WHO BEATS WITH A HAMMER'.<sup>20</sup> Come and hear:

1. 'However little' applies to all the foregoing labors.

2. I.e., it is not necessary to add thereto, which on occasion may be complete in itself
3. This is explained in the Gemara.
4. *Perutah*. pl. perutoth, a very small coin. Thus we find an instance of very little building, and therefore this sets the standard. Money was hidden in the earth. Cf. B.M. 42a: 'Money can only be guarded by placing it in the earth'; Josephus. Wars, V. 7. 2: 'which the owners have treasured up underground against the uncertain fortunes of war'.
5. <>The labors performed there being the basis for the principal Sabbath labors, v. *supra* 73a.
6. This would never be necessary there, for everything was prepared in large quantities.
7. All these are instances of building.
8. Shifting the stone about on the ground until it is in the right spot.
9. For building, even if no mortar is used.
10. But not the former, which contradicts Samuel.
11. Tosaf. omits 'R. Jose said', and Wilna Gaon makes a somewhat similar emendation.
12. But no mortar, and Samuel refers to this.
13. This means all the rows between the bottom and the top rows.
14. Without the meticulous care needed for the bottom row, since nothing was to go upon it.
15. This being the completion of the work, v. *supra* 75b.
16. For ventilation, etc.
17. Rashi: the pin passed through the handle and made it fast to the blade.
18. Chiseling a stone to smooth it is an essential part of building.
19. By reversing the former argument.
20. The latter being explanatory of the former.

## Shabbath 103a

**HE WHO BORES A HOLE, HOWEVER LITTLE, IS CULPABLE.** As for Rab, it is well: it looks like boring a hole for a building. But according to Samuel,<sup>1</sup> [surely] this is not a completion of work?<sup>2</sup> — The meaning here is that he pierces it with an iron pick and leaves it therein, so that that is the completion of its work.

**THIS IS THE GENERAL PRINCIPLE.** What does **THIS IS THE GENERAL PRINCIPLE** add?<sup>3</sup> — It adds the case of hollowing out a *kapiza* in a *kab* measure.<sup>4</sup>

**R. SIMEON B. GAMALIEL SAID: HE TOO IS CULPABLE WHO BEATS WITH THE SLEDGE-HAMMER ON THE ANVIL,** etc.

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

What does he do?<sup>5</sup> — Rabbah and R. Joseph both say: Because he trains his hand. The sons of Rahabah found this difficult: if so, if one sees a labor [being performed] on the Sabbath and he learns it,<sup>6</sup> is he really culpable?<sup>7</sup> — But Abaye and Raba both say: Because those who beat out the [metal] plates of the Tabernacle<sup>8</sup> did thus.<sup>9</sup> It was taught likewise: R. Simeon b. Gamaliel said: Also he who beats with the sledge-hammer on the anvil at the time of his work is culpable, because those who beat out the [metal] plates of the Tabernacle did thus.

**MISHNAH.** HE WHO PLOWS, HOWEVER LITTLE, HE WHO WEEDS AND HE WHO TRIMS [TREES],<sup>10</sup> AND HE WHO CUTS OFF YOUNG SHOOTS, HOWEVER LITTLE, IS CULPABLE. HE WHO GATHERS TIMBER: IF IN ORDER TO EFFECT AN IMPROVEMENT,<sup>11</sup> [THE STANDARD OF CULPABILITY IS] HOWEVER LITTLE; IF FOR FUEL, AS MUCH AS IS REQUIRED FOR BOILING A LIGHT EGG. IF ONE COLLECTS GRASS, IF TO EFFECT AN IMPROVEMENT, [THE STANDARD OF CULPABILITY IS] HOWEVER LITTLE; IF FOR AN ANIMAL[’S FODDER], A KID’S MOUTHFUL.

**GEMARA.** What is it fit for?<sup>12</sup> — It is fit for [planting] the seeds of a pumpkin.<sup>13</sup> Similarly in respect to the Tabernacle, [such a labor was performed] because it is fit for one stalk of [vegetable] dyes.

**HE WHO WEEDS AND HE WHO TRIMS [TREES] AND HE WHO CUTS OFF YOUNG SHOOTS.** Our Rabbis taught: He who plucks endives and he who cuts greens [shoots],<sup>14</sup> if for [human] consumption, [the standard of culpability is] the size of a dried fig; is for animal [food], a kid’s mouthful; if for fuel, as much as is required for boiling a light egg; if in order to improve the soil,<sup>15</sup> however little. Are not all in order to improve the soil?<sup>16</sup> Rabbah and R. Joseph both say: They [the Sages] learnt this of an uncleared field.<sup>17</sup> Abaye said: You may even say [that they spoke] of a field that is not uncleared, but in a case where he has no intention.<sup>18</sup> But surely Abaye and Raba both said, R. Simeon

admits in a case of, ‘cut off his head but let him not die’?<sup>19</sup> This holds good only when he works in his neighbor’s field.<sup>20</sup>

**MISHNAH.** HE WHO WRITES TWO LETTERS, WHETHER WITH HIS RIGHT OR WITH HIS LEFT HAND, OF THE SAME DESIGNATION OR OF TWO DESIGNATIONS<sup>21</sup> OR IN TWO PIGMENTS,<sup>22</sup> IN ANY LANGUAGE, IS CULPABLE. SAID R. JOSE: THEY DECLARED ONE CULPABLE [FOR WRITING] TWO LETTERS ONLY BECAUSE [HE MAKES] A MARK, BECAUSE THUS DID THEY WRITE ON EACH BOARD OF THE TABERNACLE, TO KNOW WHICH WAS ITS COMPANION.<sup>23</sup> R. JUDAH SAID: WE FIND A SHORT NAME [FORMING PART] OF A LONG NAME: SHEM AS PART OF SHIME’ON OR SHEMUEL, NOAH AS PART OF NAHOR, DAN AS PART OF DANIEL, GAD AS PART OF GADDI’EL.<sup>24</sup>

**GEMARA.** As for his being culpable on account of his right hand, that is well, since that is the [usual] way of writing; but why on account of his left hand, seeing that it is not the [usual] way of writing? — Said R. Jeremiah, They learnt this of a left-handed person. Then let his left hand be as the right hand of all [other] people, and so let him be liable on account of his left, but not his right hand? — Rather said Abaye: [They learned this] of one who can use both hands. R. Jacob the son of Jacob’s daughter<sup>25</sup> said: The author of this is R. Jose, who said: THEY DECLARED ONE CULPABLE [FOR WRITING] TWO LETTERS ONLY BECAUSE [HE MAKES] A MARK.<sup>26</sup> But since the second clause is R. Jose[’s], the first clause is not R. Jose? — The whole is R. Jose.

**R. JUDAH SAID: WE FIND, [etc.]** Then according to R. Judah, one is culpable only on account of two letters of two designations,<sup>27</sup> but not two letters of the same designation? But surely it was taught: *[If a soul shall sin unwittingly against any of the commandments of the Lord concerning things which ought not to be done,] and shall do of one [of them]:*<sup>28</sup> I might think that one must write the whole noun or weave a whole garment or make a whole sieve [before he is

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

guilty]; hence 'of *one*' is stated. If 'of *one*', I might think that even if one writes only one letter or weaves a single thread or makes only one mesh of a sieve, [he is culpable];

1. Who holds that boring a hole is not building.
2. For the hole must be filled up subsequently.
3. It is a rule that this phrase always adds something not explicitly mentioned.
4. The kapiza was a small measure, less than a *kab*. If one hollows out a kapiza in a block of wood that is large enough for a *kab*, one might think that this labor is incomplete for he will probably enlarge it subsequently to a *kab*. Therefore the general principle is stated to teach that this is a complete labor. On the size of a kapiza v. J.E. XII, 488 I; and 489 Table.
5. How does this constitute a labor?
6. Merely by watching.
7. Surely not.
8. For covering the altar.
9. They beat the anvil occasionally, that it might present a smooth surface for the metal plates.
10. By lopping off dead branches, etc.
11. E.g., he cuts off branches or twigs to allow of a more vigorous growth.
12. Sc. plowing very little.
13. 'Ar. and MS.M.: as a cavity for a pumpkin.
14. When very young these are fit for human consumption; a little later they are only fit for animals, and still later, when more hardened, they are used as fuel.
15. To leave room for expansion for the other plants.
16. That is their effect, whatever the intention.
17. Where the improvement is unnecessary.
18. Of improving the soil.
19. v. 75a. This too is inevitable.
20. Since he has no interest in his neighbor's field, the inevitable improvement is disregarded.
21. I.e., the same letter twice or two different letters.
22. E.g., one letter in black and one in red.
23. So that when the Tabernacle was dismantled and subsequently re-erected, the boards should remain in the same order as before. Therefore if one makes any two marks, not particularly letters, he is guilty in R. Jose's view.
24. If one commences writing long names, but writes only part thereof, which forms a complete name in itself, he is liable. The actual transliteration is employed here and in the Gemara below, to show the exact letters referred to.
25. Rashi in 'Er. 8 states that the father was an unworthy person, and so he is not mentioned.
26. Even a right-handed person can do that quite easily with his left.

27. I.e., two different letters, since he does not give an example of two identical letters, e.g., SHesh as part of SHishak.

28. Lev. IV, 2; lit. translation. In a way, 'of' and 'one' are contradictory. since 'of' denotes a portion of an act, whereas 'one' implies a complete act. This is discussed here, the various views put forward really being attempts to harmonize the two.

## Shabbath 103b

therefore '*one*' is stated. How is this [to be reconciled]? One is liable only if he writes a short noun [as part] of a long noun: SHeM as part of SHiMe'oN or SHeMU'eL, NoaH as part of NaHoR, DaN as part of DaNI'eL, GaD as part of GaDDI'eL.<sup>1</sup> R. Judah said: Even if one writes two letters of the same designation, he is liable: e.g., SHeSH, TeTH, RaR, GaG, HaH.<sup>2</sup> Said R. Jose: Is he then guilty on account of writing? Surely he is guilty only on account of [making] a mark, because marks were made on [each of] the boards of the Tabernacle to know which was its companion. Therefore if one draws one line across two boards, or two lines on one board, he is culpable. R. Simeon said: 'And shall do one': I might think that one must write the whole noun or weave a complete garment or make a whole sieve [before he is liable]; therefore it is written, 'of *one*'. If of *one*, I might think that even if one writes one letter only, or weaves one thread only, or makes one mesh only in a sieve, [he is guilty]: therefore '*one*' is stated. How is this [to be reconciled]? One is liable only when he performs an action the like of which stands [on its own].<sup>3</sup> R. Jose said: 'And shall do one, and shall to them': sometimes one sacrifice is incurred for all of them, at others one is liable for each separately.<sup>4</sup> Now it is incidentally taught, R. Judah said: Even if one only writes two letters of the same designation, he is liable? — There is no difficulty: one is his own [view], the other is his teacher's. For it was taught: R. Judah said in R. Gamaliel's name: Even if one only writes two letters of the same designation, he is liable, e.g., SHeSH, TeTH, RaR, GaG, HaH.

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

Now R. Simeon, is he not identical with the first Tanna? And should you answer, they differ in respect of the *a'a* of *a'azzereka*:<sup>3</sup> the first Tanna holding, [for writing] the *a'a* of *a'azzereka* one is not liable:<sup>4</sup> while R. Simeon holds, Since it is contained in charms in general,<sup>7</sup> he is culpable, — shall we then say that R. Simeon is more stringent? Surely it was taught: He who bores, however little,<sup>8</sup> he who scrapes,<sup>9</sup> however little, he who tans, however little, he who draws a figure on a vessel, however little, [is culpable]. R. Simeon said: [He is not culpable] unless he bores right through or scrapes the whole of it [the skin] or tans the whole of it or draws the whole of it!<sup>10</sup> Rather R. Simeon comes to teach us this: [one is not guilty] unless he writes the whole word. But can you say so? Surely it was taught, R. Simeon said: 'And shall do one': you might think that one must write the whole word; therefore 'of one' is stated? — Answer and say thus: You might think that one must write a complete sentence, therefore 'of one' is stated.

R. Jose said: 'And shall do one, and shall do them': sometimes one sacrifice is incurred for all of them, at others one is liable for each separately. Said R. Jose son of R. Hanina, What is R. Jose's reason? 'One', 'of one', 'them', 'of them': [this implies] one may be the equivalent of many, and many may equal one. 'One', [i.e.,] SHiMe'oN; 'of one', [i.e.,] SHeM [as part] of SHiMe'oN; 'them' [i.e.,] the principal labors; 'of them':, the derivative labors. 'One is the equivalent of many' — awareness of the Sabbath coupled with unawareness of [the forbidden nature of his] labors. 'Many may equal one' unawareness of the Sabbath coupled with awareness [of the forbidden nature of his] labors.<sup>11</sup>

R. JUDAH SAID: WE FIND A SHORT NAME [FORMING PART] OF A LONG NAME. Are they then similar: the *mem* of SHeM is closed, whereas that of SHiMe'oN is open?<sup>12</sup> — Said R. Hisda: This proves that if a closed [*mem*] is written open,<sup>13</sup> it is valid.<sup>14</sup> An objection is raised: *U-kethabtam*:<sup>15</sup> it must be *kethibah tammah* [perfect writing];<sup>16</sup> thus

one must not write the *alef* as an '*ayyin*', the '*ayyin*' as an *alef*, the *beth* as a *kaf*, or the *kaf* as a *beth*, the *gimmel* as a *zadde* or the *zadde* as a *gimmel*,<sup>17</sup> the *daleth* as a *resh* or the *resh* as a *daleth*, the *heh* as a *heth* or the *heth* as a *heh*, the *waw* as a *yod* or the *yod* as a *waw*, the *zayyin* as a *nun* or the *nun* as a *zayyin*, the *teth* as a *pe* or the *pe* as a *teth*, bent letters straight or straight letters bent,<sup>18</sup> the *mem* as a *samek* or the *samek* as a *mem*, closed [letters] open or open letters closed.<sup>19</sup> An open section [*parashah*] may not be written closed, nor a closed section open.<sup>20</sup> If one writes it as the 'Song', or if one writes the 'Song' as the general text,<sup>21</sup> or if one writes it without ink, or if one writes the 'Names'<sup>22</sup> in gold, they [the Scrolls thus written] must be 'hidden'.<sup>23</sup> — He [R. Hisda] holds with the following Tanna. For it was taught, R. Judah b. Bathyra said: In reference to the second [day] 'We-niskehem [*and their drink-offerings*]' is stated; in reference to the sixth, 'u-nesakehah [*and the drink-offerings thereof*]'; in reference to the seventh, 'ke-mishpatam [*after the ordinance*]'':<sup>24</sup> this gives *mem*, *yod*, *mem*<sup>25</sup> [i.e.,] *mayim* [water], whence we have a Biblical intimation of the water libation.<sup>26</sup> Now since if an open letter is written closed, it is valid,<sup>27</sup> a closed [letter] is the same, [viz.,] if a closed letter is written open, it is fit. But how compare! If an open [letter] is written closed,

1. Though examples of proper nouns are given, there is no reason for not assuming that the same does not apply to common nouns too, both here and in the Mishnah.
2. These are complete words in themselves, and also the beginnings of longer words. SHeSh = linen; Teth = giving; Rar = flowing; Gag = roof; Hah = hook.
3. V. p. 490, n. 2 on Mishnah *supra* 102b.
4. This is explained below.
5. Isa. XLV, 5, E.V.: I will gird thee. The word commences with a double alef ([H]), and a double alef does not form an independent word.
6. Since it is not a word.
7. Rashi. Tosaf., and R. Han. Jast.: since it has merely the value of a vowel letter.
8. Even if the wood is not pierced right through.
9. E.g., hair off skin.
10. I.e., the entire figure which he intended to draw. This proves that he is more lenient.

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

11. V. *supra* 70a and b for notes.
12. Mem at the end of a word is written o (closed); in the middle it is written n (open).
13. In a Scroll of the law, or in a *mezuzah* or phylacteries.
14. Hence when one writes [H] with a closed mem it is still possible to add thereto as it stands.
15. Deut. VI, 9: E.V.: and thou shalt write them.
16. This is a play on u-kethabtam by dividing it into two words.
17. The original reads, the gamma, this being the ancient name of the letter. In the translation the modern name is used.
18. The medial forms of *kaf*, *pe*, *zadde* and *nun* are bent, thus: [H] the final forms are straight, thus: [H].
19. This refers to the open and closed mem. — Thus this contradicts R. Hisda.
20. The *parashiot* (chapters or sections) are either open or closed, the nature of each *parashoh* being fixed by tradition. Maimonides and Asheri differ on the definition of 'open' and 'closed', but the present practice is this: Both an open and a closed parashah end in the middle of the line, but in an open one the next parashah commences on the following line, whereas in a closed parashah the next one commences on the same line after a short blank space. V.J.E. art. Scroll of the Law, XI, 192'f.
21. The 'Song refers to the two songs of Moses, Ex. XV, 1-18 and Deut. XXXII, 1-43. The first is written in the form of half bricks set over whole bricks, thus: [see fig. 1]. The second is written in seventy double half-columns, thus: [see fig. 2].
22. Lit., 'the mentions' (of the Divine Name).
23. This is the technical term to indicate that a Scroll is unfit for public use and must be 'hidden', i.e., buried; v. Meg. 26b.
24. V. Num. XXIX, 19, 31, 33. The reference is to the Feast of Tabernacles.
25. Taking one letter out of each of these three words.
26. Which took place on that Feast, v. Ta'an. 2b. For a description of the ceremony v. Suk. 48a and b. The sanctity of this ceremony was disputed by the Sadducees, as stated in the Mishnah a.l.; cf. also Josephus, Ant. XIII, 13, 5 and Halevy, Dorothe, 1, 3, 480 seq. This may be the reason why R. Judah b. Bathyra sought a hint for it in the Bible.
27. The *mem* of *we-niskehem*, coming as it does at the end, is closed; but it is taken as the first letter of *mayim*, i.e., open; hence it follows that if an open letter is written closed the Scroll is fit.

## Shabbath 104a

it[*'s* sanctity] is enhanced, for R. Hisda said: The mem and the samek which were in the

Tables stood [there] by a miracle.<sup>1</sup> But as for a closed letter which is written open, it[*'s* sanctity] is diminished, for R. Jeremiah-others state, R. Hiyya b. Abba-said [The double form of] *manzapak*<sup>2</sup> was declared by the Watchmen [prophets].<sup>3</sup> (But, is that reasonable: surely it is written, These are the commandments,<sup>4</sup> [teaching] that a prophet may henceforth [i.e., after Moses] make no innovations! — Rather they were in existence, but it was not known which were [to be used] medially and which finally, and the Watchmen came and fixed [the mode of their employment]). But still, 'these are the commandments' [teaches] that a prophet may henceforth make no innovations?<sup>5</sup> — Rather they had forgotten them, and they [the Watchmen] reinstated them.<sup>6</sup>

It was stated above, R. Hisda said: The *mem* and the *samek* which were in the Tables stood [there] by a miracle. R. Hisda also said: The writing of the Tables could be read from within and without,<sup>7</sup> e.g., *nebub* [hollow] would be read *buban*; — *behar* [in the mountain] [as] *rahav*; *saru* [they departed] [as] *waras*.<sup>8</sup>

The Rabbis told R. Joshua b. Levi: Children have come to the *Beth Hamidrash* and said things the like of which was not said even in the days of Joshua the son of Nun. [Thus:] *alef Beth* [means] 'learn wisdom [*alef Binah*];<sup>9</sup> *Gimmel Daleth*, show kindness to the Poor [*Gemol Dallim*]. Why is the foot of the *Gimmel* stretched toward the *Daleth*? Because it is fitting for<sup>10</sup> the benevolent to run after [seek out] the poor. And why is the roof<sup>11</sup> of the *Daleth* stretched out toward the *Gimmel*? Because he [the poor] must make himself available to him.<sup>12</sup> And why is the face of the *Daleth* turned away from the *Gimmel*? Because he must give him [help] in secret,<sup>13</sup> lest he be ashamed of him. *He, Waw*, that is the Name of the Holy One, blessed be He;<sup>14</sup> *Zayyin, Heth, Teth, Yod, Kaf, Lamed*: [this sequence teaches,] and if thou doest thus, the Holy One, blessed be He, will sustain [*Zan*] thee, be gracious [*Hen*] unto thee, show goodness [*meTib*] to thee, give thee

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

a heritage [*Yerushah*], and bind a crown [*Kether*] on thee in the world to come. The open *Mem* and the closed *Mem* [denote] open teaching [*Ma'amar*] and closed [esoteric] teaching.<sup>15</sup> The bent *Nun* and the straight *Nun*: the faithful [*Ne'eman*] if bent [humble], [will ultimately be] the faithful, straightened.<sup>16</sup> *Samek*, 'ayyin: support [*Semak*] the poor [*'aniyyim*]. Another interpretation: devise [*'aseh*] mnemonics [*Simanin*] in the Torah and [thus] acquire [memorize] it.<sup>17</sup> The bent *pe* and the straight *pe* [intimate] an open mouth [*peh*], a closed mouth.<sup>18</sup> A bent *zadde* and a straight *zadde*: the righteous [*zaddik*] is bent [in this world]; the righteous is straightened [in the next world].<sup>19</sup> But that is identical with the faithful bent [and] the faithful straightened? — The Writ added humility<sup>20</sup> to his humility;<sup>21</sup> hence [we learn that] the Torah was given under great submissiveness.<sup>22</sup> *Kuf* [stands for] *Kadosh* [holy]; *Resh* [for] *Rasha'* [wicked]: why is the face of the *Kuf* averted from, the *Resh*? The Holy One, blessed be He, said: I cannot look at the wicked. And why is the crown of the *Kuf*<sup>23</sup> turned toward the *Resh*? The Holy One, blessed be He, saith: If he repents, I will bind a crown on him like Mine. And why is the foot of the *Kuf* suspended?<sup>24</sup> [To show] that if he repents, he can enter and be brought in [to God's favor] through this [opening]. This supports *Resh Lakish*, for *Resh Lakish* said: What is meant by, *Surely he scorneth the scorners, But he giveth grace unto the lowly*?<sup>25</sup> If one comes to defile himself, he is given an opening;<sup>26</sup> if one comes to cleanse himself, he is helped. *SHin* [stands for] *SHeker* [falsehood]; *Taw* [for] *emeTH* [truth]: why are the letters of *SheKeR* close together, whilst those of 'eMeTH are far apart?<sup>27</sup> Falsehood is frequent, truth is rare.<sup>28</sup> And why does falsehood [stand] on one foot, whilst truth has a brick-like foundation?<sup>29</sup> Truth can stand, falsehood cannot stand. *AT BaSh*:<sup>30</sup> he that rejects Me [*othi Ti'ew*], shall I desire [*eTh'aweh*] him? *BaSH*: he that delighteth not in Me [*Bi lo haSHak*], shall My Name [*SHemi*] rest upon him? *GaR*: he has defiled his body [*Gufo*] — shall I have mercy [*arahem*] upon him? *DaK*:

he has closed My doors [*Dalthothay*] shall I not cut off his horns [*Karnaw*]?<sup>31</sup> Thus far is the exegesis for the wicked, but the interpretation for the righteous is: *AT BaSH*: If thou are ashamed [to sin] [*aTTah BoSh*], then *GaR DaK* [i.e.,] dwell [*GuR*] in heaven [*DoK*]. *HaZ WaF*: there will be a barrier [*HaZiZah*] between thee and wrath [*aF*]. *Za' HaS TaN*: nor wilt thou tremble [*miZda' aZe'a*] before Satan [*SaTaN*]. *YaM KoL*: the prince of Gehenna said to the Holy One, blessed be He, Sovereign of the Universe! To the sea [*YaM*] let all [*KoL*] be consigned.<sup>32</sup> But the Holy One, blessed be He, replieth, *AHaS, BeTa, GiF*.<sup>33</sup> I [*ani*] spare [*HaS*] them, because they have spurned [*Ba'aTu*] sensual pleasures [*GiF*]. *DaKaZ*: they are contrite [*Dakkim*]; they are true [*Kenim*]; they are righteous [*Zaddikim*]. *HaLaK*: thou hast [*LaK*] no portion [*HeLeK*] in them. *UMaRZaN SHeTH*: the Gehenna cried out before Him, Sovereign of the Universe! My Lord [*MaRi*]! Satisfy me [*ZeNini*] with the seed of *SHeTH*.<sup>34</sup> [But] He retorted, *aL BaM* [thou hast naught in them]; *GaN DaS*: Whither shall I lead them? to the Garden [*GaN*] of myrtles [*haDaS*].<sup>35</sup> *Ha! WaF*: the Gehenna cried out before the Holy One, blessed be He, Sovereign of the Universe! I am faint [*'ayeF*] [with hunger]. [To which He replied,] *ZaZ HaK*: these are the seed [*Zar'oi*] of Isaac [*YiZHak*]. *TaR YeSH KaT*: Wait [*TaR*]! I have [*YeSH*] whole companies [*KiToth*] of heathens whom I will give thee.

1. The engraving of the Tables went right through from side to side. Consequently the completely closed letters, viz., the mem and the samek, should have fallen out, and the fact that they did not was a miracle. This assumes that only the closed mem was then in use, for it is now assumed that the employment of distinct medial forms was a later innovation. Hence if one writes a closed mem instead of an open one, he enhances its sanctity, since that is the older form. This is historically correct: the present medial forms were probably introduced in order to make it possible to join them to the next letter, and since this was unnecessary in the case of final letters, they were left in their original state. *V.J.E.*, art. Alphabet, Vol. 1, 443.
2. I.e., *mem, nun, zadde, pe, and kaf* ([H]). *V. Meg.*, Sonc. ed., p. 8, n. 5.

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

3. Hence the open letters, dating from a later period, are less sacred.
4. Lev. XXVII, 34.
5. Even such definitive fixing, where none existed before, is held to be an innovation. Weiss, Dor, II, p. 8 maintains that this exegesis was directed against Paul's claim to abrogate the Torah.
6. Hence both forms are of equal sanctity.
7. I.e., from both sides.
8. These words do not actually occur in the Ten Commandments written on the Tables, but are given as examples of what words might be legible backwards. For the writing would naturally appear backwards as seen from without and the letters of the words given as examples are fairly easy to read thus. Maharsha assumes that R. Hisda found some meaning in these reversed readings.
9. Here follows a homiletic interpretation of the names of the Hebrew letters in alphabetical order.
10. Lit., 'the way of'.
11. Lit., 'foot'.
12. And not trouble his benefactor too much, to find him.
13. As though with averted face.
14. These letters form part of the Tetragrammaton.
15. Such which men are forbidden to seek.
16. I.e., upright in the world to come. (Rashi): Jast. (s.v. [H] faithful when bent, faithful when straightened).
17. Cf. 'Er. 54b.
18. The medial (bent) *pe* is almost closed ([H]). — 'A time to keep silence, and a time to speak' (Eccl. III, 7).
19. Or, righteous when bent, righteous when straight: cf. n. 8.
20. Lit., 'bending'.
21. I.e., particularly emphasized the virtue of humility.
22. Lit., 'with bent head'
23. The upward turn of the 'tittle' or 'dagger' on the upper line of the Kuf.
24. Not joined to the rest of the letter.
25. Prov. III, 34.
26. I.e., he is permitted, but not actively helped.
27. The three letters of Sheker, [H] occur together; whereas the three of emeth, [H] are far apart, [H] being the first, [H] the middle, and [H] the last letters of the alphabet.
28. I.e., Instances of truth are found only at distant intervals.
29. I.e., each of the letters of [H] is insecurely poised on one leg ([H] was anciently written [H] with a narrow pointed bottom) whereas those of [H] are firmly set, each resting on two ends, the [H] too resting on a horizontal bar.
30. Here follows an interpretation of the letters coupled, the first with the last, the second with the last but one, and so on.
31. Or the passages may be understood affirmatively: though he has rejected Me, yet shall I desire him; etc.
32. Rashi: 'all' — i.e., including Israel; the sea, i.e., Gehenna.
33. A combination of letters wherein the first, eighth. and fifteenth are grouped together; similarly the second, ninth and sixteenth, and so on.
34. I.e., with all, both Jews and non-Jews.
35. I.e., of Eden, probably so called here on account of its fragrance: cf. B.B. 75a.

## Shabbath 104b

**MISHNAH.** IF ONE WRITES TWO LETTERS IN ONE STATE OF UNAWARENESS,<sup>1</sup> HE IS CULPABLE. IF ONE WRITES WITH INK, CHEMICALS, SIKRA,<sup>2</sup> KUMOS,<sup>3</sup> KANKANTUM,<sup>4</sup> OR WITH ANYTHING THAT LEAVES A MARK ON THE ANGLE OF TWO WALLS OR ON THE TWO LEAVES [TABLES] OF A LEDGER, AND THEY [THE TWO LETTERS] ARE READ<sup>5</sup> TOGETHER, HE IS CULPABLE. IF ONE WRITES ON HIS FLESH, HE IS CULPABLE: HE WHO SCRATCHES A MARK ON HIS FLESH, R. ELIEZER DECLARES HIM LIABLE TO A SIN-OFFERING; BUT THE SAGES EXEMPT HIM. IF ONE WRITES WITH A FLUID, WITH FRUIT JUICE, WITH ROAD DUST,<sup>6</sup> OR WITH WRITER'S POWDER,<sup>7</sup> OR WITH<sup>8</sup> ANYTHING THAT CANNOT ENDURE, HE IS NOT CULPABLE. [IF ONE WRITES] WITH THE BACK OF HIS HAND, WITH HIS FOOT, WITH HIS MOUTH, OR WITH HIS ELBOW; IF ONE WRITES ONE LETTER NEAR [OTHER] WRITING,<sup>9</sup> OR IF ONE WRITES UPON WRITING;<sup>10</sup> IF ONE INTENDS WRITING A HETH BUT WRITES TWO ZAYYININ; ONE [LETTER] ON THE GROUND AND ANOTHER ON A BEAM; IF ONE WRITES ON TWO WALLS OF THE HOUSE, OR ON TWO LEAVES OF A LEDGER WHICH ARE NOT TO BE READ<sup>11</sup> TOGETHER, HE IS NOT CULPABLE. IF ONE WRITES ONE LETTER AS AN ABBREVIATION,<sup>12</sup> R. JOSHUA B. BATHYRA HOLDS HIM LIABLE, WHILST THE SAGES EXEMPT HIM.

**GEMARA.** *DYo* [ink] is *deyutha*, *SaM* [chemical] is *samma* [orpiment]; *SIKRA*:

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

Rabbah b. Bar Hanah said, Its name is sekarta. *Kumos* is *Kumma*. *Kankantum*: Rabbah b. Bar Hanah said in Samuel's name, The blacking used by shoemakers.<sup>13</sup>

**OR WITH ANYTHING THAT LEAVES A MARK.** What does this add?<sup>14</sup> — It adds what was taught by R. Hanina: If he writes it [a divorce] with the fluid of taria,<sup>15</sup> or gall-nut [juice], it is valid.<sup>16</sup> R. Hiyya taught: If he writes it with dust,<sup>17</sup> with a black pigment, or with coal, it is valid.

**HE WHO SCRATCHES A MARK ON HIS FLESH, [etc.]** It was taught. R. Eliezer said to the Sages: But did not Ben Stada bring forth witchcraft from Egypt by means of scratches<sup>18</sup> [in the form of charms] upon his flesh?<sup>19</sup> He was a fool, answered they, and proof cannot be adduced from fools.<sup>20</sup>

**IF ONE WRITES ONE LETTER NEAR [OTHER] WRITING.** Who teaches this? — Said Rabbah son of R. Huna, It does not agree with R. Eliezer. For if [it agreed with] R. Eliezer, — surely he maintained, [for] one [thread] added to woven stuff, he is culpable.<sup>21</sup>

**IF ONE WRITES UPON WRITING.** Who teaches this? Said R. Hisda, It does not agree with R. Judah. For it was taught: If one had to write the [Divine] Name,<sup>22</sup> but [erroneously] intended to write Judah [YHWDH]<sup>23</sup> but omitted the daleth,<sup>24</sup> he can trace his reed [writing pen] over it and sanctify it: this is R. Judah's view,<sup>25</sup> but the Sages maintain: The [Divine] Name [thus written] is not of the most preferable.

It was taught: If one writes one letter and completes a book<sup>26</sup> therewith, [or] weaves one thread and completes a garment therewith, he is culpable. Who is the authority? — Said Rabbah son of R. Huna, It is R. Eliezer, who maintained: [For] one [thread] added to woven stuff, he is culpable. R. Ashi said, You may even say that it is the Rabbis: completing is different.

R. Ammi said: If one writes one letter in Tiberias and another in Sepphoris,<sup>27</sup> he is

culpable: it is one [act of] writing but that it lacks being brought together. But we learnt: **IF ONE WRITES ON TWO WALLS OF A HOUSE, OR ON TWO LEAVES OF A LEDGER WHICH CANNOT BE READ TOGETHER, HE IS NOT CULPABLE?** — There the act of being brought together is lacking;<sup>28</sup> but here the act of bringing together is not lacking.<sup>29</sup>

A Tanna taught: If one corrects one letter, he is culpable. Now, seeing that if one writes one letter he is not culpable. if he [merely] corrects one letter he is culpable?<sup>30</sup> — Said R. Shesheth: The circumstances here are e.g., that he removes the roof [i.e.. the upper bar] of a heth and makes two zayyin thereof. Raba said: E.g.. he removes the projection of a daleth and makes a resh thereof.<sup>31</sup>

A Tanna taught: If one intended writing one letter,

1. V. *supra* 67b.
2. A kind of red paint.
3. Ink prepared with gum.
4. Vitriol used as an ingredient of ink.
5. Lit., — lead'.
6. Mixed with water to produce a weak ink. — Others: in the dust of the roads, i.e., one traces writing therein with his finger.
7. The refuse of writing material, or the colored sand strewn over the writing (Rashi and Jast.). Others: in writer's powder.
8. Or 'in'.
9. I.e., near a letter already written, so as to complete the word.
10. To make it clearer.
11. Lit., 'lead'.
12. I.e., a letter followed by a short stroke or point to indicate that it is an abbreviation, e.g. [H].
13. In the above the Hebrew of the Mishnah is translated into the more familiar Aramaic used by the amoraim. V. *Git.*, Sonc. ed., p. 71, n. 2.
14. V. p. 492. n. 5.
15. A sort of ink. Rashi: either fruit juice or rain water. V. *Low. Graph. Requisiten*, pp. 158, 161. v. *Meg.*, Sonc. ed., p. 103.
16. Hence it must be regarded as durable and therefore involves culpability in connection with the Sabbath.
17. So cur. edd. Rashi reads: with lead.
18. Incisions.
19. Which proves that scratches are important. and so one should be liable therefore. In the uncensored text this passage follows: Was he

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

then the son of Stada: surely he was the son of Pandira? — Said R. Hisda: The husband was Stada, the paramour was Pandira. But the husband was Pappos b. Judah? — His mother was Stada. But his mother was Miriam the hairdresser? — It is as we say in Pumbeditha: This one has been unfaithful to (lit., 'turned away from' — *satath da*) her husband. — On the identity of Ben Stada v. Sanh., Sonc. ed., p. 456, n. 5.

20. His action was too unusual to furnish a criterion.
21. V. *infra* 105a. The same principle applies here too.
22. The Tetragrammaton; the reference is to a Scroll of the Law, in which the Tetragrammaton must be written with sacred intention.
23. In this word the *waw* (W) is a vowel.
24. Thus writing YHWH-the Tetragrammaton-after all, but without sacred intention.
25. Thus he counts retracing as writing.
26. Rashi: of one of the Hebrew Scriptures.
27. Two towns of Galilee.
28. Before the two letters can be read as one the paper must be cut away. so that they can be put together.
29. E.g. if the letters are written on the edges of two boards.
30. Surely not.
31. In a Scroll of one of the Biblical books. This constitutes a complete labor, because one may not permit a Scroll of Scripture to remain with an error.

## Shabbath 105a

but chanced to write two, he is culpable. But we learnt: HE IS NOT CULPABLE?<sup>1</sup> — There is no difficulty: in the one case it requires crownlets; in the other, it does not require crownlets.<sup>2</sup>

IF ONE WRITES ONE LETTER AS AN ABBREVIATION, R. JOSHUA B. BATHYRA HOLDS HIM LIABLE, WHILST THE SAGES EXEMPT HIM. R. Johanan said in R. Jose b. Zimra's name; How do we know [that] abbreviated forms [are recognized] by the Torah? Because it is written, for AB [the father of] HaMWN [a multitude of]<sup>3</sup> nations have I made thee:<sup>4</sup> a father [Ab] of nations have I made thee; a chosen one [Bahur] among nations have I made thee. HaMWN beloved [Habib]<sup>5</sup> have I made thee among nations; a king [Melek] have I appointed thee for the nations;

distinguished [Wathik] have I made thee among the nations; faithful [Ne'eman] have I made thee to the nations.<sup>6</sup> R. Johanan on his own authority quoted. aNoKY [I — am the Lord thy God, etc.].<sup>7</sup> I [ana] Myself [Nafshi] have written the Script [Kethibah Yehabith]. The Rabbis interpreted: Sweet speech [amirah Ne'imah], a writing, a gift [Kethibah Yehibah]. Others state, aNoKY [interpreted] reversed is: Scripture was given [to man] [Yahibah Kethibah]. faithful are its words [Ne'emanin amarehah]. The School of R. Nathan quoted, Because thy way is perverse [YaRaT] before me:<sup>8</sup> She [the ass] feared [Yare'ah], saw [Ra'athah], [and] turned aside [naTethah]. The School of R. Ishmael taught: KaRMel [fresh ears]:<sup>9</sup> rounded [KaR] and full [MaLe]. R. Aha b. Jacob quoted, and he cursed me with a curse that is grievous [NiMReZeTh].<sup>10</sup> This is an abbreviation: he is an adulterer [No'ef], a Moabite, a murderer [Rozeah], an adversary [Zorer], an abomination [To'ebah]. R. Nahman b. Isaac quoted, What shall we speak<sup>7</sup> or how shall we clear ourselves [NiZTaDaK]:<sup>11</sup> We are honest [Nekonim], we are righteous [Zaddikim], we are pure [Tehorim], we are submissive [Dakkim], we are holy [Kedoshim].

*MISHNAH.* IF ONE WRITES TWO LETTERS IN TWO STATES OF UNAWARENESS, ONE IN THE MORNING AND ONE IN THE EVENING, R. GAMALIEL HOLDS HIM LIABLE, WHILST THE SAGES EXEMPT HIM.

*GEMARA.* Wherein do they differ? — R. Gamaliel holds: Awareness in respect of half the standard is of no account; whilst the Rabbis hold: Awareness in respect of half the standard is of account.<sup>12</sup>

## CHAPTER XIII

*MISHNAH.* R. ELIEZER SAID: HE WHO WEAVES THREE THREADS AT THE BEGINNING<sup>13</sup> OR ONE [THREAD] ADDED TO<sup>14</sup> WOVEN STUFF, IS CULPABLE; BUT THE SAGES MAINTAIN: WHETHER AT THE BEGINNING OR AT THE END, THE STANDARD [FOR CULPABLE] IS TWO

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

THREADS. HE WHO MAKES TWO MESHES, ATTACHING THEM EITHER TO THE CROSS-PIECES [NIRIM] OR TO THE SLIPS [KEROS], OR IN A WINNOW, SIEVE, OR BASKET, IS CULPABLE. AND HE WHO SEWS TWO STITCHES, AND HE WHO TEARS IN ORDER TO SEW TWO STITCHES [IS LIKEWISE CULPABLE].

*GEMARA.* When R. Isaac came,<sup>15</sup> he recited: Two. But we learnt THREE? — There is no difficulty: the one refers to thick [threads], the other to thin [ones]. Some explain it in one way, others explain it the reverse. Some explain it in one way: [of] thick threads, three will not break, but two will break;<sup>16</sup> [of] thin threads, even two will not break. Others explain it the reverse: [of] thin [threads], three are noticeable<sup>17</sup> whereas two are not.<sup>18</sup> [of] thick threads, even two are noticeable.

It was taught: He who weaves three threads at the beginning or one thread added to woven stuff, is culpable; but the Sages maintain: Whether at the beginning or at the end, the standard is two threads, and at the selvedge, two threads over the breadth of three meshes. To what is this like? To weaving a small belt two threads over the breadth of three meshes [in size].<sup>19</sup> [Now,] 'He who weaves three threads at the beginning or one thread added to woven stuff, is culpable': this anonymous [teaching] is in' agreement with R. Eliezer. Another [Baraita] taught: He who weaves two threads added to<sup>20</sup> the border of the web<sup>21</sup> or to the hem,<sup>22</sup> is culpable. R. Eliezer said: Even one. And at the selvedge, two threads over the breadth of three meshes. To what is this like? To weaving a small belt two or three threads over the breadth of three meshes [in size]. 'He who weaves two threads added to the border of the web or to the hem, is culpable': this anonymous [teaching is] in agreement with the Rabbis.

HE WHO MAKES TWO MESHES, ATTACHING THEM EITHER TO THE CROSS-PIECES [NIRIM]. What does, 'TO THE NIRIM' mean? — Said Abaye: Two in a mesh and one in the cross-piece.

OR TO THE SLIPS [KEROS]. What is KEROS? — Said Rab: The slips.<sup>23</sup>

AND HE WHO SEWS TWO STITCHES. But we have [already] learnt it in [the list of] principal labors: 'and he who sews two stitches?<sup>24</sup> — Because he wishes to teach the second clause: AND HE WHO TEARS IN ORDER TO SEW TWO STITCHES, he also teaches, AND HE WHO SEWS, [etc.]. But we learnt about tearing too in [the list of] principal labors? Rather because he wishes to teach in a subsequent clause, 'He who tears in his anger or for his dead',<sup>25</sup> he therefore teaches [here], HE WHO SEWS TWO STITCHES.

AND HE WHO TEARS IN ORDER TO SEW TWO STITCHES. How is that possible?

1. If he intends writing a heth and writes two zayinin.
2. The references to a Scroll of the Law, where certain letters, including the [H], are embellished with 'tittles', 'daggers'. If one writes [H] instead of [H] (in a Scroll of the law [H] is written as a double [H], thus: [H]) but without the daggers, he is not culpable; with the daggers, he is culpable.
3. Here too the *waw* is used vocally, but is interpreted consonantly.
4. Gen. XVII, 5.
5. H and [H] interchange.
6. Thus AB Hamwn is interpreted as an abbreviation.
7. Ex. XX, 1.
8. Num. XXII, 32.
9. Lev. XXIII, 14.
10. 1 Kings II 8.
11. Gen. XLIV, 16.
12. V. *supra* 71b; 102a.
13. Of a garment or a piece of cloth. V. Halevy, Doroth, I, 3, pp. 261 seq.
14. Lit., 'upon'.
15. From Palestine to Babylon; cf. p. 12, n. 9.
16. Under their own weight. Or, the thickness of the thread prevents them from being closely woven; hence if there are only two they may split.
17. Lit., 'known'.
18. One cannot see that anything substantial has been made; therefore he is not culpable.
19. Therefore weaving this amount on the selvedge is a culpable offence.
20. Lit., upon'.

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

21. Or, thickly woven material.
22. Rashi: made at the beginning of the cloth.
23. Jast.: the thrums or slips to which the threads of the warp are attached.
24. *Supra* 73a.
25. *Infra* b.

## Shabbath 105b

— If he made it [the garment] like a pocket.<sup>1</sup>

**MISHNAH.** HE WHO TEARS IN HIS ANGER OR [IN MOURNING] FOR HIS DEAD,<sup>2</sup> AND ALL WHO EFFECT DAMAGE ARE EXEMPT; BUT HE WHO DAMAGES IN ORDER TO REPAIR,<sup>3</sup> HIS STANDARD [FOR CULPABILITY] IS AS FOR REPAIRING. THE STANDARD OF BLEACHING [WOOL], HATCHELLING, DYEING OR SPINNING IT, IS A FULL DOUBLE SIT.<sup>4</sup> AND HE WHO WEAVES TWO THREADS TOGETHER, HIS STANDARD IS A FULL SIT.

**GEMARA.** But the following contradicts this: He who rends [his garment] in his anger, in his mourning or for his dead, is guilty, and though he desecrates the Sabbath, he has fulfilled his duty of rending?<sup>5</sup> — There is no difficulty: the one refers to his dead,<sup>6</sup> the other to the dead in general.<sup>7</sup> But he [our Tanna] states, HIS DEAD? — After all, it does refer to his dead,<sup>8</sup> but those for whom there is no duty of mourning?<sup>9</sup> Now, if he [the dead] was a Sage, he is indeed bound [to rend his garments]? For it was taught: If a Sage dies, all are his kinsmen. All are his kinsmen! can you think so? Rather say, all are as his kinsmen, [i.e.] all must rend [their garments] for him; all must bare [their shoulders] for him,<sup>10</sup> and all partake of the [mourner's] meal for him in a public square!<sup>11</sup> — This holds good only if he was not a Sage. But [even] if he was [merely] a worthy man, one is indeed bound [to rend his garments]? For it was taught: Why do a man's sons and daughters die in childhood? So that he may weep and mourn for a worthy man? 'So that he may weep' — is a pledge taken!<sup>12</sup> But because he did not weep and mourn for a worthy man, for whoever weeps for a worthy man is forgiven all his iniquities

on account of the honor which he showed him! — This holds good only if he was not a worthy man. But if he stood [there] at the parting of the soul<sup>13</sup> he is indeed bound? For it was taught, R. Simeon b. Eleazar said: He who stands by the dead at the parting of the soul is bound to rend [his garments]: [for] what does this resemble? A scroll of the Law that is burnt!<sup>14</sup> — This holds good only if he was not standing there at the moment of death.

Now, that is well in respect to his dead. But [the two statements concerning tearing] in one's anger are contradictory? — These too cause no difficulty: one agrees with R. Judah, the other with R. Simeon. One agrees with R. Judah, who maintained: One is liable in respect of a labor which is not required per se, the other with R. Simeon, who maintained: One is exempt in respect of a labor which is not required per se.<sup>15</sup> But you know R. Judah [to rule thus] in the case of one who repairs? do you know him [to rule thus] in the case of one who causes damage? — Said R. Abin: This man too effects an improvement, because he appeases his wrath. But is it permitted [to affect this] in such a manner? Surely it was taught, R. Simeon b. Eleazar said in the name of Halfa b. Agra in R. Johanan b. Nuri's name: He who rends his garments in his anger, he who breaks his vessels in his anger, and he who scatters his money in his anger, regard him as an idolater, because such are the wiles of the Tempter: To-day he says to him, 'Do this'; to-morrow he tells him, 'Do that,' until he bids him, 'Go and serve idols,' and he goes and serves [them].<sup>16</sup> R. Abin observed: What verse [intimates this]? There shall be no strange god in thee; neither shalt thou worship any strange god;<sup>17</sup> who is the strange god that resides in man himself? Say, that is the Tempter!<sup>18</sup> — This holds good only where he does it in order to instill fear in his household, even as Rab Judah pulled the thrums [of his garment];<sup>19</sup> R. Aha b. Jacob broke broken vessels; R. Shesheth threw brine on his maidservant's head; R. Abba broke a lid.

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

R. Simeon b. Pazzi said in the name of R. Joshua b. Levi in Bar Kappara's name: If one sheds tears for a worthy man, the Holy One, blessed be He, counts them and lays them up in His treasure house, for it is said, Thou countest my grievings: Put thou my tear into thy bottle; Are they not in thy book?<sup>20</sup> Rab Judah said in Rab's name: He who is slothful to lament a Sage deserves to be buried alive, because it is said, And they buried him in the border of his inheritance in Timnath-serah, which is in the hill country of Ephraim; on the north of the mountain of Gaash:<sup>21</sup> this teaches that the mountain raged against them to slay them.<sup>22</sup> R. Hiyya b. Abba said in R. Johanan's name: He who is slothful to lament a Sage will not prolong his days, [this being] measure for measure, as it is said, In measure, when thou sendest her away, thou dost contend with her.<sup>23</sup> R. Hiyya b. Abba objected to R. Johanan: And Israel served the Lord all the days of Joshua and all the days of the elders who prolonged their days after Joshua?<sup>24</sup> — O Babylonian! answered he, they prolonged 'their days',<sup>25</sup> but not years. If so, that your days may be multiplied, and the days of your children.<sup>26</sup> [does that mean] days but not years! — A blessing is different.<sup>27</sup>

R. Hiyya b. Abba also said in R. Johanan's name]: When one of brothers dies,

1. Rashi: bulging and creasing, so that part has to be torn open in order for it to be resewn.
2. At the death of one's parents, brothers, sisters, children, wife or husband the garments are rent.
3. As in the example mentioned immediately preceding the Mishnah.
4. Rashi: the distance between the tips of the index finger and middle finger when held wide apart, v. Gemara.
5. Sc. for the dead.
6. Sc. those enumerated in p. 508. n. 9. Since rending is a duty there, it is an act of positive value, and he is liable.
7. Though he rends his garment in grief, it is not actually necessary.
8. I.e., one whom through certain circumstances it is his duty to bury.
9. I.e., other than those enumerated in p. 508, n. 9.
10. This was a mourning rite in former times, but is no longer practiced.

11. The first meal after the funeral is called the meal of comfort (se'udath habra'ah), and is supplied by friends of the mourner. In the case of a Sage all must partake of such a meal.
12. For the future surely not!
13. I.e., at the moment of death.
14. If one sees this he must rend his garments, and even the most ignorant and the most worthless Jew has some knowledge thereof and has fulfilled some of its precepts.
15. V. *supra* 30a.
16. Since then this is forbidden, he cannot be held to effect an improvement.
17. Ps. LXXXI, 10.
18. This shows that no real separate identity was ascribed to the source of evil, of which the Tempter is merely a personification; cf. Joseph, M., 'Judaism as Creed and Life', pp. 65-68.
19. To show his anger.
20. Ps. LVI, 9.
21. Josh. XXIV, 30. 'Gaash' is derived from a root meaning to tremble or rage.
22. Because they did not fittingly lament him.
23. Isa. XXVII, 8.
24. Josh. *ibid.* 31. Thus they lived long in spite of their failure to mourn for Joshua.
25. (Maharsha: Their days seemed prolonged on account of the difficult times they experienced, v. however Rashi.)
26. Deut. XI, 21.
27. [The length of days in the case of a blessing can be only another expression for length of years, cf. n. 6.]

## Shabbath 106a

all the other brothers should fear. When one of a company dies, the whole company should fear. Some say that this means where the eldest [or chief] dies; others say, where the youngest<sup>1</sup> dies.

AND ALL WHO AFFECT DAMAGE ARE EXEMPT. R. Abbahu recited before R. Johanan: All who cause damage are exempt, except he who wounds and he who sets fire [to a stack of corn]. Said he to him, Go and recite it outside:<sup>2</sup> wounding and setting fire is not a Mishnah;<sup>3</sup> and should you say that it is a Mishnah, wounding refers to one who needs [the blood] for his dog, and setting fire, to one who needs the ashes.<sup>4</sup> But we learnt, ALL WHO EFFECT DAMAGE ARE EXEMPT?<sup>5</sup> — Our Mishnah is [in accordance with] R. Judah, while the Baraitha<sup>6</sup> [agrees with] R. Simeon. What is

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

R. Simeon's reason? — Since a verse is required to permit circumcision [on the Sabbath],<sup>2</sup> it follows that for wounding elsewhere one is liable. And since the Divine Law forbade burning in respect of a priest's [adulterous] daughter,<sup>3</sup> it follows that for kindling a fire in general one is liable. And R. Judah?<sup>2</sup> -There he effects an improvement, even as R. Ashi [said]. For R. Ashi said: What is the difference whether one repairs [the foreskin by] circumcision or one repairs a utensil: what is the difference whether one boils [melts] the lead bar<sup>10</sup> or one boils dyes?

THE STANDARD OF BLEACHING, etc. R. Joseph indicated the double [measure]; R. Hiyya b. Ammi showed the single [measure].<sup>11</sup>

**MISHNAH.** R. JUDAH SAID: HE WHO HUNTS A BIRD [AND DRIVES IT] INTO A TURRET, OR A DEER INTO A HOUSE, IS GUILTY; BUT THE SAGES MAINTAIN: [HE WHO HUNTS] A BIRD INTO A TURRET,

1. Or, least important.
2. It is not an authenticated teaching to be admitted to the school.
3. I.e., no Mishnah states that these are exceptions.
4. For medical purposes. Then the wounding and setting fire is beneficial, not a damage-effecting labor.
5. Which refutes n. Abbahu.
6. Cited by R. Abbahu.
7. V. *infra* 132a.
8. Who may not be thus executed on the Sabbath, Sanh. 35b.
9. How does he refute these arguments?
10. Death by fire was carried out by pouring molten lead down the condemned person's throat, Sanh. 52a.
11. [Rashi: The distance between the tips of the index and middle fingers held widely apart, which is the measure of a single sit, is half the distance between the tips of the outstretched thumb and index finger. Thus, whereas R. Joseph using the smaller unit indicated by gesture a double measure to explain the meaning of DOUBLE SIT', R. Hiyya b. Ammi, using the larger unit, indicated a single measure. For other interpretations v. Jast. s.v. [H].]

## Shabbath 106b

AND A DEER INTO A GARDEN,<sup>1</sup> COURTYARD OR VIVARIUM, IS LIABLE. R.

SIMEON B. GAMALIEL SAID: NOT ALL VIVARIA ARE ALIKE. THIS IS THE GENERAL PRINCIPLE: IF IT [STILL] NEEDS TO BE CAUGHT, HE IS EXEMPT IF IT DOES NOT STILL NEED TO BE CAUGHT,<sup>2</sup> HE IS LIABLE.

**GEMARA.** We learnt elsewhere: Fish may not be caught out of aquaria on a Festival, nor may food be placed before them; but beasts and birds may be caught out of vivaria, and food may be placed before them. But the following contradicts it: As for vivaria of beasts, birds and fish, one may not catch [the animals, etc.] out of them on a Festival, and we may not place food before them: [thus the rulings on] beasts are contradictory, and [the rulings on] birds are contradictory. As for [the rulings on] beasts, it is well: there is no difficulty, one agreeing with R. Judah,<sup>3</sup> the other with the Rabbis.<sup>4</sup> But [the rulings on] birds are contradictory? And should you say, [The rulings on] birds too are not contradictory: one refers to a covered vivarium,<sup>5</sup> whereas the other refers to an uncovered vivarium — [It might be asked]: But a house is covered, yet both R. Judah and the Rabbis hold, Only [if one hunts a bird] into a turret [is he culpable], but not [if he hunts it] into a house? — Said Rabbah b. R. Huna: Here we treat of a free bird,<sup>6</sup> [the reason being] because it does not submit to domestication.<sup>7</sup> For the School of R. Ishmael taught: Why is it called a free bird? Because it dwells in a house [free] just as in the field. Now that you have arrived at this [answer], [the rulings on] beasts too are not contradictory: one refers to a large vivarium, the other to a small vivarium. What is a large vivarium and what is a small vivarium? Said R. Ashi: Where one can run after and catch it with a single lunge, that is a small vivarium; any other is a large vivarium. Alternatively, if the shadows of the walls fall upon each other, it is a small vivarium; otherwise it is a large vivarium. Alternatively, if there are not many recesses,<sup>8</sup> it is a small vivarium; otherwise it is a large vivarium.<sup>9</sup>

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

R. SIMEON B. GAMALIEL SAID, etc. R. Joseph said in Rab Judah's name in Samuel's name: The *halachah* is as R. Simeon b. Gamaliel. Said Abaye to him, [You say,] The *halachah* [etc.]: hence it follows that they [the Rabbis] disagree?<sup>10</sup> And what difference does that make? he replied.<sup>11</sup> Shall one learn a tradition as it were [merely] a song? he retorted.<sup>12</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: If one catches a deer that is blind or asleep, he is culpable; a deer that is lame, aged or sick, he is exempt. Abaye asked R. Joseph: What is the difference between them? — The former try to escape;<sup>13</sup> the latter do not try to escape. But it was taught: [If one catches] a sick [deer] he is culpable? — Said R. Shesheth, There is no difficulty: one refers to [an animal] sick with fever;<sup>14</sup> the other to [an animal] sick through exhaustion.

Our Rabbis taught: He who catches locusts, gazin,<sup>15</sup> hornets, or gnats on the Sabbath is culpable: that is the view of R. Meir. But the Sages rule: If that species is hunted, one is liable; if that species is not hunted, one is not liable.<sup>16</sup> Another [Baraitha] taught: He who catches locusts at the time of dew is not liable;<sup>17</sup> at the time of dry heat [midday], is liable. Eleazar b. Mahabai said: If they advance in thick swarms, he is not culpable.<sup>18</sup> The scholars asked: Does Eleazar b. Mahabai refer to the first clause or to the last? — Come and hear: He who catches locusts at the time of dew is not liable; at the time of dry heat, is liable. Eleazar b. Mahabai said: Even at the time of dry heat, if they advance in thick swarms he is not culpable.

**MISHNAH.** IF A DEER ENTERS A HOUSE AND ONE PERSON SHUTS [THE DOOR] BEFORE IT, HE IS CULPABLE; IF TWO SHUT IT, THEY ARE EXEMPT. IF ONE COULD NOT SHUT IT, AND BOTH SHUT IT, THEY ARE CULPABLE. R. SIMEON DECLARES [THEM] EXEMPT.<sup>19</sup>

**GEMARA.** R. Jeremiah b. Abba said in Samuel's name: If one catches a lion on the

Sabbath he is not culpable unless he entices it into its cage.

**MISHNAH.** IF ONE SITS DOWN IN THE DOORWAY BUT DOES NOT FILL IT, AND A SECOND SITS DOWN AND FILLS IT,<sup>20</sup> THE SECOND IS CULPABLE. IF THE FIRST SITS DOWN IN THE DOORWAY AND FILLS IT, AND A SECOND COMES AND SITS DOWN AT HIS SIDE, EVEN IF THE FIRST [THEN] RISES AND DEPARTS, THE FIRST IS CULPABLE WHILE THE SECOND IS EXEMPT. WHAT DOES THIS RESEMBLE? ONE WHO SHUTS HIS HOUSE TO GUARD IT,<sup>21</sup> AND A DEER IS [THEREBY] FOUND TO BE GUARDED THEREIN.<sup>22</sup>

1. BaH reads: into a house, garden, etc. V. Halevy, Doroth, I, 3, pp. 233-234 and n. 38 a.l.
2. The animal having been driven into a place where it is easy to seize it.
3. In our Mishnah, Since he holds that only when an animal is in a house is it regarded as trapped, it follows that it is not trapped in a vivarium, and therefore if one catches a beast out of a vivarium he is guilty, in accordance with the general principle of the Mishnah.
4. That it is trapped even in a vivarium.
5. In which a bird is regarded as already trapped, and so one may catch a bird out of it on a Festival.
6. Swallow(?). It lives in a house just as in the open and it is difficult to catch it there. But other birds are trapped when driven into a house.
7. Lit., 'authority'.
8. Into which the animals may run when chased.
9. On the whole passage v. Bez. 23b.
10. But it has just been stated that they too differentiate between large and small vivaria.
11. If the Rabbis do not disagree, the *halachah* is certainly so.
12. I.e., why use words superfluously?
13. Their senses are on the alert and they feel the attempt to take them. Hence they need hunting and catching.
14. That animal tries to escape.
15. Rashi: hagazin; a species of wild bees, or locusts, Jast.
16. Nobody hunts gnats or hornets, as they are of no use.
17. Rashi: they are blind then and need no catching.
18. They are easily taken and need no catching.
19. In accordance with his view *supra* 92b.
20. Thereby effectively trapping an animal that has entered the house.
21. But not to trap an animal.

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

22. I.e., a deer which had previously been caught; so here too the first, by filling up the doorway, traps the deer, and the second only guards all animal already caught.

## Shabbath 107a

**GEMARA.** R. Abba said in R. Hiyya b. Ashi's name in Rab's name: If a bird creeps under the skirts [of one's garments], he may sit and guard it<sup>1</sup> until evening. R. Nahman b. Isaac objected: IF THE FIRST SITS DOWN IN THE DOORWAY AND FILLS IT, AND A SECOND COMES AND SITS DOWN AT HIS SIDE, EVEN IF THE FIRST [THEN] RISES AND DEPARTS, THE FIRST IS CULPABLE WHILE THE SECOND IS EXEMPT. Surely that means, he IS EXEMPT, yet it is forbidden? — No: he is exempt, bind it is permitted. Reason too supports this: since the second clause teaches, WHAT DOES THIS RESEMBLE? ONE WHO SHUTS HIS HOUSE TO GUARD IT, AND A DEER IS [THEREBY] FOUND TO BE GUARDED THEREIN, it follows that it means, he is EXEMPT, and it is permitted.<sup>2</sup> Others state, R. Nahman b. Isaac said: We too learnt thus: EVEN IF THE FIRST [THEN] RISES AND DEPARTS, THE FIRST IS CULPABLE, WHILE THE SECOND IS EXEMPT: surely that means, he IS EXEMPT, and it is permitted? No: he is EXEMPT, yet it is forbidden. But since the second clause states, WHAT DOES THIS RESEMBLE? ONE WHO SHUTS HIS HOUSE TO GUARD IT, AND A DEER IS [THEREBY] FOUND TO BE GUARDED THEREIN, it follows that he is EXEMPT, and it is permitted. This proves it.

Samuel said: Everything [taught as] involving no liability on the Sabbath involves [indeed] no liability, yet is forbidden, save these three, which involve no liability and are permitted. This [sc. the capture of a deer] is one. And how do you know that he is exempt and it is permitted? Because the second clause teaches: WHAT DOES THIS RESEMBLE? ONE WHO SHUTS HIS HOUSE TO GUARD IT, AND A DEER IS THEREBY FOUND TO BE GUARDED

THEREIN. A second [is this]: If one manipulates an abscess on the Sabbath, if in order to make an opening for it, he is liable;<sup>3</sup> if in order to draw the matter out of it, he is exempt. And how do you know that he is exempt and it is permitted? Because we learnt: A small needle<sup>4</sup> [may be moved on the Sabbath] for the purpose of extracting a thorn.<sup>5</sup> And the third: If one catches a snake on the Sabbath: if he is engaged therewith [sc. in catching it] so that it should not bite him,<sup>6</sup> he is exempt; if for a remedy,<sup>7</sup> he is liable. And how do you know that he is exempt and it is permitted? — Because we learnt: A dish may be inverted over a lamp, that the beams should not catch [fire], or over an infant's excrements, or over a scorpion, that it should not bite.<sup>8</sup>

## CHAPTER XIV

**MISHNAH.** AS FOR THE EIGHT REPTILES [SHERAZIM] WHICH ARE MENTIONED IN THE TORAH,<sup>9</sup> HE WHO CATCHES OR WOUNDS THEM [ON THE SABBATH] IS CULPABLE;<sup>10</sup> BUT [AS FOR] OTHER ABOMINATIONS AND CREEPING THINGS,<sup>11</sup> HE WHO WOUNDS THEM IS EXEMPT; HE WHO CATCHES THEM, BECAUSE HE NEEDS THEM, HE IS LIABLE; IF HE DOES NOT NEED THEM, HE IS EXEMPT, AS FOR A BEAST OR BIRD IN ONE'S PRIVATE DOMAIN, HE WHO CATCHES IT IS EXEMPT; HE WHO WOUNDS IT IS CULPABLE.

**GEMARA.** Since he [the Tanna] teaches, HE WHO WOUNDS THEM IS CULPABLE, it follows that they have skin.<sup>12</sup> Which Tanna [maintains this]? — Said Samuel, It is R. Johanan b. Nuri. For we learnt, R. Johanan b. Nuri said: The eight reptiles have skins.<sup>13</sup> Rabbah son of R. Huna said in Rab's name, You may even say [that this agrees with] the Rabbis: the Rabbis disagree with R. Johanan b. Nuri only in respect of defilement, because it is written, And these are they which are unclean unto you,<sup>14</sup> extending [the law to teach] that their skins are as their flesh; but in respect to the Sabbath even the Rabbis agree. But do they not differ in respect of the

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

Sabbath? Surely it was taught: He who catches one of the eight reptiles mentioned in the Torah, [or] he who wounds them, is culpable: this is R. Johanan b. Nuri's view. But the Sages maintain: Only those which the Sages enumerated<sup>15</sup> have skin.

1. To prevent it from flying away.
2. For obviously one may lock his house in order to guard it.
3. Rashi: either on account of building an opening, or because of mending, for there is no difference between mending a utensil and mending (i.e., healing) a wound.
4. Lit., 'hand-needle'.
5. Because it pains him, and matter which causes pain is similar.
6. 'Mith'assek' may be understood in the sense of performing indirect labor, i.e., he catches it only incidentally, as he does not need the snake but merely desires to prevent it from doing harm.
7. The snake's poison can be used medicinally.
8. Though it is thereby caught.
9. As unclean, i.e., non-edible; Lev. XI, 29f.
10. These have a skin distinct from the flesh (v. *infra*), and a wound does not completely heal but leaves a scar; this is regarded as a minor degree of killing, i.e., part of the animal's life is taken away.
11. E.g., worms, insects, snakes, etc.
12. V. n. 2.
13. V. Hul. 122a. The Rabbis rule that the skins of four of these defile by the same standard as their flesh, viz., the size of a lentil. Thus they hold that their skin is not distinct from their flesh, and R. Johanan b. Nuri disputes it.
14. Ibid.
15. As those whose skins are the same as their flesh.

## Shabbath 107b

[Whereon it was asked]: On the contrary, Those which the Sages enumerated have no skin?<sup>1</sup> And 'Abaye said, This is what he [the Tanna] states: Only those not enumerated by the Sages have a skin distinct from the flesh.<sup>2</sup> Said Raba to him: But he states, which the Sages enumerated? Rather said Raba, This is the meaning: the skin of those [reptiles] only which the Sages enumerated defiles like the flesh.<sup>3</sup> Hence it follows that R. Johanan b. Nuri holds that even those which the Sages did not enumerate defile [in this way]? But it is stated, R. Johanan b. Nuri said: The eight reptiles have skins and do not defile? —

Rather Said R. Adda b. Mattenah, Reconcile it thus: But the Sages maintain: In respect of defilement those which the Sages enumerated have skin.

Still, however, do they not differ in respect of the Sabbath? But it was taught: He who catches one of the eight reptiles mentioned in the Torah, [or] he who wounds them, is culpable, [viz.,] in the case of the reptiles which have skins.<sup>4</sup> And what is a wound that does not heal?<sup>5</sup> If the blood becomes clotted, even if it does not issue. R. Johanan b. Nuri said: The eight reptiles have skins!<sup>6</sup> — Said R. Ashi, Who is the first Tanna? R. Judah, who maintains that touch is the criterion.<sup>7</sup> For we learnt, R. Judah said: The halta'ah<sup>8</sup> is like the weasel. But the Rabbis who disagree with R. Johanan b. Nuri in respect of defilement agree with him in respect of the Sabbath.<sup>9</sup> If so, instead of 'this is the view of R. Johanan b. Nuri,' 'this is the view of R. Johanan b. Nuri and his opponents' is required?<sup>10</sup> — Learn: 'this is the view of R. Johanan b. Nuri and his opponents.'<sup>11</sup>

Levi asked Rabbi: How do we know that a wound<sup>12</sup> is such as is permanent?<sup>13</sup> — Because it is written, Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots [habarbarothaw]?<sup>14</sup> What does 'habarbarothaw' mean: shall we say, that it is covered with spots? Then instead of 'and a leopard habarbarothaw, 'it should read, 'a leopard gawwanaw [its colors]'? Rather it is parallel to Ethiopian, — just as the skin of an Ethiopian cannot turn, so is a [real] wound one that does not turn [i.e., heal].<sup>15</sup>

BUT OTHER ABOMINATIONS, etc. But if one kills them, he is culpable: which Tanna [holds thus]? Said R. Jeremiah, It is R. Eliezer. For it was taught, R. Eliezer said: He who kills vermin on the Sabbath is as though he killed a camel on the Sabbath. R. Joseph demurred to this: The Rabbis disagree with R. Eliezer only in respect to vermin, which does not multiply and increase, but as for other abominations and creeping things, which multiply and increase, they do not differ [therein]. And both learn it from none

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

but the rams.<sup>16</sup> R. Eliezer holds, It is as the rams: just as there was the taking of life in the case of the rams, so whatever constitutes the taking of life [is a culpable offence]. While the Rabbis argue, It is as the rams: just as rams multiply and increase, so are all which multiply and increase [of account].<sup>17</sup> Said Abaye to him, Do not vermin multiply and increase? But a Master said: 'The Holy One, blessed be He, sits and sustains [all creatures], from the horns of wild oxen to the eggs of vermin'.<sup>18</sup> — It is a species called 'eggs of vermin'. But it was taught: Tippuyi<sup>19</sup> and the eggs of vermin? — The species is called 'eggs of vermin'. But there is the flea, which multiplies and increases, yet it was taught, If one catches a flea on the Sabbath: R. Eliezer declares him liable, while R. Joshua exempts [him]? — Said R. Ashi: You oppose catching to killing! R. Eliezer and R. Joshua disagree only in that one Master holds: If the species is not hunted, one is liable; whilst the other Master holds: He is exempt. But in respect to killing even R. Joshua agrees.

**HE WHO CATCHES THEM BECAUSE HE NEEDS THEM, HE IS LIABLE, etc.** Which Tanna [rules thus]? — Said Rab Judah in Rab's name: It is R. Simeon, who maintains, One is not culpable on account of a labor unrequired per se.<sup>20</sup> Others learn it in reference to this: If one manipulates an abscess on the Sabbath, — if in order to make an opening for it, he is liable; if in order to draw the matter out of it, he is exempt. Which Tanna [rules thus]? Said Rab Judah in Rab's name: It is R. Simeon, who maintains: One is not culpable on account of a labor unrequired per se. Others again learn it in reference to this: If one catches a snake on the Sabbath: if he is engaged therewith [in catching it] so that it should not bite him, he is exempt; if for a remedy, he is liable.<sup>21</sup> Which Tanna [rules thus]? Said Rab Judah in Rab's name, It is R. Simeon, who maintains: One is not culpable on account of a labor unrequired per se.

Samuel said: If one removes a fish from the sea,<sup>22</sup> as soon as the size of a *sela'* thereof becomes dry, he is liable.<sup>23</sup> R. Jose b. Abin observed: provided it is between the fins.<sup>24</sup> R. Ashi said: Do not think literally dry, but even if it forms slimy threads.<sup>25</sup>

Mar Bar Hamduri said in Samuel's name: If one inserts his hand in an animal's bowels and detaches an embryo that is inside her, he is culpable. What is the reason? Said Raba: Bar Hamduri explained it to me: Did not R. Shesheth say: If one plucks cuscuta from shrubs and thorns, he is culpable on account of uprooting something from the place of its growth;<sup>26</sup> so here too he is culpable on account of uprooting something [sc. the embryo] from the place of its growth. Abaye said: He who plucks

1. Since their skin is the same as their flesh.
2. But those enumerated by them have no skin distinct from the flesh, and consequently wounding them involves no liability. On this interpretation the Rabbis differ even in respect of the Sabbath, which contradicts Rab. But on the following explanations there is no difficulty.
3. V. p. 518, n. 5.
4. I.e., the four not enumerated by the Sages. This shows that they differ even in respect of the Sabbath.
5. I.e., which leaves a permanent discoloring only such entails liability.
6. All involve culpability on the Sabbath.
7. Lit., 'who goes after touch'.
8. A species of lizard.
9. R. Judah holds that the question whether the skin of reptiles is like their flesh or not in the matter of defilement is not settled by deduction from the verse, 'and these are they which are unclean, etc.' (quoted *supra* a), but is dependent on touch. I.e., if the skin, is thick and perceptibly distinct from the flesh, it is not the same as the flesh; otherwise it is. By this criterion the halta'ah is like the weasel, since both have thick skins; though if the matter were decided by Scriptural exegesis these two would be dissimilar, as is shown in Hul. 142a. Hence he holds that in respect of the Sabbath, too, three of these eight have no skin, i.e., if one wounds them he is not guilty, for the skin is thin and not distinct from the flesh. But the Rabbis in Hul. count the halta'ah as one of the reptiles whose skin is the same as their flesh, in spite of its thickness. This shows that they settle the matter solely by reference to the verse, and therefore

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

their view, which disagrees with R. Johanan b. Nuri's, applies only to defilement, since the verse is written in that connection, but not to the Sabbath.

10. Since the Rabbis agree with him.
11. This is probably not an emendation, but merely implies that it is to be understood thus.
12. For it to involve culpability on the Sabbath.
13. Lit., 'return'.
14. Jer. XIII, 23.
15. On this interpretation namer (E.V. leopard) is derived from mur, to change, and the verse is translated: Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or turn (i.e., heal) his wounds? habarbarothaw (E.V. spots) being derived from haburah, a wound.
16. Which were killed for the sake of their skins, which were dyed red and used in the Tabernacle. Thus killing was a labor of importance in the Tabernacle, and hence ranks as a principal labor; v. *supra* 49b.
17. In that killing them renders one liable.
18. 'Eggs of vermin is assumed to mean its progeny.
19. Name of certain small insects.
20. V. *supra* 105b.
21. V. end of last chapter for notes.
22. Rashi and Tosaf. both explain that this refers to a fish that was already caught before the Sabbath, In that case 'from the sea' is unintelligible. Maim. in Hilchoth Sabbath beginning of ch. XI reads 'from a bowl', which is preferable. V. Marginal Gloss, [Rashi, however, did not seem to read 'from the sea'].
23. For taking life, as it cannot live after that. — There is no culpability for catching, since it was caught before the Sabbath.
24. But a dryness in any other part does not mean that the fish can no longer live.
25. I.e., it becomes partially dry only, so that the moisture adheres to one's finger in slimy threads.
26. But not for detaching from the soil, as cuscuta was not held to be attached to the soil; v. 'Er. 28b.

## Shabbath 108a

fungus from the handle of a pitcher is liable on account of uprooting something from the place of its growth. R. Oshaia objected: If one detaches [aught] from a perforated pot, he is culpable; if it is unperforated, he is exempt? — There, that is not its [normal place for] growing; but here this is its [normal place for] growing.<sup>1</sup>

AN ANIMAL OR A BIRD, etc. R. Huna said: Tefillin may be written upon the skin of a clean bird. R. Joseph demurred: What does he inform us? That it has a skin!<sup>2</sup> [But] we have [already] learnt it: HE WHO WOUNDS IT IS CULPABLE?<sup>3</sup> Said Abaye to him, He informs us much. For if we [deduced] from our Mishnah, I might object, Since it is perforated all over,<sup>4</sup> it may not [be thus used]; hence he informs us as they say in the West [Palestine]: Any hole over which the ink can pass is not a hole.

R. Zera objected: [And he shall rend it] by the wings thereof:<sup>5</sup> this is to teach that the skin is fit.<sup>6</sup> Now if you think that it is [a separate] skin, how can Scripture include it?<sup>7</sup> — Said Abaye to him, it is [indeed a separate] skin, but the Divine Law includes it.<sup>8</sup> Others state, R. Zera said: We too learnt thus: 'By the wings thereof'; — this is to include the skin. Now, if you say that it is [a separate] skin, it is well: hence a verse is required for including it. But if you say that it is not skin, why is a verse required for including it? Said Abaye to him, in truth I may tell you that it is not [a separate] skin, yet it is necessary. I might argue, Since it is covered with splits [holes], it is repulsive. [Hence] we are informed [otherwise].

Mar son of Rabina asked R. Nahman b. Isaac: May tefillin be written upon the skin of a clean fish? If Elijah will come and declare, he replied. What does 'if Elijah will come and declare' mean. Shall we say, whether it has a [separate] skin or not, — but we see that it has a skin? Moreover we learnt: The bones of a fish and its skin afford protection in the tent wherein is a corpse!<sup>9</sup> Rather [he meant]: If Elijah comes and tells [us] whether its foul smell<sup>10</sup> evaporates or not.

Samuel and Karna were sitting by the bank of the Nehar Malka,<sup>11</sup> and saw the water rising and becoming discolored. Said Samuel to Karna, A great man is arriving from the West who suffers from stomach trouble, and the water is rising to give him a welcome, Go and smell his bottle!<sup>12</sup> So he went and met Rab. He asked him, How do we know that

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

tefillin maybe written only on the skin of a clean [edible] animal? Because it is written, that the Law of the Lord may be in thy mouth,<sup>13</sup> [meaning] of that which is permitted in thy mouth, he replied. How do we know that blood is red? he asked.<sup>14</sup> — Because it is said, and the Moabites saw the water over against them as red as blood.<sup>15</sup> How do we know that circumcision [must be performed] in that [particular] place? — 'His 'orlah'<sup>16</sup> is stated here, and 'its 'orlah'<sup>17</sup> is stated elsewhere: just as there something that produces fruit [is meant], so here too something [the limb] that produces fruit [is meant]. Perhaps it means the heart, for it is written, Circumcise therefore the foreskin of your heart?<sup>18</sup> Perhaps it means the ear, for it is written, behold, their ear is uncircumcised?<sup>19</sup> — We learn the complete [word] 'orlatho from the complete [word] 'orlatho, but we do not learn the complete 'orlatho from 'orlath, which is incomplete.<sup>20</sup> 'What is your name?' he asked. Karna. 'May it be [His] will that a horn [karna] shall sprout out from between his eyes!' he retorted.<sup>21</sup> Subsequently Samuel took him into his house, gave him barley bread and a fish pie to eat, and strong liquor to drink,<sup>22</sup> but did not show him the privy, that he might be eased.<sup>23</sup> Rab cursed, saying, He who causes me pain, may no sons arise from him — And thus it was.

This is a controversy of Tannaim. How do we know that circumcision [must be performed] in that place? 'Orlatho is stated here, and 'orlatho is stated elsewhere: just as there something that produces fruit [is meant], so here too something that produces fruit [is meant]: that is R. Josiah's view. R. Nathan said: It is unnecessary: surely it is said, And the uncircumcised male who is not circumcised in the flesh of his foreskin: — [that indicates] the place where the male sex is differentiated from the female sex.

Our Rabbis taught: Tefillin can be written upon the skin of clean animals and upon the skin of clean beasts, and<sup>24</sup> upon the skin of their nebeloth or terefoth,<sup>25</sup> and they are tied

round with their hair,<sup>26</sup> and sewn with their tendons. And it is a *halachah* from Moses at Sinai<sup>27</sup> that tefillin are tied round with their hair and sewn with their tendons. But we may not write [them] upon the skin of unclean animals or upon the skin of unclean beasts, and the skin of their nebeloth and terefoth need not be stated;<sup>28</sup> nor may they be tied round with their hair or sewn with their tendons. And this question a certain Boethusian<sup>29</sup> asked R. Joshua the grits dealer: How do we know that tefillin may not be written upon the skin of an unclean animal? Because it is written, 'that the law of thy Lord may be in thy mouth' [implying] of that which is permitted in thy mouth. If so, they should not be written on the skin of nebeloth and terefoth.? Said he to him, I will give you a comparison. What does this resemble? Two men who were condemned to death by the State, one being executed by the king and the other by the executioner. Who stands higher? Surely he who was slain by the king!<sup>30</sup> If so, let them be eaten? The Torah saith, Ye shall not eat any *nebelah*,<sup>31</sup> he retorted, yet you say, let them be eaten! Well spoken!<sup>32</sup> admitted he.

**MISHNAH. ONE MAY NOT PREPARE [PICKLING] BRINE ON THE SABBATH,<sup>33</sup>**

1. The reference being to a moss or fungus which sprouts up in such places.
2. Distinct from its flesh.
3. Which shows that it has a distinct skin, v. p. 518, n. 2.
4. Lit., 'it has holes (and) holes'- where the feathers are set.
5. Lev. I, 17. The reference is to a fowl burnt-offering, whose wings were burnt upon the altar.
6. To be burnt on the altar, it being unnecessary to skin the bird first.
7. It should be the same as the skin of all animal, which must be first removed, v. 6.
8. This verse shows that the skin of a bird is not the same as that of an animal.
9. If food is in a vessel which is covered by the bones or the skin of a fish, or if the whole vessel, which is closed, is made from these materials, the food is protected from contamination; v. Num. XIX, 15. — Thus the skin is mentioned as a separate entity.
10. Lit., 'filth'.

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

11. The Royal Canal. The Canal connecting the Euphrates and the Tigris at Nehardea and Mahoza respectively; Obermeyer, 244f.
12. Examine his knowledge—a humorous allusion to Karna's ability to judge whether wine was good or not merely by smelling the bottle, Keth. 105a. V. Obermeyer. *op. cit.*, p. 247 and notes.
13. Ex. XIII, 9.
14. Only blood that is red or of colors akin to redness defiles a woman as a menstruant (Nid. 19a), and this was the point of his question.
15. II Kings III, 22.
16. Gen. XVII, 14, in connection with circumcision (E.V. foreskin).
17. Lev. XIX, 23, in reference to the fruit of a tree within the first three years of its planting, which may not be eaten (E.V. uncircumcision).
18. Deut. X, 16. This question of course was not mentioned seriously, but was put merely to point out that 'circumcision' is mentioned in connection with other organs too.
19. Jer. VI, 10.
20. 'Orlatho' is written in both verses quoted by Rab, whereas 'orlah' and 'orlath' are written in the verses proposed by Karna.
21. He was probably annoyed at Karna's temerity in thus examining him.
22. All this he gave him to act as a laxative.
23. This, too, was part of the treatment. Samuel was a doctor.
24. Behemah denotes a domestic animal; hayyah, a wild animal.
25. V. [Glos.](#)
26. The slips of parchment are rolled up and tied round with hair of these animals.
27. V. p. 123, n. 7.
28. As unfit.
29. The Boethusians were a sect similar to the Sadducees, and disagreed with the Pharisees on certain religious beliefs, such as immortality and its concomitant, reward and punishment in the hereafter, and resurrection, which they rejected; and in certain practices, viz., the date of Pentecost and the method of preparing incense on the Day of Atonement (Men. X, 3; Tosaf. Yoma I, 8—the parallel passage in Yoma 39a has 'Sadducees'). The opinion most generally held is that the Boethusians were a variety of the Sadducees.
30. Similarly, nebeloth and terefoth may be regarded as slain by God.
31. Deut. XIV, 21. (E.V.: 'of anything that dieth of itself').
32. The same law applies to both — either both are forbidden or both are permitted.
33. Before the salt is put into it.

## Shabbath 108b

**BUT ONE MAY PREPARE SALT WATER AND DIP HIS BREAD INTO IT OR PUT IT INTO A STEW. SAID R. JOSE, BUT THAT IS BRINE, WHETHER [ONE PREPARES] MUCH OR LITTLE?<sup>1</sup> RATHER THIS IS THE SALT WATER THAT IS PERMITTED: OIL IS FIRST PUT INTO THE WATER<sup>2</sup> OR INTO THE SALT.<sup>3</sup>**

**GEMARA.** What does he [the first Tanna] mean?<sup>4</sup> Said Rab Judah in Samuel's name, He means this: One may not prepare a large quantity of salt water, but one may prepare a small quantity of salt water.

**SAID R. JOSE, BUT THAT IS BRINE, WHETHER [ONE PREPARES] MUCH OR LITTLE?** The scholars asked: Does R. Jose [mean] to forbid [both] or to permit [both]? — Said Rab Judah: He [means] to permit [both], since it is not stated, R. Jose forbids. Said Rabbah to him: But since the final clause states, **RATHER THIS IS THE SALT WATER THAT IS PERMITTED**, it follows that R. Jose [means] to forbid [in the first clause]! Rather said Rabbah: He [means] to forbid; and thus did R. Johanan say: He [means] to forbid. It was taught likewise: One may not prepare a large quantity of salt water for putting into preserved vegetables in a mutilated vessel,<sup>5</sup> but one may prepare a little salt water and eat his bread therewith or put it into a stew. Said R. Jose: Is it just because this is in large quantity and this is in small, that the one is forbidden and the other is permitted? then it will be said, Much work is forbidden but a little work is permitted! Rather both are forbidden, and this is the salt water that is permitted: one puts oil and salt [mixed into water] or oil and water [over salt], but provided that water and salt are not mixed at the outset.

[Mnemonic: *Strong radish and citron.*]<sup>6</sup> R. Judah b. Habiba recited: We may not prepare strong salt water. What is strong salt water? — Rabbah and R. Joseph b. Abba both say: Such that an egg floats in it. And how much is that? — Said Abaye: Two parts

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

of salt and one part of water. For what is it made? Said R. Abbahu: For muries.<sup>7</sup>

R. Judah b. Habiba recited: One may not salt a radish or an egg on the Sabbath.<sup>8</sup> R. Hezekiah said in Abaye's name: Radish is forbidden, but an egg is permitted. R. Nahman said: Originally I used to salt radish, arguing, I do indeed spoil it, for Samuel said, Sharp radish is [more] beneficial. But when I heard what 'Ulla said when he came,<sup>9</sup> viz., In the West [Palestine] they salt them slice by slice,<sup>10</sup> I no longer salt them,<sup>11</sup> but I certainly do drop them [in salt].<sup>12</sup>

R. Judah b. Habiba recited: A citron, radish, and egg, but for their outer shell,<sup>13</sup> would never leave the stomach.<sup>14</sup>

When R. Dimi came,<sup>15</sup> he said: No man ever sank in the Lake of Sodom.<sup>16</sup> R. Joseph observed: Sodom was overturned and the statement about it is topsy-turvy.<sup>17</sup> No man sank [in it], but a plank did?<sup>18</sup> Said Abaye to him, He states the more surprising thing.<sup>19</sup> It is unnecessary [to mention] a plank, seeing that it does not sink in any water; but not even a man, who sinks in all [other] waters of the world, [ever] sank in the Lake of Sodom. What difference does that make? — Even as it once happened that Rabin was walking behind R. Jeremiah by the bank of the Lake of Sodom, [and] he asked him, May one wash with this water on the Sabbath?<sup>20</sup> — It is well, he replied.<sup>21</sup> Is it permissible to shut and open [one's eyes]?<sup>22</sup> I have not heard this, he answered, [but] I have heard something similar; for R. Zera said, at times in R. Mattenah's name, at others in Mar 'Ukba's name, and both [R. Mattenah and Mar 'Ukba] said it in the names of Samuel's father and Levi: one said: [To put] wine into one's eye<sup>23</sup> is forbidden; [to put it] on the eye, is permitted.<sup>24</sup> Whilst the other said: [To put] tasteless saliva,<sup>25</sup> even on the eye, is forbidden. It may be proved that it was Samuel's father who ruled, '[To put] wine into one's eye is forbidden; on the eye, is permitted': for Samuel said: One may soak bread in wine and place it on his eye on the Sabbath. Now, from whom, did he hear this,

surely he heard it from his father? — But then on your reasoning, when Samuel said: [To apply] tasteless saliva even on the eye is forbidden; from whom did he hear it? Shall we say that he heard it from his father, — then Levi did not state any one [of these laws]! Hence he [must have] heard one from his father and one from Levi, but we do not know which from his father and which from Levi.

Mar 'Ukba said in Samuel's name: One may steep collyrium [an eye salve] on the eve of the Sabbath and place it upon his eyes on the Sabbath without fear.<sup>26</sup> Bar Lewai was standing before Mar 'Ukba, and saw him opening and shutting [his eyes].<sup>27</sup> To this extent Mar Samuel certainly did not give permission, he observed to him.<sup>28</sup> R. Jannai sent [word] to Mar 'Ukba, Send us some of Mar Samuel's eye-salves.<sup>29</sup> He sent back [word], I do indeed send [them] to you, lest you accuse me of meanness; but thus did Samuel say: A drop of cold water in the morning, and bathing the hands and feet in hot water in the evening, is better than all the eye-salves in the world. It was taught likewise: R. Muna said in R. Judah's name: A drop of cold water in the morning and bathing the hands and feet [in hot water]<sup>30</sup> in the evening is better than all the eye-salves in the world. He [R. Muna] used to say: If the hand [be put] to the eye, let it be cut off;<sup>31</sup> the hand to the nose, let it be cut off; the hand to the mouth, let it be cut off; the hand to the ear, let it be cut off; the hand to the vein [opened for blood letting], let it be cut off; the hand to the membrum, let it be cut off; the hand to the anus, let it be cut off; the hand

1. [G].
2. This is forbidden under 'salting', v. *supra* 73a.
3. Before the salt is put into the water. The oil weakens the salt in both cases.
4. Surely brine and salt water are identical.
5. Which is specially set aside for pickling.
6. A mnemonic is a string of words to aid the memory.
7. A pickle containing fish hash and sometimes wine (Jast.).
8. A number of slices at the same time (Rashi).
9. Cf p. 12, n. 9.

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

10. Eating the one before the next is salted.
11. More than one slice. Two slices at once (Rashi).
12. Each radish as I eat it.
13. This refers to the white of the egg, not what is generally called the shell.
14. They are very constipating.
15. V. p. 12, n. 9.
16. Owing to its high specific gravity due to its large proportion of salt.
17. Lit., 'overturned'.
18. Surely a plank is even lighter.
19. Lit., 'he says, it is unnecessary (to state)'.
20. Its saltiness conferred healing properties upon it; hence the question, since one may not heal on the Sabbath.
21. For it is not evident that one washes himself for that reason. [Healing is forbidden only for fear lest one crushes the necessary ingredients, but it is not labor in itself: consequently the Rabbis did not impose this interdiction unless one is obviously performing a cure.]
22. Several times in succession, for the salt to enter and heal them. The purpose is more obvious here.
23. By opening and shutting it. This is similar to Rabin's question, Thus the saltiness of the Lake of Sodom has a practical bearing in law.
24. For it looks as though he is merely washing himself.
25. I.e., saliva of a person who has tasted nothing after sleeping.
26. Of transgression.
27. For the salve to enter right in.
28. Surely one was reported in his name!
29. Samuel was a doctor.
30. So the text is emended in 'Aruch.
31. R causes it injury, and so the rest. In nearly all cases it means before washing in the morning.

## Shabbath 109a

to the vat,<sup>1</sup> let it be cut off: [because] the [unwashed] hand leads to blindness, the hand leads to deafness, the hand causes a polypus.<sup>2</sup>

It was taught, R. Nathan said: It<sup>3</sup> is a free agent, and insists [on remaining on the hands] until one washes his hands three times. R. Johanan said: Stibium removes [cures] the Princess,<sup>4</sup> stops the tears, and promotes the growth of the eye-lashes. It was taught likewise, R. Jose said: Stibium removes the Princess, stops the tears, and promotes the growth of the eye-lashes.

Mar 'Ukba also said in Samuel's name: Leaves<sup>5</sup> have no healing properties.<sup>6</sup> R.

Joseph said: Coriander has no healing properties. R. Shesheth said: Cuscuta has no healing properties. R. Joseph observed: Coriander is injurious even to me.<sup>7</sup> R. Shesheth observed: Eruca is beneficial even to me.<sup>8</sup>

Mar 'Ukba said in Samuel's name: All kinds of cuscuta are permitted, except teruza.<sup>9</sup>

R. Hisda said: To glair roast meat<sup>10</sup> is permitted; to make hashed eggs<sup>11</sup> is forbidden. Ze'iri's wife made [it] for Hiyya b. Ashi,<sup>12</sup> but he did not eat it. Said she, 'I have made this for your teacher [Ze'iri] and he ate, yet do you not eat!'-Ze'iri follows his view. For Ze'iri said: One may pour clear wine and clear water through a strainer on the Sabbath, and he need have no fear.<sup>13</sup> This proves that since it can be drunk as it is,<sup>14</sup> he does nothing;<sup>15</sup> so here too, since it can be eaten as it is,<sup>16</sup> he does nothing.

Mar 'Ukba also said: If one knocks his hand or foot, he may reduce the swelling with wine, and need have no fear. The scholars asked: What about vinegar? Said R. Hillel to R. Ashi, When I attended R. Kahana's academy they said, Not vinegar.<sup>17</sup> Raba observed: But the people of Mahoza,<sup>18</sup> since they are delicate, even wine heals them.<sup>19</sup>

Rabina visited R. Ashi: He saw that an ass had trodden on his foot, and he was sitting and reducing the swelling in vinegar.<sup>20</sup> Said he to him, Do you not accept R. Hillel's statement, Not vinegar? [A swelling on] the back of the hand or on the foot is different, he replied.<sup>21</sup> Others state, He saw him reducing the swelling in wine. Said he to him, Do you not agree with what Raba said, The people of Mahoza, since they are delicate, even wine heals them, and you too are delicate? [A swelling on] the hand or on the foot is different, he replied, for R. Adda b. Mattenah said in Rab's name, [A blow on] the hand or on the foot is like an internal wound, and the Sabbath may be desecrated on its account.

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

Our Rabbis taught: One may bathe in the water of Gerar,<sup>22</sup> in the water of Hammethan,<sup>23</sup> in the water of Essa,<sup>24</sup> and in the water of Tiberias,<sup>25</sup> but not in the Great Sea [the Mediterranean], or in the water of steeping,<sup>26</sup> or in the Lake of Sodom. But this contradicts it: One may bathe in the water of Tiberias and in the Great Sea, but not in the water of steeping or in the Lake of Sodom. Thus [the rulings on] the Great Sea are contradictory. — Said R. Johanan, There is no difficulty: one agrees with R. Meir, the other with R. Judah. For we learnt: All seas are like a mikweh,<sup>27</sup> for it is said, and the gathering of [mikweh] the waters called he Seas:<sup>28</sup> this is R. Meir's view. R. Judah said: The Great Sea [alone] is like a mikweh, 'seas' being stated only because it contains many kinds of waters.<sup>29</sup> R. Jose maintained: All seas [including the Great Sea] purify when running,<sup>30</sup> but they are unfit for zabim, lepers, and to be sanctified as the water of lustration.<sup>31</sup> R. Nahman b. Isaac demurred:

1. Which is to be filled with wine.
2. A morbid growth in the nose.
3. The evil spirit that rests on the hands during the night. The belief in same is held to have been borrowed from the Persians, and many regulations were based thereon; v. Weiss, Dor, II, p. 13.
4. The name of a demon afflicting the eye, also a certain disorder of the eye. *Var. lec.*: [H] the Nobleman's daughter, likewise with the same meaning.
5. 'Alin. Rashi: the name of a certain herb.
6. Therefore they may be applied to the eye on the Sabbath (Ri).
7. Who am blind.
8. Though I possess good eyesight already.
9. A kind of cucumber or melon possessing medicinal properties. These are used for no other purpose; hence they are forbidden (cf. p. 527, n. 16).
10. Rashi; R. Han.: to strain off the juice of melon, which is taken as a laxative. V. Tosaf. a.l.
11. I.e., a hash of roasted eggs beaten up.
12. Rashi: roast meat glared.
13. Of transgression.
14. Without straining.
15. Though one may not filter muddy wine on the Sabbath.
16. Without the covering of eggs.
17. Its purpose is too obviously medicinal.
18. V. p. 150, n. 11.

19. Their skin is so delicate that even wine acts like vinegar upon it. Hence they would only use it medicinally, and therefore it is forbidden.
20. It was the Sabbath.
21. A bruise there is dangerous.
22. Gerar was the seat of a Philistine prince (Gen. X, 19; XX, 1 *et seq*; I Chron. IV, 39) whose site has not been identified with certainty. Some think it was southwest of Kadesh; others, that it was south of Gaza.
23. The word means 'hot Springs'. It was a town a mile away from Tiberias.
24. Supposed to be east of the lake of Tiberias, v. Neub. Geogr. p. 38; Jast. s.v.
25. Though all these are salty, it is permitted, as it does not look that one is bathing particularly for medicinal purposes (v. p. 527, n. 16).
26. In which flax was steeped.
27. v. *Glos.* They are like a mikweh in all respects, and not like a spring. The difference between these two are: (i) a *zab* can have his ritual bath in a spring, but not in a mikweh; (ii) the water of a spring, but not of a mikweh, is fit for sprinkling upon a leper (Lev. XIV, 5) and for mixing with the ashes of the red heifer (Num. XIX, 17); (iii) the water of a spring purifies when running, whereas a mikweh purifies only when its water is still (v. *supra* 65a bottom and b top and notes a.l.). — Since R. Meir maintains that all seas are alike, he draws no distinction in respect to bathing either, and permits it in the Great Sea too.
28. Gen. I, 10.
29. Many different rivers flow into the sea, hence the plural; but actually the verse refers to the Great Sea only. Thus he draws a distinction between the Great Sea and other seas, and so he also forbids bathing therein on the Sabbath.
30. Since that is the nature of seas.
31. I.e., to be mixed with the ashes of the red heifer.

## Shabbath 109b

Say that they differ in respect to uncleanness and purity; but do you know them [to differ] in respect of the Sabbath?<sup>1</sup> Rather said R. Nahman b. Isaac: There is no difficulty: in the one case he tarries [there];<sup>2</sup> in the other he does not tarry [there]. To what have you referred the second [Baraita]? Where he does not tarry! If he does not tarry, [it is permitted] even in the water of steeping too. For it was taught: One may bathe in the waters of Tiberias and in the water of steeping and in the Lake of Sodom, even if he has scabs on his head. When is that? If he

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

does not tarry [there]; but if he tarries [there], it is forbidden! — Rather [reply thus]: [The rulings on] the Great Sea are not contradictory: one refers to its wholesome [water]; the other to its malodorous [water].<sup>3</sup> [The rulings on] the water of steeping too are not contradictory: in the one case he tarries; in the other he does not tarry.

**MISHNAH.** WE MAY NOT EAT GREEK HYSSOP ON THE SABBATH, BECAUSE IT IS NOT THE FOOD OF HEALTHY PEOPLE;<sup>4</sup> BUT WE MAY EAT YO'EZER<sup>5</sup> AND DRINK ABUB RO'EH.<sup>6</sup> A MAN MAY EAT ANY KIND OF FOOD AS A REMEDY, AND DRINK ANY LIQUID,<sup>7</sup> EXCEPT WATER OF PALM TREES<sup>8</sup> AND A POTION<sup>9</sup> OF ROOTS, BECAUSE THEY ARE [A REMEDY] FOR JAUNDICE; BUT ONE MAY DRINK WATER OF PALM TREES FOR HIS THIRST AND RUB HIMSELF WITH OIL OF ROOTS WITHOUT MEDICAL PURPOSE.

**GEMARA.** R. Joseph said: Hyssop<sup>10</sup> is *abratha bar hemag*,<sup>11</sup> Greek hyssop is *abratha bar henag*.<sup>12</sup> 'Ulla said: [Hyssop is] white marwa [sage]. 'Ulla visited R. Samuel b. Judah [and] they set white marwa before him. Said he to them, That is the hyssop prescribed in Scripture. R. Pappi said, It is *shumshuk*. [marjoram]. R. Jeremiah of Difti<sup>13</sup> said: Reason Supports R. Pappi. For we learnt: 'The law of hyssop [requires] three stalks [each] containing three calyxes'; and *shumshuk*, is found to have that shape. For what is it eaten? — [As a remedy] for worms. With what is it eaten? With seven black dates. By what is it [the disease of worms] caused? — Through [eating] barley-flour forty days old.

**BUT ONE MAY EAT YO'EZER.** What is YO'EZER? — Pennyroyal.<sup>14</sup> For what is it eaten? [As a remedy] for worms in the bowels<sup>15</sup> With what is it eaten? With seven white dates. Through what is it caused? Through [eating] raw meat<sup>16</sup> and [drinking] water on an empty stomach; through meat on an empty stomach or ox meat on an empty stomach; through nuts on an empty stomach; shoots of fenugreek on an empty stomach and drinking water after it.<sup>17</sup> But if not,<sup>18</sup> let him

swallow white cress. If not, let him fast, then bring fat meat and cast it on the coals, suck out a thick piece and drink vinegar. But others say, not vinegar, because it affects the liver. If not, let him procure the scrapings of a thorn bush which was scraped from top to bottom but not from below and upward, lest [the worms] issue through his mouth, and boil them in strong liquor<sup>19</sup> at twilight.<sup>20</sup> On the morrow let him stop up his orifices<sup>21</sup> and drink it: And when he eases himself, he must do so on the stripped parts of a palm tree.

**AND DRINK ABUB RO'EH.** What is ABUB RO'EH? *Humtarya* [eupatorium]. What is *humtarya*? The lonely staff.<sup>22</sup> What is it prepared for? [As a remedy for] one who drank uncovered water.<sup>23</sup> If not,<sup>24</sup> let him bring five roses and five glasses of strong liquor, boil them together until they amount to an *anpak*,<sup>25</sup> and drink it. The mother of R. Ahadbuy b. Ammi prepared [a potion of] one rose and one glass of strong liquor for a certain man. She boiled them up, made him drink it, lit the stove and swept it out, placed bricks in it,<sup>26</sup> and it [the poison of the snake] issued like a green palm-leaf. R. Awia said: A quarter [log] of milk from a white goat.<sup>27</sup> R. Huna b. Judah said: Let him obtain a sweet citron, scoop it out, fill it with honey, set it on burning embers [to boil], and then eat it. R. Hanina said: [One drinks] urine forty days old<sup>28</sup> [as a remedy]; a *barzina*<sup>29</sup> for [the sting of] a wasp; a quarter [log] for a scorpion [bite]; an eighth [of a log] for uncovered water; a quarter is efficacious even against witchcraft. R. Johanan said: *Elaiogaron*,<sup>30</sup> *kangad*,<sup>31</sup> and *theriac* are efficacious against both uncovered water and witchcraft. If one swallows a snake, he should be made to eat *cuscuta* with salt and run three miles. R. Shimi b. Ashi saw a man swallow a snake; thereupon he appeared to him in the guise of a horseman,<sup>32</sup> made him eat *cuscuta* with salt and run three miles before him, [and] it issued from him in strips.<sup>33</sup> Others say: R. Shimi b. Ashi swallowed a snake, thereupon Elijah came,<sup>34</sup> appeared to him in the guise of a horseman, made him eat *cuscuta* with salt

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

and run three mils before him, [and] it issued from him in strips.

If one is bitten by a snake, he should procure an embryo of a white ass, tear it open, and be made to sit upon it; providing, however, that it was not found to be *terefah*. A certain

1. Which is totally different.
2. Then it is obvious that his purpose is to effect a cure.
3. The latter is forbidden, since no one would bathe therein for cleanliness.
4. But obviously a medicine.
5. A certain plant.
6. Lit., 'shepherd's flute' — name of a plant (Eupatorium) used for medicinal purposes (Jast.).
7. Provided that they are eaten and drunk without healing intentions too.
8. Explained *infra* 110a.
9. Lit., 'clip'.
10. Prescribed in the Torah for purification, e.g.. Lev. Xlv, 4.
11. So they called it.
12. Abratha is probably *Artemisia abrotanum*, and with the designations *bar hemag* (of the bush) and *bar hemag* (of the shrub) the names of two sub-species of hyssop were meant.
13. V p. 35, n. 5.
14. *Mentha pelegium*; Jast.
15. Fluke worms(?).
16. *Umza* is meat roasted directly on coals or pickled in a strong acid.
17. That probably applies to all the foregoing.
18. If pennyroyal is unobtainable or has failed to cure.
19. Mead, or beer.
20. Or the text may mean, 'in a neighbor's house', so that the sufferer himself should not smell it, lest the smell affect him.
21. Either his nostrils, so as not to smell it, lest the smell nostrils and ears, that the strength of the potion should not pass out of his body.
22. Name of a drink made of liver-wort (Jast.).
23. Water left uncovered over night might not be drunk, lest a snake had drunk of it — a necessary precaution in Eastern countries.
24. V. n. 6.
25. A quarter of a *log*. B.B. 58b.
26. For the sufferer to sit on.
27. Is a good remedy for this.
28. Or, of a babe forty days old.
29. A small measure, one thirty-second of *log*.
30. A sauce of oil and garum, to which wine is sometimes added (Jast.).
31. A kind of chervil.
32. Rashi: in order to frighten him, which would help to kill the snake.

33. The snake was broken up within him.

34. Elijah was thought to appear quite frequently to favored persons: cf. B.M. 59b; Sanh. 113a; Keth. 61a, *passim*.

## Shabbath 110a

officer of Pumbeditha was bitten by a snake. Now there were thirteen white asses in Pumbeditha; they were all torn open and found to be *terefah*. There was another on the other side of Pumbeditha, [but] before they could go and bring it a lion devoured it. [Thereupon] Abaye observed to them. 'Perhaps he was bitten by a snake of the Rabbis,<sup>1</sup> for which there is no cure, as it is written, and whoso breaketh through a fence,<sup>2</sup> a serpent shall bite him?'<sup>3</sup> 'Indeed so, Rabbi,' answered they. For when Rab died, R. Isaac b. Bisna decreed that none should bring myrtles and palm-branches to a wedding feast to the sound of a tabla,<sup>4</sup> yet he went and brought myrtle and palm-branches at a wedding to the sound of the tabla; [so] a snake bit him and he died.

If a snake winds itself around a person, let him go down into water, put a basket over its head and force it [the snake] away from himself, and when it goes on to it [the basket], he should throw it into the water, ascend and make off.

If a man is scented by a snake,<sup>5</sup> if his companion is with him, he should make him ride four cubits.<sup>6</sup> If not, let him jump a ditch.<sup>7</sup> If not, let him cross a river; and at night place his bed on four barrels and sleep under the stars,<sup>8</sup> and bring four cats and tie them to the four legs of the bed. Then he should fetch rubbish<sup>9</sup> and throw it there, so that when they hear a sound they [the cats] will devour it.

If a man is chased by one [a snake], he should flee into sandy places.<sup>10</sup>

If a woman sees a snake and does not know whether it has turned its attention to her or not, let her remove her garments and throw them in front of it; if it winds itself around them, its mind is upon her; if not, its mind is

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

not upon her. What can she do? She should cohabit [with her husband] in front of it. Others say, That will even strengthen its instincts. Rather she should take some of her hair and nails and throw them at it and say, 'I am menstruous'.

If a snake enters a woman, let her spread her legs and place them on two barrels; fat meat must be brought and cast on the burning coals; a basket of cress must be brought together with fragrant wine and placed there, and be well beaten together.<sup>11</sup> They should take a pair of tongs in their hand, for when it smells the fragrance it will come out, so that it can be seized and burnt in the fire, as otherwise it will re-enter.

**EXCEPT WATER OF PALM TREES.** It was taught: Except water that pierces. He who teaches, water that pierces, [calls it thus] because it pierces the gall.<sup>12</sup> And he who says **WATER OF PALM TREES**, that is because it comes forth from [between] two palm trees. What is water of palm trees?<sup>13</sup> — Rabbah b. Beruna said: There are two tali<sup>14</sup> in the west [Palestine] and a spring of water issues from between them. The first cup [thereof] loosens, the second causes motion, and the third passes out just as it enters. 'Ulla said: I myself drank Babylonian beer and it is more efficacious than these [waters];<sup>15</sup> provided, however, that one had discontinued [drinking] it for forty days.<sup>16</sup>

R. Joseph said: Egyptian beer consists of one part barley, one part safflower, and one part salt. R. Papa said: One part wheat, one part safflower, and one part salt. And the token is sisane.<sup>17</sup> And it is drunk between Passover<sup>18</sup> and Pentecost; upon him who is constipated it acts as a laxative, while him who suffers with diarrhea it binds.

**AND A POTION OF ROOTS.** What is a **POTION OF ROOTS**? Said R. Johanan: The weight of a *zuz*<sup>19</sup> of Alexandrian gum is brought, a *zuz* weight of liquid alum and a *zuz* weight of garden crocus, and they are powdered together. For a zabah, a third thereof [mixed] with wine [is efficacious] that

she shall not become barren. For jaundice two thirds thereof [mixed] with beer [is drunk], and he [the sufferer] then becomes impotent.<sup>20</sup> 'For a zabah, a third thereof [mixed] with win [is efficacious] that she shall not become barren': but if not,<sup>21</sup> let them procure three

1. I.e., as a punishment for disobeying the Rabbis.
2. Rabbinical laws were often so called; cf. Aboth, I, 13.
3. Eccl. X, 8.
4. A bell or a collection of bells forming an instrument specially used at public processions, weddings, etc.
5. Which pursues him.
6. To break the track of the scent.
7. The water breaks the scent.
8. So that the snake cannot attack him either from below or above.
9. Rashi: branches, twigs, etc. which rustle and make a noise when anything passes over them. 'Ar: refuse of reeds.
10. Where the snake cannot follow.
11. To cause their fragrance to ascend.
12. I.e., makes it function.
13. BaH deletes this question.
14. A species of palms.
15. Sc. of the well just mentioned.
16. Otherwise the system does not react to it.
17. A basket made of twigs. Sisane contains two sameks; thus R. Joseph ([H]) mentioned barley ([H]) — the samek and sin being interchangeable.
18. Lit., 'the sacrifice'.
19. Three and five hundred eighty-five thousand grammes; v. J.E. Weights and Measures, XII, p. 486; Other Weights and Table on p. 489.
20. Though cured of his illness.
21. If it is unavailable or fails to cure.

## Shabbath 110b

kapiza<sup>1</sup> of Persian onions, boil them in wine, make her drink it, and say to her, 'Cease your discharge.' But if not, she should be made to sit at cross-roads, hold a cup of wine in her hand, and a man comes up from behind, frightens her and exclaims, 'Cease your discharge!' But if not, a handful of cumin, a handful of saffron, and a handful of fenugreek are brought and boiled in wine, she is made to drink it, and they say to her, 'Cease your discharge'. But if not, let sixty pieces of sealing clay of a [wine] vessel be

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

brought, and let them smear her<sup>2</sup> [therewith] and say to her, 'Cease your discharge'. But if not, let one take a fern,<sup>3</sup> boil it in wine, smear her with it and say to her, 'Cease your discharge'. But if not, let one take a thistle growing among Roman thorns,<sup>4</sup> burn it, and gather it up in linen rags in summer and in cotton rags in winter. If not, let one dig seven holes and burn therein a young shoot of 'orlah,<sup>5</sup> put a cup of wine into her hand, then make her rise from one [hole] and seat her on the next, make her rise from that and seat her on the following [and so on], and at each one he should say to her, 'Cease your discharge'. But if not, let one take the flour, rub her from the lower half downwards and say to her, 'Cease your discharge'. If not; let him take an ostrich egg, burn it, and wrap it in linen rags in summer and in cotton rags in winter. If not, let him broach a barrel of wine specially for her sake. If not, let him fetch barley grain which is found in the dung of a white mule: if she holds it one day, it [her discharge] will cease (or two days; if she holds it two days, it will cease for three days; but if she holds it three days, it will cease for ever.

'For jaundice two thirds thereof with beer [is drunk], and he [the sufferer] then becomes impotent.' But if not, let him take the head of a salted shibuta,<sup>6</sup> boil it in beer and drink it. If not, let him take brine of locusts. If brine of locusts is not available, let him take brine of small birds,<sup>7</sup> carry it into the baths and rub himself [therewith]. If there are no baths, he should be placed between the stove and the wall.<sup>8</sup>

R. Johanan said: If one wishes to make him [the sufferer from jaundice] warm, he should wrap him well<sup>9</sup> in his sheet. R. Aha b. Jacob suffered therewith, so R. Kahana treated him thus and he recovered. But if not, let him take three kapiza of Persian dates, three kapiza of dripping wax,<sup>10</sup> and three kapiza of purple aloes, boil them in beer and drink it. If not, let him take a young ass; then he [the invalid] shaves half his head, draws blood from its forehead and applies it to his [own]

head, but he must take care of his eyes, lest it [the blood] blind him. If not, let him take a buck's head which has lain in preserves [vinegar], boil it in beer and drink it. If not, let him take a speckled swine, tear it open and apply it to his heart: If not, let him take porret [leeks] from the wastes of the valley.<sup>11</sup> A certain Arab suffered with it. Said he to a gardener, Take my robe and give me some leeks from the wastes of the valley.<sup>12</sup> He gave them to him [and] he ate them. Then he requested, Lend me your robe and I will sleep in it. He singed it, wrapped himself therein and slept. As he became heated through and got up, it fell away from him bit by bit.<sup>13</sup>

'For jaundice two [thirds thereof] with beer, and he becomes impotent.' But is this permitted? Surely it was taught: How do we know that the castration of a man is forbidden? From the verse, neither shall ye do thus in your land:<sup>14</sup> [this means], ye shall not do [thus] to yourselves: the words of R. Hanina! — That is only if he intends [it so], but here it is automatic. For R. Johanan said: If one wishes to castrate a cock, let him cut off its crest, and it is automatically castrated.<sup>15</sup> But R. Ashi said: There it suffers from conceit?<sup>16</sup> Rather [the reference here is to] one who is [already] a castrate.<sup>17</sup> But R. Hiyya b. Abba said in R. Johanan's name:

1. v. p. 492, n. 6.
2. Rashi: after soaking it in water.
3. Pastina. The word means a low, spreading plant.
4. Jast.: probably corduelis spinosa.
5. v. [Glos.](#)
6. Name of a fish, probably mullet (Jast.).
7. 'Aruch: clear fish brine.
8. To make him perspire.
9. Or, rub him.
10. That drips down from an overfull honeycomb.
11. Jast., who also suggests an alternative: of the after-crops of valleys. Rash: from the middle of the furrow, where the leeks are sharp.
12. Or, as Rash. V. preceding note.
13. From the feverish heat of the sleeper.
14. Lev. XXII, 24 v. preceding part of the verse.
15. Thus direct castration only is prohibited, but not indirect, and the same applies here.
16. It grieves that its crest is removed add refuses to copulate, but actually it is not castrated.
17. Who suffers from jaundice.

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

## Shabbath 111a

All agree that if one prepares it [a meal-offering] as leaven after another has prepared it as leaven,<sup>1</sup> he is culpable; because it is said, It shall not be baked leaven,<sup>2</sup> it shall not be made leaven,<sup>3</sup> If one castrates after another has castrated, he is culpable, for it is said, That which hath its stones bruised, or crushed, or broken, or cut away,<sup>4</sup> [ye shall not offer unto the Lord; neither shall ye do thus in your land]:<sup>5</sup> now, if one is guilty for cutting [them] away, how much more so for breaking them!<sup>6</sup> But it is to teach<sup>7</sup> that if one castrates after another, he is culpable!<sup>8</sup> — Rather it refers to an old man.<sup>9</sup> But R. Johanan said: It was those very [remedies]<sup>10</sup> which restored me to my youth?<sup>11</sup> — Rather the reference [here] is to a woman.<sup>12</sup> But according to R. Johanan b. Beroka, who said: Concerning both [man and woman] it is said, And God blessed them: and God said unto them, Be fruitful and multiply,<sup>13</sup> what can be said? — The reference [here] is to an old woman<sup>14</sup> or to a barren woman.

**MISHNAH.** IF ONE'S TEETH PAIN HIM, HE MUST NOT SIP VINEGAR THROUGH THEM,<sup>15</sup> BUT MAY DIP [HIS BREAD IN VINEGAR] IN THE USUAL MANNER,<sup>16</sup> AND IF HE IS CURED, HE IS CURED. IF ONE'S LOINS PAIN HIM, HE MUST NOT RUB THEM WITH WINE OR VINEGAR, BUT HE MAY ANOINT THEM WITH OIL,<sup>17</sup> YET NOT ROSE OIL.<sup>18</sup> ROYAL CHILDREN MAY ANOINT THEIR WOUNDS WITH ROSE OIL, SINCE IT IS THEIR PRACTICE TO ANOINT THEMSELVES THUS ON WEEKDAYS. R. SIMEON SAID: ALL ISRAEL ARE ROYAL CHILDREN.

**GEMARA.** R. Aha the Long, i.e., R. Ahab. Papa, pointed out a contradiction to R. Abbahu. We learnt: IF ONE HAS TOOTHACHE, HE MUST NOT SIP VINEGAR ON THEM. Shall we say that vinegar is beneficial to the teeth, — but it is written, As vinegar to the teeth, and as smoke to the eyes?<sup>19</sup> — There is no difficulty: the one

refers to vinegar of fruit;<sup>20</sup> the other to acid. Alternatively, both refer to acid: one means where there is a wound; the other, where there is no wound.<sup>21</sup> If there is a wound it heals; if there is no wound it loosens [the teeth in the gums].

**HE MUST NOT SIP VINEGAR THROUGH THEM.** But it was taught, He must not sip and eject, yet he may sip and swallow? — Said Abaye, When we learnt our Mishnah we too learnt of sipping and ejecting. Raba said, You may even say [that it refers to] sipping and swallowing: the one holds good before the dipping, the other after the dipping.<sup>22</sup> But let us say, Since it is permitted before the dipping, it is permitted after the dipping too,<sup>23</sup> for we know that Raba accepts this argument.<sup>24</sup> For Raba said: There is nothing which is permitted on the Sabbath and forbidden on the Day of Atonement:<sup>25</sup> since it is permitted on the Sabbath, it is permitted on the Day of Atonement too? He retracted from the present statement.<sup>26</sup> How do you know that he retracted from, this statement: perhaps he retracted from the other? — You cannot think so, For it was taught: All who are obliged to perform tebillah may do so in the normal way, both on the ninth of Ab and on the Day of Atonement.<sup>27</sup>

**IF ONES LOINS PAIN HIM,** etc. R. Abba b. Zabda said in Rab's name: The *halachah* is as R. Simeon. Shall we say that Rab holds with R. Simeon?<sup>28</sup> Surely R. Simeon son of R. Hiyya said in Rab's name: The stopper of the brewing vat<sup>29</sup>

1. I.e., the first kneads the dough after it was leaven, a second shapes it, and a third bakes it.
2. Lev. VI, 10.
3. Ibid. II, 11. The repeated prohibition shows that every separate act of preparation entails guilt.
4. E. V. cut,' from the present discussion it appears, however, that the Talmud translates the word 'cut away'.
5. Ibid. XXII, 24.
6. Then why mention it?
7. Lit., 'bring'.
8. Hence even a castrate may not drink this potion.
9. Who is in any case unable to beget children.
10. The reference is to the remedies mentioned in Git. 70a.

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

11. And made me potent again.
12. Who is not commanded to procreate: hence she may sterilize herself.
13. Gen. I, 28. This is understood as a positive command.
14. 'Who certainly can not regain her youth in this respect.
15. This is healing which is forbidden on the Sabbath.
16. And eat the vinegar-soaked bread.
17. Since this is done even without intention of healing.
18. Which ordinary people use only as a remedy.
19. Prov. X, 26.
20. Rashi: Wine not fully matured in the grapes — that is injurious.
21. Or, swelling.
22. Bread dipped in vinegar was eaten before meals. Before one has done this he may sip vinegar for his tooth, as it merely looks like a substitute for soaked bread. But if he has already eaten, he is obviously sipping it now as a remedy only.
23. For a thing cannot be permitted during one portion of the Sabbath and forbidden during the other.
24. Lit., 'he accepts "Since"'.  
25. In the matter of labor.
26. Sc. that which differentiates between before and after dipping.
27. It was in reference to this that Raba stated that what is permitted on the Sabbath is permitted on the Day of Atonement, and he is supported by a Baraita.
28. I.e., with his lenient rulings relating to the Sabbath.
29. In which beer is kept during the process of brewing. The stopper was made of soft materials, such as rags, wound round the bung.

## Shabbath 111b

may not be forced into [the bung-hole] on a Festival!<sup>1</sup> — There even R. Simeon agrees, For Abaye and Raba both maintain: R. Simeon agrees in the case of 'cut off his head but let him not die'.<sup>2</sup> But R. Hiyya b. Ashi said in Rab's name: The *halachah* is as R. Judah,<sup>3</sup> while R. Hanan b. Ammi said in Samuel's name: The *halachah* is as R. Simeon. Further, R. Hiyya b. Abin recited it without [intermediary] scholars:<sup>4</sup> Rab said: The *halachah* is as R. Judah; while Samuel ruled: The *halachah* is as R. Simeon? — Rather said Raba, I and a lion of the company,<sup>5</sup> viz., R. Hiyya b. Abin, explained it: [Rab said:] The *halachah* is as R. Simeon,

but not on account of his view. What is meant by 'The *halachah* is as R. Simeon, but not on account of his view?' Shall we say, 'The *halachah* is as R. Simeon', that it is permitted; 'but not through his reason for R. Simeon holds [that] it heals,<sup>6</sup> whereas Rab holds that it does not heal? Does then Rab hold that it does not heal? But surely, since he [the Tanna] states, ROYAL CHILDREN MAY ANOINT THEIR WOUNDS WITH ROSE OIL, it follows that [all agree] that it does heal? But 'the *halachah* is as R. Simeon', that it is permitted; 'but not through his reason': for whereas R. Simeon holds that in spite of its being rare it is permitted, Rab holds: Only if it is common [is it permitted], but not if it is rare,<sup>7</sup> and in Rab's place rose oil was common.

## CHAPTER XV

**MISHNAH.** Now, THESE ARE THE KNOTS WHICH ENTAIL CULPABILITY:<sup>8</sup> CAMEL-DRIVERS' KNOTS AND SAILORS' KNOTS. AND JUST AS ONE IS GUILTY FOR TYING THEM, SO IS HE GUILTY FOR UNTYING THEM. R. MEIR SAID: ANY KNOT WHICH ONE CAN UNTIE WITH ONE HAND ENTAILS NO GUILT.

**GEMARA.** What are CAMEL-DRIVERS' KNOTS AND SAILORS' KNOTS? Shall we say, the knot which is tied through the nose ring<sup>9</sup> and the knot which is tied through the ship's ring,<sup>10</sup> but these are non-permanent knots?<sup>11</sup> Rather it means the knot of the nose ring itself and of the ship's ring itself.<sup>12</sup>

**R. MEIR SAID: ANY KNOT, etc.** R. Ahadbuy the brother of Mar Aha asked: What of a slip-knot<sup>13</sup> on R. Meir's view: is R. Meir's reason because it can be untied with one hand, and this too can be untied;<sup>14</sup> or perhaps R. Meir's reason is that it is not well-fastened,<sup>15</sup> whereas this is well-fastened? The question stands over.

**MISHNAH.** YOU HAVE SOME KNOTS WHICH DO NOT ENTAIL GUILT LIKE FOR CAMEL-DRIVERS' KNOTS AND SAILORS' KNOTS.<sup>16</sup> A WOMAN MAY TIE UP THE OPENING OF HER

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

CHEMISE, THE RIBBONS OF HER HAIR-NET AND OF HER GIRDLE,<sup>17</sup> THE LACES OF HER SHOES OR SANDALS, PITCHERS OF WINE AND OIL, AND THE MEAT POT.<sup>18</sup> R. ELEAZAR B. JACOB SAID: ONE MAY TIE [A ROPE] IN FRONT OF AN ANIMAL,<sup>19</sup> THAT IT SHOULD NOT GO OUT.

**GEMARA.** This is self-contradictory: you say, YOU HAVE SOME KNOTS WHICH DO NOT ENTAIL GUILT LIKE FOR CAMEL-DRIVERS' KNOTS AND SAILORS' KNOTS; thus there is indeed no guilt, but there is a prohibition. Then he [the Tanna] teaches: A WOMAN MAY TIE UP THE OPENING OF HER CHEMISE, [which means] even at the very outset? — This is what he says: YOU HAVE SOME KNOTS WHICH DO NOT ENTAIL GUILT LIKE FOR CAMEL-DRIVERS' KNOTS AND SAILORS' KNOTS, and which are they?

1. For thereby the moisture which it previously absorbed is wrung out, and this is forbidden. But it is unintentional, whereas R. Simeon holds that such is permitted, *v. supra* 75a.
2. V. p. 357, II. 8.
3. Viz., that whatever is unintentional is forbidden.
4. Lit., 'men'.
5. I.e., one of our great scholars.
6. Yet it is permitted to all because a thing cannot be permitted to one and forbidden to another.
7. Where it is evident that it is applied as a remedy.
8. Tying knots is a principal labor, *supra* 73a.
9. Rash: a ring was inserted through the camel's nose (this ring was of cord, and had to be knotted after passing through the nose — R. Han., and the same appears from the Gemara) and when it was to be tethered a long rope was tied thereto. The reference is to the knot that is made in tying this long rope.
10. Rashi: a ring at the head of the ship, through which a rope was passed and tied when the ship was moored. Jast. translates: the loop which they made when attaching the sail to the rigging.
11. Only a permanent knot entails guilt, and these are naturally untied when the camel or the ship moves on.
12. Which are permanent.
13. Or, loop, which, however, is strongly fastened.
14. Hence it does not involve guilt.
15. An ordinary knot must be quite loose if it can be untied with one hand.
16. Nevertheless they are forbidden. The Gemara explains which are meant.

17. Rashi. Jast.: the cords of the breast bandage.
18. All these are tied and untied daily, and therefore are not permanent.
19. I.e., across the stable entrance.

## Shabbath 112a

The knot which is tied through the nose ring and the knot which is tied through the ship's ring: [for these] there is indeed no guilt, nevertheless there is a prohibition.<sup>1</sup> But some are permitted at the outset. And which are they? [A WOMAN] MAY TIE UP THE OPENING OF HER CHEMISE.

THE OPENING OF HER CHEMISE. But that is obvious? — This is necessary only where it has two pairs of bands:<sup>2</sup> you might say, One of these is disregarded:<sup>3</sup> hence he informs us [that we do not fear this].

AND THE RIBBONS OF HER HAIR-NET. But that is obvious? — This is necessary [to teach] only where it is roomy:<sup>4</sup> you might say, She will remove it [thus]:<sup>5</sup> hence he informs us that a woman is careful over<sup>6</sup> her hair and will [first] untie it.

AND THE LACES OF HER SHOES OR SANDALS. It was stated: If one unties the laces of his shoes or sandals, — one [Baraita] taught: He is liable to a sin-offering; another taught: He is not liable, yet it is forbidden; while a third taught: It is permitted in the first place. Thus [the rulings on] shoes are contradictory, and [those on] sandals are contradictory? [The rulings on] shoes are not contradictory: when it teaches, 'he is liable to a sin-offering', it refers to cobblers' [knots];<sup>7</sup> 'he is not liable, but it is forbidden' — that refers to [a knot] of the Rabbis;<sup>8</sup> 'it is permitted in the first place', refers to [the knots] of the townspeople of Mahoza.<sup>9</sup> [The rulings on] sandals too are not contradictory: when it states that 'one is liable to a sin-offering', it refers to [sandals] of travellers<sup>10</sup> tied by cobblers; one is not liable yet it is forbidden', refers to amateur knots<sup>11</sup> tied by [the wearers] themselves; 'it is permitted at the outset', refers to sandals in which two go out,<sup>12</sup> as was the case with Rab

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

Judah. For Rab Judah, brother of R. Salla the Pious, had a pair of sandals, at times he went out in them, at others his child. He went to Abaye and asked him, How is it in such a case? — One is liable to a sin-offering [for tying them], he replied. I do not even understand<sup>13</sup> why [though] one is not liable for this yet it is forbidden, and you tell me that one is liable to a sin-offering. What is the reason?<sup>14</sup> — Because on weekdays too, he replied, at times I go out in them, at others the child. In that case, said he, it is permitted at the outset.

R. Jeremiah was walking behind R. Abbahu in a *karmelith*, when the lace of his sandal snapped.<sup>15</sup> What shall I do with it? enquired he. — Take a moist reed that is fit for an animal's food and wind it about it, he replied. Abaye was standing in front of<sup>16</sup> R. Joseph,<sup>17</sup> when the lace of his sandal snapped. What shall I do with it? asked he. — Let it be, he replied.<sup>18</sup> Wherein does it differ from R. Jeremiah's [case]? — There it was not guarded,<sup>19</sup> here it is guarded. But it is still a utensil,<sup>20</sup> seeing that I could change it from the right [foot] to the left?<sup>21</sup> — Said he to him: Since R. Johanan explained [the law] on R. Judah's view, it follows that the *halachah* is as R. Judah.<sup>22</sup> To what does this refer? — For it was taught: If the two ears of the sandal<sup>23</sup> or its two strappings are broken, or if the entire sole is removed, it is clean.<sup>24</sup> If one of its ears or strappings [is broken], or if the greater part of the sole is removed, it is unclean. R. Judah said: If the inner one is broken, it is unclean;<sup>25</sup> if the outer, it is clean. Whereon 'Ulla-others State, Rabbah b. Bar Hanah said in R. Johanan's name: Just as the controversy in respect to uncleanness, so is there a controversy in respect to the Sabbath,<sup>26</sup> but not in respect to *halizah*.<sup>27</sup> Now we discussed this: To whose [view] does R. Johanan refer? Shall we say, To that of the Rabbis, [and he states], since it is a utensil in respect to uncleanness, it is also so in respect to the Sabbath, but not in respect to *halizah*, where it is not a utensil? Surely we learnt: If she removes the left[-foot shoe] from the right foot,<sup>28</sup> the *halizah* is valid?<sup>29</sup>

[Shall we] on the other hand [say that he refers] to R. Judah's [ruling]: [and means], since it is not a 'utensil' in respect to defilement, it is not a 'utensil' in respect to the Sabbath either, but that is not so in respect to *halizah*, where it is a 'utensil': [it may be asked against this]: Perhaps we rule, If she removes the left[-foot shoe] from the right foot the *halizah* is valid, only where it is a 'utensil' for its own function;<sup>30</sup> but here it is not a 'utensil' for its own function, seeing that R. Judah said: If the outer is broken, it is clean, which proves that it is not a 'utensil'?<sup>31</sup> In truth, [R. Johanan referred] to R. Judah's view: say, And it is likewise so in respect to *halizah*, and he informs us this: When do we say, If she removes the left [-foot shoe] from the right foot the *halizah* is valid, [only] where

1. For though temporary only, as stated *supra* 111b, they are frequently left there a long time, and so are forbidden.
2. Lit., 'entrances'. The chemise ties up by two pairs of bands or strings. It can be put on and removed even when one set is actually tied, thought of course with difficulty.
3. I.e., when she removes it she may leave one pair tied, which makes it permanent knot; since we do not know which may be left, both should be forbidden.
4. Not closely fitting, so that it can be removed from the head even when tied.
5. Without untying the ribbons.
6. Lit., 'spares'.
7. Rashi: when the cobbler inserts the lace in the shoe, he ties it there permanently. — Perhaps the shoes and its laces were so arranged that part of the lace was permanently fastened.
8. Sometimes they tied it very loosely, so that the shoe could be removed and put on without untying. Thus whilst not actually permanent to involve a sin-offering, it is semi-permanent, hence forbidden.
9. Who were particular that all their garments should fit exactly. Hence their shoes too were tightly fastened and had to be untied every time they were put on or off. perhaps they are mentioned in particular because being well-to-do they thought more of dress; cf. Obermeyer, p. 173.
10. Taya'a, specially Arabian caravan merchants.
11. Lit., 'balls'.
12. They are worn by two different people on occasion. Hence they must be tied exactly each time, and therefore the knot is temporary. — In

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

the other two the differences are the same as in the case of shoes.

13. Lit., 'it presents a difficulty to me'.
14. Abaye asked this: why do you think that it ought to be permitted?
15. With the result that the sandal fell off his foot.
16. Tosaf. in Hag. 23a s.v. [H] reads: was walking behind.
17. Rashi: in a courtyard.
18. Do not pick it (the sandal) up to put away.
19. In a *karmelith* others might take it.
20. Why should it not be allowed to handle the sandal?
21. A sandal had two strappings, perhaps like loops, through which the laces were inserted, one on the outside and the other on the inside of the foot. Now, if the inner one is broken, it can be mended, and though it is not very seemly to walk in sandals with the strappings or laces merely knotted together, nevertheless it does not matter, as it is not very noticeable on the inner part of the foot. But if the outer one is broken, one would not walk out in it until a new one is inserted; consequently it ceases to be a 'utensil', and may not be handled on the Sabbath (cf. p. 125, n. 3). In Abaye's case the outer strap was broken, hence R. Joseph's ruling. But Abaye argued that by changing the sandal to the other foot this would become the inner strapping, hence it should be permitted. Presumably their sandals were not shaped exactly to the foot, and were interchangeable.
22. That it ceases to be a 'utensil' if the outer is broken.
23. At the back, by means of which the sandal is held when it is tied up.
24. For here too it ceases to be a 'utensil'.
25. For it is still a 'utensil'.
26. If it is a utensil in respect of the former, it is likewise so in respect of the latter, and may be handled on the Sabbath.
27. V. [Glos.](#)
28. In the ceremony of *halizah* the shoe must be removed from the right foot.
29. Because they are interchangeable. But then it should also be regarded as a shoe in respect to *halizah* even if the outer strapping is broken.
30. I.e., it is at least fully fit for the left foot.
31. Even in respect of its own foot.

## Shabbath 112b

it is a 'utensil' for its own function, but here it is not a 'utensil' for its own function.<sup>1</sup>

Now, did R. Johanan say thus?<sup>2</sup> Surely R. Johanan said, The *halachah* is as an anonymous Mishnah,<sup>3</sup> and we learnt: If one

of the ears of a sandal is broken and he repairs it, it [the sandal] is unclean as midras.<sup>4</sup> (If the second is broken [too] and he repairs it, it is clean in that it is not defiled as midras,<sup>5</sup> but it is unclean as that touched by midras.)<sup>6</sup> Does not [this mean that] there is no difference whether it is the inner or the outer?<sup>7</sup> — No, [it refers] only [to] the inner. Then what if the outer [is broken]? [Would it be] clean! If so, instead of teaching, If the second is broken [too] and he repairs it, it is clean in that it is not defiled as midras, but it is unclean as that touched by midras, let him [the Tanna] draw a distinction in that very matter and teach: When is that? if the inner is broken; but [if] the outer [is broken] it is clean? — Said R. Isaac b. Joseph: Let our Mishnah<sup>8</sup> treat of a sandal which has four ears and four strappings, so as not to overthrow<sup>2</sup> the words of R. Johanan.

When Rabin came,<sup>10</sup> he said: R. Hanan b. Abba said in Rab's name: The *halachah* is as R. Judah; while R. Johanan said: The *halachah* is not as R. Judah. But did R. Johanan say thus: surely since R. Johanan explained [the law] on the basis of R. Judah's view, it follows that he agrees with R. Judah? — There is [a controversy of] amoraim as to R. Johanan's opinion.

We learnt elsewhere: As for all utensils belonging to private people, their standards are [holes as large] as pomegranates.<sup>11</sup> Hezekiah asked: What if it [a utensil] receives a hole [large enough] for an olive to fall through, and he [the owner] closes it, then it receives another hole<sup>12</sup> [large enough] for an olive to fall through, and he closes it, [and so on] until it is made large enough for a pomegranate to fall through? Said R. Johanan to him, You have taught us: If one of the ears of a sandal is broken and he repairs it, it [the sandal] is unclean as midras; if the second is broken and he repairs it, it is clean in that it is not defiled as midras, but it is unclean as that touched by midras. Now we asked you: Why is it different [when] the first [is broken], — because the second is sound? But [when] the

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

second [too] is broken, the first is [already] repaired? And you answered us: A new entity<sup>13</sup> has arrived hither;<sup>14</sup> here too, a new entity has arrived hither! [Thereupon] he [Hezekiah] exclaimed concerning him, This one is not the son of man!<sup>15</sup> Others say, Such a one is indeed the son of man!<sup>16</sup> R. Zera said in Raba b. Zimuna's name: If the earlier [scholars] were sons of angels, we are sons of men; and if the earlier [scholars] were sons of men, we are like asses, and not [even] like asses of R. Hanina b. Dosa and R. Phinehas b. Jair,<sup>17</sup> but like other asses.

**PITCHERS OF WINE OR OIL.** But that is obvious? — This is necessary only where they have two spouts;<sup>18</sup> you might say, He [the owner] may completely disregard one;<sup>19</sup> therefore he [the Tanna] informs us [that we do not fear this].

**THE MEAT POT.** But that is obvious? — This is necessary only where it has a [screwed-in] stopper: you might say, He [the owner] may completely abandon [it]:<sup>20</sup> hence he informs us [that we do not fear this].

**R. ELIEZER B. JACOB SAID: ONE MAY TIE, etc.** But that is obvious? This is necessary only where there are two cords: you might say,

1. And this is the statement referred to above that R. Johanan explained the law on the view of R. Judah.
2. That the *halachah* is according to R. Judah.
3. I.e., one not taught in the name of any Rabbi.
4. If it belonged to a *zab*. V. p. 312, n. 9.
5. I.e., it loses the midras defilement which it contracted previously.
6. I.e., it is unclean in the first degree, which is one degree below midras itself. It retains this lesser degree of defilement, because we regard it as having touched itself, as it were, when it was unclean as midras. — Rashal deletes the bracketed passage here.
7. Which is against R. Judah.
8. The cited anonymous Mishnah (Kel. XXVI, 4).
9. Lit., 'break'.
10. V. P. 12, n. 9.
11. If they are unclean, and then broken, the holes being large enough to allow a pomegranate to fall through, they cease to be utensils and become clean; cf. *supra* 95b.
12. At the side of the first.

13. Lit., 'face'.
14. I.e., subsequent to the shoe being defiled as midras, the breaking of both loops and their mending so change the shoe as to make it virtually a different utensil, not the one which was defiled.
15. He is superhuman.
16. He is a man in the full sense of the word.
17. The allusions are explained in Hul. 7a and Ta'an. 24a.
18. And the Mishnah refers to tying them up.
19. Lit., 'make it as naught', and use the other only; cf. p. 544, n. 7.
20. Sc. the cloth which he ties on top, as he can unscrew the stopper and take the food out that way.

## Shabbath 113a

He [the owner] may completely disregard one;<sup>1</sup> hence he [the Tanna] informs us (that we do not fear this).

R. Joseph said in Rab Judah's name in Samuel's name: The *halachah* is as R. Eliezer b. Jacob. Said Abaye to him, [You say,] The *halachah* [etc.]: hence it follows that they [the Rabbis] disagree?<sup>2</sup> And what difference does that make? he replied. Shall the accepted tradition be [merely] like a song? he retorted.<sup>3</sup>

**MISHNAH.** A BUCKET [OVER A WELL] MAY BE TIED WITH A FASCIA<sup>4</sup> BUT NOT WITH A CORD;<sup>5</sup> BUT R. JUDAH PERMITS IT. R. JUDAH STATED A GENERAL RULE: ANY KNOT THAT IS NOT PERMANENT ENTAILS NO CULPABILITY.

**GEMARA.** What CORD is meant. Shall we say an ordinary [bucket] cord? [How then state] R. JUDAH PERMITS IT? — [Surely] it is a permanent knot? Rather it refers to a weaver's rope.<sup>6</sup> Shall we say that the Rabbis hold, We preventively forbid a weaver's cord on account of an ordinary one,<sup>7</sup> while R. Judah holds, We do not preventively forbid? But the following contradicts it: If the cord of a bucket is broken, one must not tie it [together] but merely make a loop [slip-knot]; whereas R. Judah maintains: One may wind a hollow belt or a fascia around it, providing that he does not tie it with a slip-

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

knot. [Thus] R. Judah's [views] are self-contradictory and [similarly] the Rabbis'? — The Rabbis' [views] are not self-contradictory: one rope may be mistaken for<sup>8</sup> another,<sup>9</sup> [whereas] looping cannot be mistaken for knotting.<sup>10</sup> R. Judah's [views] are not self-contradictory: there it is not because looping may be mistaken for knotting, but [because] looping itself is [a form of] knotting.<sup>11</sup>

R. Abba said in the name of R. Hiyya b. Ashi in Rab's name: A man may bring a cord from his house and tie it to a cow and [its] trough.<sup>12</sup> R. Aha the Long, that is R. Aha b. Papa, refuted R. Abba: If a cord [is attached] to a trough, one may tie it to [his] cow; and if [attached] to a cow, one may tie it to a trough, provided however, that he does not bring a cord from his house and tie it to the cow and the trough? — There [the reference is to] an ordinary cord; here [we treat of] a weaver's cord.

Rab Judah said in Samuel's name: A weaver's implements may be handled on the Sabbath.<sup>13</sup> Rab Judah was asked: What of the upper beam and the lower beam?<sup>14</sup> — Yes and No, and he was uncertain about it.<sup>15</sup> It was stated: R. Nahman said in Samuel's name: A weaver's implements may be handled on the Sabbath, even the upper beam and the lower beam, but not the [vertical] rollers.<sup>16</sup> Raba asked R. Nahman: Why are rollers different, that it is not [permitted]? Shall we say, because one makes holes?<sup>17</sup> But the holes are made automatically!<sup>18</sup> For we learnt: If one stores turnips or radishes under a vine, provided some of their leaves are uncovered, he need have no fear on account of kil'ayim, the seventh year, or tithes, and they may be removed on the Sabbath?<sup>19</sup> — In a field one will not come to level [fill up] the holes; [whereas] here in the house one will come to level the holes.<sup>20</sup>

R. Johanan asked R. Judah b. Lewai: As for a weaver's implements, e.g., the upper beam and the lower beam, may they be handled on the Sabbath? They may not be handled,

answered he. What is the reason? Because they cannot be taken up [moved].<sup>21</sup>

*MISHNAH.* ONE MAY FOLD UP GARMENTS EVEN FOUR OR FIVE TIMES,<sup>22</sup> AND SPREAD THE SHEETS ON THE BEDS ON THE NIGHT OF THE SABBATH<sup>23</sup> FOR [USE ON] THE SABBATH, BUT NOT ON THE SABBATH FOR [USE ON] THE CONCLUSION OF THE SABBATH. R. ISHMAEL SAID: ONE MAY FOLD UP GARMENTS AND SPREAD THE SHEETS ON THE BEDS ON THE DAY OF ATONEMENT FOR [USE ON] THE SABBATH;<sup>24</sup> AND THE FATS OF THE SABBATH<sup>25</sup> MAY BE OFFERED [BURNT ON THE ALTAR] ON THE DAY OF ATONEMENT,<sup>26</sup> BUT NOT THOSE OF THE DAY OF ATONEMENT ON THE SABBATH. R. AKIBA SAID: NEITHER MAY THOSE OF THE SABBATH BE OFFERED ON THE DAY OF ATONEMENT, NOR MAY THOSE OF THE DAY OF ATONEMENT BE OFFERED ON THE SABBATH.

*GEMARA.* The School of R. Jannai said: They learnt this only of one man, but [it may] not [be done] by two men.<sup>27</sup> And even of one man, we said [this] only of new [garments],<sup>28</sup> but not of old [ones]. And even of old [garments], we said this only of white, but not of colored [ones].<sup>29</sup> And we said this only if he has no others to change, but if he has others to change it is not permitted. It was taught: [The members] of the household of R. Gamaliel did not fold up their white garments, because they had [others] for changing.

R. Huna said: If one has a change [of garments],<sup>30</sup> he should change [them], but if he has nothing to change into, he should lower his garments.<sup>31</sup> R. Safra demurred: But this looks like ostentation? — Since he does not do this every day, but [only] now [on the Sabbath], it does not look like ostentation.

And thou shalt honor it, not doing thine own ways:<sup>32</sup> 'and thou shalt honor it', that thy Sabbath garments should not be like thy weekday garments, and even as R. Johanan called his garments 'My honourers'.<sup>33</sup> 'Not

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

doing thine own ways', that thy walking on the Sabbath shall not be like thy walking on weekdays.<sup>34</sup> 'Nor finding thine own affairs':<sup>35</sup> thine affairs are forbidden, the affairs of Heaven [religious matters] are permitted. 'Nor speaking thine own words:'

1. He will untie only the lower one, and the animal can leave the stable by stooping.
2. Surely not, seeing that this is exactly similar to the other cases.
3. V. *supra* 57b, 106b.
4. A band or fillet.
5. The first is certainly not permanent, but the second may be left there, and thus a permanent knot will have been tied on the Sabbath.
6. He needs this and will not abandon it there.
7. The former ought to be permitted, since the knot is only temporary (v. preceding note), and the only reason for prohibiting it is that we fear that otherwise one may fasten an ordinary rope too.
8. Lit., 'interchanged with'.
9. As in n. 4.
10. No one will think that if the former is permitted the latter is too.
11. In his view.
12. Without fear of subsequently leaving one end tied, in which case it becomes a permanent knot.
13. For a permissible use, though of course their normal use is forbidden on the Sabbath.
14. Jast.: the upper beam on which the warp depends; the lower beam, the roller on which the web is wound as it advances. — Do we say that since these are costly the weaver is careful not to use them for any purpose but their own, and hence they may not be handled even for a legitimate use?
15. Lit., 'it was weak in his hand'.
16. Perforated rollers used by women in weaving.
17. The roller is set in the ground, and in pulling it out one naturally dislodges the earth around it and thus makes a hole.
18. I.e., they cannot be regarded as made by him.
19. v. *supra* 50b bottom *et seq.* for notes. Thus we do not say that in removing them from the ground he makes holes.
20. And for fear of this it is forbidden.
21. Even on weekdays, owing to their heaviness. Hence they are utensils whose exclusive purpose is a labor forbidden on the Sabbath (cf. p. 167, n. 8.)
22. Every time one takes them off, if they are to be worn again on the Sabbath.
23. I.e., Friday night.
24. Rashi: e.g., if the former falls on Friday. — Nowadays this can never happen, but it was possible in the age of the Mishnah, when the

beginning of each month was fixed by direct observation.

25. I.e., the fats of sacrifices offered on the Sabbath.
26. If it follows the Sabbath. The fats were burnt during the night following the day in which the sacrifice was offered up.
27. When two men fold up garments they naturally smooth out the creases, and thus repair them, as it were.
28. They have less creases, and also the cloth is harder, and so the folding does not smooth them out
29. Their creases are more easily smoothed out. — Perhaps their method of dyeing had that effect on the cloth.
30. For the Sabbath.
31. Wear them lower down, to make them look longer. — Wealthy men who did not work in the field generally wore longer garments than workers.
32. Isa. LVIII, 13. The reference is to the Sabbath.
33. The garments dignify the person.
34. This is explained *infra*.
35. Ibid. E.V.: pleasure.

## Shabbath 113b

that thy speech [conversation] on the Sabbath should not be like thy speech on weekdays.<sup>1</sup> 'Speaking': speech is forbidden, but thought [about mundane matters] is permitted. Now, as for all [the rest], they are intelligible; but what is meant by, 'that thy walking on the Sabbath shall not be like thy walking on weekdays'? — As R. Huna said in Rab's name-others state, R. Abba said in R. Huna's name: If one is walking on the Sabbath and comes to a stream of water, if he can put down his first foot<sup>2</sup> before lifting the second,<sup>3</sup> it is permitted;<sup>4</sup> otherwise it is forbidden.<sup>5</sup> Raba demurred: What shall he do? Shall he go round it? Then he increases the walking [distance]!<sup>6</sup> Shall he cross it [walking through]? His garments may be soaked in water and he is led to wringing [them] out!<sup>7</sup> Rather [in such a case], since it is impossible [otherwise], it is permitted [to jump across]. But [what is meant]<sup>8</sup> is as Rabbi asked R. Ishmael son of R. Jose: Is it permitted to take great strides on the Sabbath?<sup>9</sup> — Who then permitted it on weekdays? he replied; for I maintain that a long stride takes away a five hundredth part of a man's eyesight,<sup>10</sup> and it is restored to him by the evening Kiddush.<sup>11</sup>

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

Rabbi asked R. Ishmael son of R. Jose: May one eat earth on the Sabbath?<sup>12</sup> — Who then permitted it on weekdays? he replied. For I maintain, It is forbidden even on weekdays, because it causes illness.

R. Ammi said: He who eats earth of Babylon is as though he ate the flesh of his ancestors;<sup>13</sup> some say, It is as though he ate of abominations and creeping things, because it is written, And he dissolved every living thing, etc.<sup>14</sup> Resh Lakish said, Why is it [Babylon] called Shinar? Because all the dead of the Deluge were shaken out [deposited] thither [nin'aru lesham]. R. Johanan said: Why was it called Mezulah [depth]? Because all the dead<sup>15</sup> of the Deluge were dumped<sup>16</sup> there.

'Some say, It is as though he ate of abominations and creeping things.' But these were certainly completely dissolved?<sup>17</sup> Rather because they cause illness the Rabbis forbade them. For a certain man ate 'gargishta<sup>18</sup> and [then] ate cress, and the cress sprouted up into his heart<sup>19</sup> and he died.

Wash thyself therefore, and anoint thee, and put thy raiment upon thee.<sup>20</sup> R. Eleazar said: This refers to the Sabbath garments. Give instructions to a wise man, and he will be yet wiser.<sup>21</sup> R. Eleazar said: This alludes to Ruth the Moabitess and Samuel of Ramah.<sup>22</sup> 'Ruth' — for whereas Naomi said to her, Wash thyself therefore, and anoint thee, and put thy raiment upon thee, and get thee down to the threshing floor, yet of her it is written, And she went down unto the threshing-floor, and [only] subsequently, and did according to all that her mother-in-law bade her.<sup>23</sup> 'Samuel': for whereas Eli said to him, Lie down: and it shall be, if he call thee, that thou shalt say, Speak, Lord, for thy servant heareth;<sup>24</sup> yet of him it is written, And the Lord came, and stood, and called as at other times, Samuel, Samuel. Then Samuel said, Speak; for thy servant heareth,<sup>25</sup> but he did not say, Speak, Lord.<sup>26</sup>

And she went and came and gleaned in the field.<sup>27</sup> R. Eleazar said: She repeatedly went and came until she found decent men whom to accompany. Then said Boaz unto his servant that was set over [the reapers, whose damsel is this?]<sup>28</sup> Was it then Boaz's practice to enquire about damsels?<sup>29</sup> — Said R. Eleazar: He perceived a wise dealing<sup>30</sup> in her behavior, two ears of corn<sup>31</sup> she gleaned; three ears of corn she did not glean.<sup>32</sup> It was taught: He perceived modest behavior in her, the standing ears<sup>33</sup> [she gleaned] standing; the fallen [she gleaned] sitting. And cleave here by my maidens:<sup>34</sup> was it then Boaz's practice to cleave<sup>35</sup> to the women?<sup>36</sup> — Said R. Eleazar, As soon as he saw that, 'and Orpah kissed her mother-in-law, but Ruth cleaved unto her,'<sup>37</sup> he said, It is permitted to cleave unto her. And at meal-time Boaz said unto her, Come hither:<sup>38</sup> Said R. Eleazar, He intimated to her,<sup>39</sup> The royal house of David is destined to come forth from thee, [the house] whereof 'hither' is written, as it is said, Then David the king went in, and sat before the Lord, — and he said, Who am I, O Lord God, and what is my house, that thou hast brought me hither?<sup>40</sup>

And dip thy morsel in vinegar.<sup>41</sup> R. Eleazar said: Hence [it may be deduced] that vinegar is beneficial in hot weather. R. Samuel b. Nahmani said: He intimated to her, A son is destined to come forth from thee whose actions shall be as sharp<sup>42</sup> as vinegar; and who was it, Manasseh — And she sat beside the reapers.<sup>43</sup> R — Eleazar observed: At the side of the reapers, but not in the midst of the reapers: he [Boaz] intimated to her<sup>44</sup> that the Kingdom of the House of David was destined to be divided.<sup>45</sup> And he reached her parched corn, and she did eat [and was sufficed, and left thereof]:<sup>46</sup> Said R. Eleazar: 'She ate' in the days of David, 'she was sufficed' in the days of Solomon, 'and she left over' in the days of Hezekiah.<sup>47</sup> Some there are who interpret, 'She ate' in the days of David and Solomon, and 'she was sufficed' in the days of Hezekiah, 'and she left over' in the days of Rabbi.<sup>48</sup> For a Master said, Rabbi's house steward was wealthier than King Shapur.<sup>49</sup>

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

In a Baraita it was taught: 'And she ate', in this world; 'and she was sufficed', in the days of the Messiah: 'and she left over', in the future that is to come.<sup>50</sup>

And beneath his glory shall he kindle a burning like the burning of a fire.<sup>51</sup> R. Johanan said: That which is 'beneath' his glory [shall be burnt], but 'glory' is not literal.<sup>52</sup> R. Johanan is consistent with his opinion, for R. Johanan called his garments 'my honorers'. R. Eleazar said, 'and beneath his glory' means literally instead of his glory.<sup>53</sup> R. Samuel b. Nahmani interpreted: 'And beneath his glory' [must be understood] like the burning of the sons of Aaron; just as there the burning of the soul [is meant], while the body remained intact,<sup>54</sup> so here too, the burning of the soul, while the body remains intact.<sup>55</sup>

R. Aha b. Abba said in R. Johanan's name:

1. E.g., business talk is forbidden.
2. On the other side of the stream.
3. From this side of the stream — i.e., he can negotiate the stream in a single stride.
4. Even to jump across.
5. To jump across.
6. Which is more tiring and certainly not preferable on the Sabbath.
7. Which is forbidden.
8. By 'that thy walking on the Sabbath, etc.'
9. Or does it not seem in keeping with the restfulness that should characterize the Sabbath.
10. Lit., 'the light of a man's eyes'.
11. By drinking the wine of Kiddush, q.v. [Glos.](#)
12. Rashi: 'day'. Perhaps as a cure.
13. Who died there.
14. Gen. VII, 23. It is now assumed that they became earth.
15. *Var. lec.*: waters.
16. Or, sunk-nitzallelu.
17. They did not become earth.
18. A certain reddish clay.
19. It took root and grew in the gargishta.
20. Ruth III, 3.
21. Prov. IX, 9.
22. I.e., the prophet.
23. Ruth III, 6. — She reversed the order, lest she be met on the way thus adorned, and suspected of being a harlot.
24. I Sam. III, 9.
25. I Sam. III, 10.
26. Being uncertain whether it was God's voice.
27. Ruth II, 3.
28. Ibid. 5.
29. Surely he did not ask about every maiden gleaning in the field!
30. Lit., 'a matter of wisdom'. BaH, quoting Nid. 69b, translates: a knowledge (lit., 'matter of halachah').
31. That fell from the reapers.
32. In accordance with the law stated in *Pe'ah* VI, 5 — This fact attracted his attention.
33. Which the reapers forgot to cut down; these belong to the poor.
34. Ibid. 8.
35. *var. lec.*: speak.
36. The question as based on the verse is not clear, v. Maharsha.
37. Ibid. I, 14.
38. Ibid. II, 14.
39. Under the action of the Holy Spirit.
40. II Sam. VII, 18. E.V.: 'thus far'; Heb. in both verses, halom.
41. Ruth II, 14.
42. Lit., 'hard', 'grievous'.
43. Ibid.
44. By seating her thus.
45. Just as the reapers made a division between her and him.
46. Ruth II, 14.
47. This metaphorically indicates the progressive stages of prosperity during the reigns of these three monarchs.
48. R. Judah the Prince, who was a descendant of the House of David.
49. Shapur I, King of Persia and a contemporary of Samuel (third century).
50. Cf. Sanh., Sonc. ed., p. 601, n. 3.
51. Isa. X, 16.
52. For the literal meaning of 'glory' in reference to a man is his body, the flesh which gives him his beauty; hence beneath his 'glory' would have to mean his soul, which R. Johanan regards as unsuited to the context. Therefore 'glory,' must refer to his garments, which dignify him, whilst 'beneath his 'glory' denotes the body.
53. Tahath means both 'beneath' and 'instead'. He too maintains that the body shall be burnt and translates, instead of his glory — sc. his body there shall be the ashes to which it is reduced.
54. v. Sanh. 52a.
55. He translates tahath 'beneath', like R. Johanan, and 'glory' his body, like R. Eleazar, and hence arrives at this conclusion. — In Sanh. 94a R. Eleazar's view and R. Samuel b. Nahmani's are combined; v. *ibid.*, Sonc. ed., p. 634.

## Shabbath 114a

Whence do we learn change of garments<sup>1</sup> in the Torah? Because it is said, And he shall

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

put off his garments, and put on other garments,<sup>2</sup> and the School of R. Ishmael taught: The Torah teaches you manners: In the garments in which one cooked a dish for his master, one should not mix a cup [of wine] for his master.<sup>3</sup>

R. Hiyya b. Abba said in R. Johanan's name: It is a disgrace for a scholar to go out with patched shoes into the market place. But R. Aha b. Hanina did go out [thus]? — Said R. Aha son of R. Nahman: The reference is to patches upon patches. R. Hiyya b. Abba also said in R. Johanan's name: Any scholar upon whose garment a [grease] stain is found is worthy of death,<sup>4</sup> for it is said, All they that hate me [mesanne'ai] love [merit] death:<sup>5</sup> read not mesanne'ai but masni'ai [that make me hated, i.e., despised].<sup>6</sup> Rabina said: This was stated about a thick patch.<sup>7</sup> Yet they do not differ: one refers to the upper garment [coat], the other to a shirt.

R. Hiyya b. Abba also said in R. Johanan's name: What is meant by the verse, Like as my servant Isaiah hath walked naked and barefoot?<sup>8</sup> 'Naked' means in worn-out garments; 'barefoot' in patched shoes.

We learnt elsewhere: A grease stain upon a saddle constitutes an interposition.<sup>9</sup> R. Simeon b. Gamaliel said: [The inferior limit is] as much as an Italian issar.<sup>10</sup> On garments: [if the stain is] on one side, it does not interpose; [if] on both sides,<sup>11</sup> it interposes. R. Judah said in R. Ishmael's name: Even on one side it interposes.<sup>12</sup>

R. Simeon b. Lakish asked R. Hanina: In the case of a saddle, [can the stain be] on one side, or [must it be] on both sides?<sup>13</sup> I have not heard this, he replied, but have heard something similar. For we learnt, R. Jose said: [The garments] of banna'im: [a stain even] on one side [interposes]; of uncultured persons, [only a stain] on both sides [interposes].<sup>14</sup> And surely a saddle does not stand higher than the garment of an ignoramus!<sup>15</sup> What are banna'im — Said R. Johanan: These are scholars, who are

engaged all their days in the up-building of the world.<sup>16</sup>

R. Johanan also said: Who is the scholar to whom a lost article is returned on his recognition thereof?<sup>17</sup> That [scholar] who is particular to turn his shirt.<sup>18</sup> R. Johanan also said: Who is the scholar that is appointed a leader of the community? He who when asked a matter of *halachah* in any place can answer it, even in the Tractate Kallah.<sup>19</sup> R. Johanan also said: Who is the scholar whose work it is the duty of his townspeople to perform?<sup>20</sup> He who abandons his own interest and engages in religious affairs; yet that is only to provide<sup>21</sup> his bread.<sup>22</sup>

R. Johanan also said: Who is a scholar? He who is asked a *halachah* in any place and can state it, In respect of what practical matter? — To appoint him a leader of the community: if [he is well versed only] in one Tractate, [he can be appointed] in his own town; if in the whole [field of] learning,<sup>23</sup> [he can be appointed] as the head of an academy.<sup>24</sup>

R. Simeon b. Lakish said: This means<sup>25</sup> the court robes [olaryin]<sup>26</sup> that come from overseas, Shall we say that they are white? But R. Jannai said to his sons, 'My sons, bury me neither in white shrouds nor in black shrouds, White, lest I do not merit,<sup>27</sup> and am like a bridegroom among mourners: black, in case I have merit, and am like a mourner among bridegrooms. But [bury me] in court garments [olaryin] that come from overseas. This proves that they are colored. — There is no difficulty: one refers to robes,<sup>28</sup> the other to shirts.<sup>29</sup>

R. ISHMAEL SAID: ONE MAY FOLD UP, etc. Our Rabbis taught: The burnt-offering of the Sabbath, on the Sabbath thereof:<sup>30</sup> this teaches concerning the fats of the Sabbath, that they may be offered [burnt] on the Day of Atonement. One might think. Those of the Day of Atonement [can] also [be burnt] on the Sabbath, therefore it is stated, 'on the Sabbath thereof': this is R. Ishmael's opinion. R. Akiba said: 'The burnt-offering of the

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

Sabbath on the Sabbath thereof': this teaches concerning the fats of the sabbath, that they can be offered on a Festival.<sup>31</sup> One might think, On the Day of Atonement too, therefore it is stated, 'on the Sabbath thereof.' When you examine the matter,<sup>32</sup> according to R. Ishmael's opinion, vows<sup>33</sup> and freewill-offerings<sup>34</sup> may be sacrificed on a Festival, hence the verse is required in respect of the Day of Atonement.<sup>35</sup> [But] on the view of R. Akiba, vows and freewill-offerings cannot be sacrificed on a Festival; hence the verse is required to permit [the burning of the fats on] Festivals.

R. Zera said:

1. As an act of honor.
2. Lev. VI, 4.
3. In Talmudic times liquor was diluted with water.
4. This expression merely denotes strong indignation a scholar should set a high standard of cleanliness.
5. Prov. VIII, 36. The speaker is learning personified.
6. For a scholar who has no pride in his personal appearance brings contempt upon his learning.
7. Jast.; v. however, Rashi.
8. Isa. XX, 3.
9. When an article is unclean and requires tebillah (v. [Glos.](#)), nothing may interpose between it and the water; otherwise the tebillah is invalid. With respect to stains, etc. if one generally objects to them, they are an interposition; if not, they are not an interposition. A grease stain belongs to the former category.
10. A certain coin. The stain must be at least that size for it to interpose.
11. The greasiness having soaked through.
12. V. Kel. IX, 5, 6.
13. In R. Ishmael's view.
14. The former are more fastidious than the latter. R. Jose disagrees with R. Judah and maintains that according to R. Ishmael a stain on the garments of banna'im (explained below as meaning scholars) interposes even if it is on one side only. — This passage is cited to show that scholars must be particular.
15. I.e., an uncultured person. On 'am ha-arez v. p 51, n. 1.
16. Banna'im lit. means builders. Frankel, *Zeitschrift für die Religiösen Interessen des Judentums*, 1846 p. 455 maintains that the term banna'im was originally applied to the Essenes. — Ignorance is the greatest enemy of stability, but it should be noted that the phrase (disciple

of the wise) (*talmid hakam*) always denoted scholarship plus piety.

17. Lit., 'on impression of the eye'. The ordinary person in claiming a lost article must state identification marks, but a scholar is believed if he simply states that he recognizes it; B.M. 23b.
18. For the seams and rough edges to be on the inside. It appears that not all were particular about this.
19. A short tractate of that name. Rashi: Though this is not generally studied. Others: the laws of Festivals (Kallah was the name given to the general assemblies in Elul and Adar, when the laws of the Festivals were popularly expounded). v. Kid., Sonc. ed., p. 247, nn 3-4.
20. V. Yoma 72b; cf. Aboth III, and note a.l. in Sonc. ed. The present passage supports the thirteenth century interpretation quoted there, and suggests that it was similarly interpreted in Talmudic ages too.
21. Lit., 'take trouble over'.
22. I.e., he can only demand the necessities of existence.
23. Jast. the Mishnah, [Kaplan, J. *op. cit.* p. 250 understands this as a technical term denoting the summary embodying conclusions arrived at in schools as a result of the discussions based on the Mishnah]
24. It may be observed that it is automatically assumed that the leader of a community must be a scholar for Jewry sought to promote an aristocracy of learning, not of birth. Cf. Halevi, *Doroth*, I, 3, pp. 640 seq.
25. Resh Lakish gives his definition of the garments of 'banna'im'.
26. Jast. Rashi reads: olyarim (from [G]): costly wraps used by wealthy persons at the baths.
27. To be amongst the righteous.
28. Upper garments, which were colored,
29. Or, chemises. These were white.
30. Num. XXXVIII, 10. This is interpreted with and without the 'thereof' (the suffix u). Thus: (i) The burnt-offering of one Sabbath may be completed (i.e., its fat burnt on the altar) on another Sabbath; (ii) The burnt-offering of one Sabbath must be completed on that self-same Sabbath. In this connection it must be observed that the Day of Atonement too is designated Sabbath in Lev. XXIII, 32
31. Following the Sabbath.
32. Lit., 'when you find to say',
33. I.e. vowed sacrifices,
34. For the difference v, R. H. 6a. Both, of course, are voluntary sacrifices,
35. For if even voluntary offerings, which can be brought on weekdays, may be sacrificed on a Festival, it goes without saying that fats left over from the obligatory public sacrifices of the Sabbath can be burnt in the evening, even if it is a Festival, and no verse is necessary to teach

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

this. Consequently the verse must be referred to the Day of Atonement.

## Shabbath 114b

When I was in Babylon<sup>1</sup> I thought,<sup>2</sup> That which was taught, If the Day of Atonement fell on the eve of the sabbath [Friday], it [the *Shofar*] was not sounded,<sup>3</sup> while [if it fell] at the termination of the Sabbath, habdalah was not recited,<sup>4</sup> is a unanimous opinion. But when I emigrated thither [to Palestine]. I found Judah the son of R. Simeon b. Pazzi sitting and saying, This is according to Akiba [only];<sup>5</sup> for if [it agrees with] R. Ishmael, — since he maintains, The fats of the Sabbath may be offered on the Day of Atonement, let it [the *Shofar*] be sounded, so that it may be known that the fats of the Sabbath can be offered on the Day of Atonement,<sup>6</sup> Whereupon I said to him, The priests<sup>7</sup> are zealous.<sup>8</sup>

Mar Kashisha son of R. Hisda said to R. Ashi: Do we then say, Priests are zealous? Surely we learnt: Three [blasts were blown] to cause the people to cease work; three, to distinguish between the holy [day] and weekdays?<sup>9</sup> — As Abaye answered,<sup>10</sup> it was for the rest of the people in Jerusalem; so here too it was for the rest of the people in Jerusalem.

Yet let it [the *Shofar*] be blown, so that they might know that the trimming of vegetables is permitted [on the Day of Atonement] from the [time of] minhah<sup>11</sup> and onwards?<sup>12</sup> Said R. Joseph: Because a shebuth<sup>13</sup> is not superseded in order to give permission.<sup>14</sup> While R. Shisha son of R. Idi answered: A shehuth [of] immediate<sup>15</sup> [importance] was permitted; a shebuth [of] distant [importance] was not permitted<sup>16</sup> But did they permit a shebuth [of] immediate [importance]? Surely we learnt: If a Festival falls on Friday, we sound [the *shofar*] but do not recite habdalah;<sup>17</sup> [if it falls] at the termination of the Sabbath, we recite habdalah<sup>18</sup> but do not sound [the *shofar*].<sup>19</sup> But why so: let it be sounded so that it may be known that killing [animals for food] is

permitted immediately [the Sabbath ends]?<sup>20</sup> Rather it is clear that it is as R. Joseph [answered].

R. Zera said in R. Huna's name — others state, R. Abba said in R. Huna's name: If the Day of Atonement falls on the Sabbath, the trimming of vegetables is forbidden. R. Mana said, It was taught likewise: How do we know that if the Day of Atonement falls on the Sabbath, the trimming of vegetables<sup>21</sup> is forbidden? Because it is said, Sabbathon; it is a shebuth.<sup>22</sup> Now, in respect of what [is it stated]: shall we say. In respect of labour<sup>23</sup> — surely it is written, thou shalt not do any work?<sup>24</sup> Hence it must surely refer to the trimming of vegetables;<sup>25</sup> this proves it.

A. Hiyya b. Abba said in R. Johanan's name: If the Day of Atonement falls on the Sabbath, the trimming of vegetables is permitted. An objection is raised: How do we know that if the Day of Atonement falls on the Sabbath, the trimming of vegetables is forbidden? Because sabbathon is stated: it is a shebuth. In respect of what: shall we say in respect of labor, — surely it is written, 'thou shalt not do any work'? Hence it must surely refer to the trimming of vegetables! — No: in truth it refers to actual work, but [it is stated] to [show that] one violates an affirmative and a negative injunction on account thereof.<sup>26</sup> It was taught in accordance with R. Johanan: If the Day of Atonement falls on the Sabbath,

1. R. Zera was a Babylonian who studied at home first and then emigrated to Palestine,
2. Lit., 'said',
3. As on ordinary Fridays, *supra* 35b.
4. In the evening prayer, V. [Glos.](#) When a Festival falls on Sunday, habdalah is recited in the evening to signify that there is a distinction between the holiness of the Sabbath and that of Festivals.
5. Since he maintains that the fats of the Sabbath may not be burnt on the Day of Atonement and vice versa, he evidently holds that they each enjoy equal sanctity. Therefore neither habdalah nor the sounding of the *shofar* is required, for these are necessary only to mark a difference in the degree of sanctity.
6. For the sounding of the *shofar* would teach that the Day of Atonement possessed a lower degree of holiness.

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

7. Who burn the fats.
8. They take care to know the law and need no reminder.
9. This was done in the Temple, and he assumed that it was in order to remind the priests,
10. In reference to another matter; v, Yoma 37b,
11. V. [Glos.](#)
12. In this it differs from the Sabbath, when it is forbidden, V. *infra*.
13. V. [Glos.](#); the blowing of the *shofar* is a shebuth.
14. But only where it is necessary to emphasize prohibitions, e.g., if Friday is a Festival, so that many things permitted thereon are forbidden on the Sabbath,
15. Lit., 'near',
16. If it were of immediate importance, the shebuth would have been permitted. But in any case when the day of Atonement falls on Friday, the vegetables, even if trimmed, cannot be cooked on the Sabbath. So that the sounding of the *shofar* would only be of importance for subsequent Days of Atonement, and in such a case the shebuth is not superseded.
17. On Friday evening, because habdalah is recited only when a more stringent holiness is left behind.
18. On Saturday evening.
19. Saturday afternoon.
20. For the preparation of food is permitted on Festivals, Ex, XII. 6.
21. I.e., cutting away those parts of vegetables which are not edible. The reference is of course to unattached vegetables.
22. Ex. XVI, 23: E.V. (solemn) rest. Here it is translated as shebuth, and thus intimates such labor as trimming vegetables.
23. I.e., the word forbids actual labor, e.g. the trimming of vegetables that are still attached to the soil, *supra* 73b. — The discussion here treats of vegetables already cut off from the ground.
24. Ex, XX, 9, hence sabbathon is superfluous.
25. The verse is merely a support (*asmakta*), the prohibition being a Rabbinical one only (Ri).
26. Sabbathon is an affirmative command, bidding one to rest.

## Shabbath 115a

the trimming of vegetables is permitted. Nuts may be cracked and pomegranates scraped from the [time of] minhah and onwards, on account of one's vexation.<sup>1</sup> The household of Rab Judah trimmed cabbage. Rabbah's household scraped pumpkins. Seeing that they were doing this [too] early,<sup>2</sup> he said to them, A letter has come from the west in R.

Johanah's name [to the elect] that this is forbidden.<sup>3</sup>

## CHAPTER XVI

**MISHNAH.** ALL SACRED WRITINGS<sup>4</sup> MAY<sup>5</sup> BE SAVED FROM A FIRE,<sup>6</sup> WHETHER WE READ THEM OR NOT;<sup>7</sup> AND EVEN IF THEY ARE WRITTEN IN ANY LANGUAGE, THEY MUST BE HIDDEN.<sup>8</sup> AND WHY DO WE NOT READ [CERTAIN OF THE SACRED WRITINGS]? BECAUSE OF THE NEGLECT OF THE *BETH HAMIDRASH*.<sup>9</sup>

**GEMARA.** It was stated: If they are written in Targum<sup>10</sup> or in any [other] language, — R. Huna said: They must not be saved from a fire; while R. Hisda ruled: They may be saved from a fire. On the view that it is permissible to read them,<sup>11</sup> all agree that they must be saved. They differ only according to the view that they may not be read. R. Huna says: We may not save [them], since they may not be read. R. Hisda says: We must save [them], because of the disgrace to Holy Writings.<sup>12</sup> We learnt: ALL SACRED WRITINGS MAY BE SAVED FROM THE FIRE, WHETHER WE READ THEM OR NOT, and even if they are written in any language. Surely WHETHER WE READ THEM refers to the Prophets, whilst OR NOT refers to the Writings, AND EVEN IF THEY ARE WRITTEN IN ANY LANGUAGE, though they may not be read [publicly], yet he [the Tanna] teaches that they MAY BE SAVED, which refutes R. Huna? — R. Huna can answer you: Is that logical? Consider the second clause: THEY MUST BE HIDDEN: seeing that they must be saved,<sup>13</sup> need hiding be mentioned?<sup>14</sup> But R. Huna explains it in accordance with his view, while R. Hisda explains it according to his. R. Huna explains it in accordance with his view. WHETHER WE READ THEM, [i.e.] the Prophets; OR NOT, [i.e.] the Writings. That is only if they are written in the Holy Tongue [Hebrew], but if they are written in any [other] language, we may not save them, yet even so they must be hidden. R. Hisda explains it according to his view:

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

WHETHER WE READ THEM, [i.e.,] the Prophets, OR NOT, [i.e.,] the Writings; EVEN IF THEY ARE WRITTEN IN ANY LANGUAGE, we must still save them. And this is what he states: And [even] their worm-eaten [material] MUST BE HIDDEN.

An objection is raised: If they are written in *Targum* or in any [other] language, they may be saved from the fire: this refutes R. Huna? — R. Huna answers you: This Tanna holds, They may be read. Come and hear: If they are written in Egyptian,<sup>15</sup> Median, a trans[-Euphratean]<sup>16</sup> Aramaic, Elamitic,<sup>17</sup> or Greek, though they may not be read, they may be saved from a fire: this refutes R. Huna? — R. Huna can answer you: It is [a controversy of] Tannaim. For it was taught: If they are written in *Targum* or in any language, they may be saved from a fire. R. Jose said: They may not be saved from a fire. Said R. Jose: It once happened that my father Halafta visited R. Gamaliel Berabbi<sup>18</sup> at Tiberias and found him sitting at the table of Johanan b. Nizuf with the *Targum* of the Book of Job in his hand<sup>19</sup> which he was reading. Said he to him, 'I remember that R. Gamaliel, your grandfather, was standing on a high eminence on the Temple Mount, when the Book of Job in a Targumic version was brought before him, whereupon he said to the builder, "Bury it under the bricks."<sup>20</sup> He [R. Gamaliel II] too gave orders, and they hid it.'<sup>21</sup> R. Jose son of R. Judah said: They overturned a tub of mortar upon it. Said Rabbi: There are two objections to this: Firstly, how came mortar on the Temple Mount?<sup>22</sup> Moreover, is it then permitted to destroy them with one's own hands? For they must be put in a neglected place to decay of their own accord.<sup>23</sup> Which Tannaim [differ on this question]?<sup>24</sup>

1. Lit., 'grief of the soul'. It would be very vexing if the breaking of the Fast had to be delayed whilst these are prepared (Baal Ha-Ma'or V. Marginal Gloss.; Rashi explains it differently)
2. Before the time of minhah.
3. Such letters afford examples of early Rabbinic Responsa.
4. E.g., the Torah, Prophets, and Writings.

5. In this connection 'may' is the equivalent of 'must', and similarly in the Gemara.
6. By being moved from one domain to another on the Sabbath. V. next Mishnah.
7. The reference is to public readings. There was (and is) public reading from the Prophets but not from the Writings (Hagiographa). Rashi quotes another explanation: even private individuals did not read the Writings (on the Sabbath), because public lectures were given on that day, which left no time for private reading.
8. If they become unfit for use. V. p. 429, n. 5.
9. The public lectures would be neglected. For a general discussion on the manner, etc. of these lectures v. Zunz, G. V. Ch. 20.
10. The Aramaic translation of the Pentateuch and other portions of the Bible are called Targum — the translation par excellence. But v. Kaplan, *op. cit.* pp. 283 seq.
11. publicly; v. Meg. 8b.
12. It disgraces them if they are allowed to be burnt like something worthless.
13. On your hypothesis.
14. Obviously if they have sufficient sanctity to be saved on the Sabbath they must not be simply thrown away when no longer fit for use.
15. Or, Coptic.
16. [H] so Jast.: perhaps the reference is to Hebrew in transliteration.
17. Of Elam, south of Assyria.
18. A title of scholars most frequently applied to disciples of R. Judah ha-Nasi and his contemporaries, but also to some of his predecessors (as here), and sometimes to the first Amoraim (Jast.). V. Naz., Sonc. ed., p. 64, n. 1.
19. This shows that a *Targum* of Job existed already in the middle of the first century C.E. This is not identical with the extant Targum, which on internal evidence must have been composed later; v. J.E. art. Targum, Vol. XII, p. 62; Zunz, G. V. 64 seq.
20. Lit., 'the course (of stones)'.  
21. The spread of words inimical to Judaism, both through the rise of Christianity and false claimants to the Messiahship, caused the Rabbis to frown upon books other than those admitted to the Holy Scriptures, even such as were not actually inimical thereto. — Weiss, Dor, I, 212, 236.
22. A mixture of lime and sand was used, but not mortar, which is made of earth and water.
23. The objection to writing down the *Targum* was probably due to the fear that it might in time be regarded as sacred. V. also Kaplan, *op. cit.*, p. 285.
24. Sc. whether they may be rescued from a fire.

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

## Shabbath 115b

Shall we say the first Tanna and R. Jose, — but perhaps they differ in this: one Master holds, It is permitted to read them; while the other holds, It is not permitted to read them?<sup>1</sup> Rather [they are] R. Jose and the Tanna [who taught the law] about the Egyptian [script].

Our Rabbis taught: Benedictions and amulets, though they contain letters of the [Divine] Name and many passages of the Torah, must not be rescued from a fire but must be burnt where they lie,<sup>2</sup> they together with their Names. Hence it was said, They who write down Benedictions are as though they burnt a Torah.<sup>3</sup> It happened that one was once writing in Sidon. R. Ishmael was informed thereof, and he went to question him [about it]. As he was ascending the ladder, he [the writer] became aware of him, [so] he took a sheaf of benedictions and plunged them into a bowl of water. In these words<sup>4</sup> did R. Ishmael speak to him: The punishment for the latter [deed] is greater than for the former.

The Resh Galutha<sup>5</sup> asked Rabbah son of R. Huna: If they are written with paint [dye], sikra,<sup>6</sup> gum ink, or calcanthum,<sup>7</sup> in Hebrew, may they be rescued from a fire or not? This is asked whether on the view that we may save<sup>8</sup> or that we may not save. It is asked on the view that we may not save: that may be only if they are written in *Targum* or any [other] language; but here that they are written in Hebrew, we may rescue [them]. Or perhaps even on the view that we may save [them], that is only when they are written in ink, which is lasting; but here, since it [the writing] is not permanent, [we may] not [rescue them]? — We may not save [them], answered he. But R. Hamnuna recited, We may save [them]? — If it was taught, it was taught, replied he.<sup>9</sup> Where was it taught? — Said R. Ashi, Even as it was taught: The only difference between the [other] Books<sup>10</sup> and the Megillah<sup>11</sup> is that the Books can be written in any language, whereas a Megillah

must be written in Assyrian,<sup>12</sup> on a Scroll, and in ink.<sup>13</sup>

R. Huna b. Halub asked R. Nahman: A Scroll of the Law in which eighty-five letters cannot be gathered,<sup>14</sup> such as the section, And it came to pass when the Ark set forward [etc.],<sup>15</sup> may it be saved from a fire or not? — Said he, Then ask about the section, 'and it came to pass, etc. 'itself!<sup>16</sup> — If the section, 'And it came to pass, etc.' is defective [through effacing], I have no problem, for since it contains the Divine Name, even if it does not contain eighty-five letters we must rescue it. My only problem is about a Scroll of the Law wherein [this number] cannot be gathered: what then? We may not save it, he answered.

He refuted him: If *Targum* is written as Mikra,<sup>17</sup> or Mikra is written in *Targum* or in Hebrew characters,<sup>18</sup> they must be saved from a fire, and the *Targum* in Ezra, Daniel and the Torah [the Pentateuch] go without saying. Now, what is the *Targum* in the Torah? [The words], Yegar sahadutha;<sup>19</sup> and though it does not contain eighty-five letters [it must be saved]? — That was taught in respect of completing [the number].<sup>20</sup>

The scholars asked: These eighty-five letters, [must they be] together or [even] scattered? R. Huna said: [They must be] together; R. Hisda said: Even scattered. An objection is raised: If a Scroll of the Law is decayed, if eighty-five letters can be gathered therein, such as the section, 'and it came to pass when the ark set forward, etc.' we must save it; if not, we may not save it. This refutes R. Huna?<sup>21</sup> — R. Hisda expounded it on the basis of R. Huna's [ruling as referring] to words.<sup>22</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: 'And it came to pass when the ark set forward that Moses said, [etc.]:' for this section the Holy One, blessed be He, provided signs above and below,<sup>23</sup> to teach

1. And the question whether they may be saved depends on whether they may be read.
2. Lit., 'in their place'.

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

3. Since should fire break out they may not be saved (Rashi).
4. Lit., 'this language'.
5. V. p. 217, n. 7.
6. A red paint.
7. Vitriol used as an ingredient of shoe-black and of ink (Jast.).
8. Holy writings written in other languages.
9. Then I am wrong.
10. Comprising the Bible — i.e., the Torah, Prophets and Hagiographa.
11. The Book of Esther.
12. The modern square Hebrew characters, which superseded the older Hebrew, viz., Syriac or Samaritan form. V. Meg., Sonc. ed., p. 47 n. 4 and Sanh., Sonc., ed. p. 120, n. 4.
13. Ri: this is only in respect of saving them from a fire. Other books even if not written on a scroll and in ink must be saved, whereas for a Megillah these conditions are necessary.
14. I.e., the whole Scroll is effaced and eighty-five clear letters cannot be found in it. This is the minimum for a Scroll to retain its sanctity.
15. Num. X, 35-36. That contains eighty-five letters, and as stated *infra* it is designated a separate 'Book'.
16. If it is written separately upon a piece of parchment, and one or more of its letters are effaced.
17. I.e., if the Biblical passages which are in Aramaic in the original are written in Hebrew, as practically the whole of the Pentateuch (mikra — lit., 'reading') is.
18. Samaritan script. V. p. 66, n. 9.
19. Gen. XXXI, 47 q.v.
20. I.e., if the Scroll contains eighty-five un-effaced letters including yegar sahadutha, it must be saved.
21. Because 'can be gathered' implies that they are scattered.
22. It contains complete words scattered about which total to eighty-five letters. They differ where all the eighty-five letters are scattered, the Scroll containing no complete words at all.
23. I.e., at the beginning and at the end. — In the Scrolls the section is preceded and followed by a reversed nun, which distinguishes and divorces it from the adjoining passages.

## Shabbath 116a

that this is not its place. Rabbi said: It is not on that account,<sup>1</sup> but because it ranks as a separate Book. With whom does the following dictum of R. Samuel b. Nahmani in R. Jonathan's name agree: *She [Wisdom] hath hewn out her seven pillars*:<sup>2</sup> this refers to the seven Books of the Law? With whom?

With Rabbi.<sup>3</sup> Who is the Tanna that disagrees with Rabbi? It is R. Simeon b. Gamaliel. For it was taught, R. Simeon b. Gamaliel said: This section is destined to be removed from here and written in its [right place].<sup>4</sup> And why is it written here? In order to provide a break between the first [account of] punishment and the second [account of] punishment.<sup>5</sup> What is the second [account of] punishment? — *And the people were as murmurers*, [etc.].<sup>6</sup> The first [account of] punishment? — And they 'moved away from the mount of the Lord,<sup>7</sup> which R. Hama b. R. Hanina expounded [as meaning] that they turned away from following the Lord. And where is its [rightful] place? — In [the chapter on] the banners.<sup>8</sup>

The scholars asked: The blank spaces of a Scroll of the Law, may we rescue them from fire or not? — Come and hear: If a Scroll of the Law is decayed, if eighty-five letters can be gathered therein, such as the section 'and it came to pass when the ark set forward,' we must save it; if not, we may not save it. But why so? conclude [that it may be saved] on account of its blank space?<sup>9</sup> That which is decayed is different.<sup>10</sup> Come and hear: If a Scroll of the Law is effaced, if eighty-five letters can be gathered therein, such as the section, 'and it came to pass when the ark set forward,' we must save it; if not, we may not save it. But why so: conclude [that we must save it] on account of its blank space?<sup>11</sup> — As for the place of the writing, I have no doubt, for when it was sanctified it was on account of the writing, [and] when its writing goes its sanctity goes (too). My problem is only in respect of [the blank spaces] above and below, between the sections, between the columns, [and] at the beginning and the end of the Scroll. Yet conclude [that it must be saved] on that account?<sup>12</sup> — It may mean [there] that one had cut off [the blank spaces] and thrown them away.

Come and hear: The blank spaces above and below, between the sections, between the columns, at the beginning and at the end of the Scroll, defile one's hands.<sup>13</sup> — It may be

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

that [when they are] together with the Scroll of the Law they are different.<sup>14</sup> Come and hear: The blank spaces<sup>15</sup> and the Books of the Minim<sup>16</sup> may not be saved from a fire, but they must be burnt in their place, they and the Divine Names occurring in them. Now surely it means the blank portions of a Scroll of the Law? No: the blank spaces in the Books of Minim. Seeing that we may not save the Books of Minim themselves, need their blank spaces be stated? — This is its meaning: And the Books of Minim are like blank spaces.

It was stated in the text: The blank spaces and the Books of the Minim, we may not save them from a fire. R. Jose said: On weekdays one must cut out the Divine Names which they contain, hide them,<sup>17</sup> and burn the rest. R. Tarfon said: May I bury my son if I would not burn them together with their Divine Names if they came to my hand. For even if one pursued me<sup>18</sup> to slay me, or a snake pursued me to bite me, I would enter a heathen Temple [for refuge], but not the houses of these [people], for the latter know (of God) yet deny [Him], whereas the former are ignorant and deny [Him], and of them the Writ saith, *and behind the doors and the posts hast thou set up thy memorial*.<sup>19</sup> R. Ishmael said: [One can reason] a minori: If in order to make peace between man and wife the Torah decreed, Let my Name, written in sanctity, be blotted out in water,<sup>20</sup> these, who stir up jealousy, enmity, and wrath between Israel and their Father in Heaven, how much more so;<sup>21</sup> and of them David said, *Do not I hate them, O Lord, that hate thee? And am I not grieved with those that rise up against thee? I hate them with perfect hatred: I count them mine enemies*.<sup>22</sup> And just as we may not rescue them from a fire, so may we not rescue them from a collapse [of debris] or from water or from anything that may destroy them.

R. Joseph b. Hanin asked R. Abbahu: As for the Books of *Be Abedan*,<sup>23</sup> may we save them from a fire or not? — Yes and No, and he was uncertain about the matter.<sup>24</sup> Rab would not enter a *Be Abedan*, and certainly not a *Be*

*Nizrefe*;<sup>25</sup> Samuel would not enter a *Be Nizrefe*, yet he would enter a *Be Abedan*. Raba was asked: Why did you not attend at the *Be Abedan*? A certain palm-tree stands in the way, replied he, and it is difficult for me [to pass it].<sup>26</sup> Then we will remove it? — Its spot will present difficulties to me.<sup>27</sup> Mar b. Joseph said: I am one of them<sup>28</sup> and do not fear them. On one occasion he went there, [and] they wanted to harm him.<sup>29</sup>

Imma Shalom, R. Eliezer's wife, was R. Gamaliel's sister. Now, a certain philosopher<sup>30</sup> lived in his vicinity,

1. Lit., 'designation'.
2. Prov. IX, 1.
3. Since that section is a separate Book, the portions of Numbers preceding and following it are also separate Books; hence there are seven in all.
4. Viz., in the section dealing with the disposition of the Israelites according to their banners and their travelling arrangements, Num. II.
5. So as to relieve the gloomy effect that would otherwise be produced.
6. Num. XI, 1 seq.
7. Ibid. X, 33.
8. But in the future, when all evil and its consequent retribution has ceased, this section will be inserted in its right place.
9. And since we do not reason thus, it follows that the margin may not be saved.
10. For the parchment of the margins too is perished. The question is where the parchment is quite sound, but the writing is effaced.
11. Which is now the entire Scroll.
12. Even if the place of the writing is no longer sacred, if the margins must be saved, the entire Scroll must be saved ipso facto.
13. Cf. *supra* 14a. This proves that they have the same sacred character as the rest of the Scroll.
14. The writing there being sound.
15. Jast. s.v. [H] translates, the gospels, though observing that here it is understood as blanks. V. Herford, R.T., 'Christianity in the Talmud', p. 155 n.
16. Sectarians. The term denotes various kinds of Jewish sectarians, such as the Sadducees, Samaritans, Judeo-Christians, etc. according to the date of the passage in which the term is used. The reference here is probably to the last-named. V. J.E., art. Min; Bacher in REJ. XXXVIII, 38. Rashi translates: Hebrew Bibles written by men in the service of idolatry.
17. v. p. 429, n. 5.

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

18. Lit., 'him' — he meant himself but used the third person owing to a reluctance to speak even hypothetically of evil befalling himself.
19. Isa. LVII, 8; they know of the true God, but have rejected Him, thrusting Him out of sight, as it were.
20. The reference is to the trial of a wife accused of adultery; v. Num. V, 23f.
21. Not only do they themselves go astray from God, but lead many others astray from Him.
22. Ps. CXXXIX, 21f.
23. The meeting place of early Christians where religious controversies were held (Jast.). Rashi: the books written for the purpose of these controversies; v. also Weiss, Dor, III, p. 166 and n. 13. [The meaning of Be Abedan is still obscure in spite of the many and varied explanations suggested; e.g., (a) House of the Ebionites; (b) Abadan (Pers.) 'forum'; (c) Beth Mebedhan (Pers.) 'House of the chief Magi'; v. Krauss's Synagoga Altertumer, p. 31].
24. V. *supra* 113a.
25. [H]; a meeting place of the Nazarenes, Jewish Christians, where local matters were discussed and religious debates were held. (Levy). [Ginzberg, *MGWJ* LXXVIII, p. 23 regards it as the name of a Persian house of worship meaning the Asylum of Helplessness].
26. This of course was merely an evasion.
27. It will leave a hole and render the road impassable.
28. I am well acquainted with them.
29. Uncensored text adds: R. Meir called it (the Gospel) 'Awen Gilyon, the falsehood of blank Paper; R. Johanan called it 'Awon Gilyon, the sin of, etc. On the whole passage v. Herford, *op. cit.*, pp. 161-171.
30. Rashi: min (i.e., sectarian).

## Shabbath 116b

and he bore a reputation that he did not accept bribes.<sup>1</sup> They wished to expose him,<sup>2</sup> so she brought him a golden lamp, went before him, [and] said to him, 'I desire that a share be given me in my [deceased] father's estate.' 'Divide,' ordered he. Said he [R. Gamaliel] to him, 'It is decreed for us, Where there is a son, a daughter does not inherit.' [He replied], 'Since the day that you were exiled from your land the Law of Moses has been superseded<sup>3</sup> and another book<sup>4</sup> given, wherein it is written, 'A son and a daughter inherit equally.'<sup>5</sup> The next day, he [R. Gamaliel] brought him a Lybian ass. Said he to them, 'Look<sup>6</sup> at the end of the book,

wherein it is written, I came not to destroy the Law of Moses nor<sup>7</sup> to add to the Law of Moses,<sup>8</sup> and it is written therein, A daughter does not inherit where there is a son. Said she to him, 'Let thy light shine forth like a lamp.'<sup>9</sup> Said R. Gamaliel to him, 'An ass came and knocked the lamp over!'<sup>10</sup>

AND WHY DO WE NOT READ [THEM], etc. Rab said: They learnt this only for the time of the *Beth Hamidrash*, but we may read [them] when it is not the time of the *Beth Hamidrash*. But Samuel said: We may not read them [on the Sabbath] even when it is not the time of the *Beth Hamidrash*. But that is not so, for Nehardea was Samuel's town, and in Nehardea they closed the prescribed lesson [of the Pentateuch] with [a reading from] the Hagiographa at minhah on the Sabbath?<sup>11</sup> Rather if stated it was thus stated: Rab said, They learnt this only in the place of the *Beth Hamidrash*; but we may read [them] elsewhere than in the *Beth Hamidrash*. While Samuel said: Whether in the place of the *Beth Hamidrash* or elsewhere, at the time of the *Beth Hamidrash*<sup>12</sup> we may not read [them]; when it is not the time of the *Beth Hamidrash* we may read them. And Samuel is consistent with his view, for in Nehardea they closed the prescribed lesson [of the Pentateuch] with<sup>13</sup> [a reading from] the Hagiographa. R. Ashi said, In truth, it is as we first stated, Samuel [ruling] according to R. Nehemiah.<sup>14</sup> For it was taught: Though they [the Sages] said, Holy writings may not be read, yet they may be studied, and lectures thereon may be given. If one needs a verse, he may bring [a Scroll] and see [it] therein. R. Nehemiah said: Why did they rule, Holy Writings may not be read? So that people may say, If Holy Writings may not be read, how much more so secular documents!<sup>15</sup>

**MISHNAH.** ONE MAY SAVE THE SHEATH OF A SCROLL TOGETHER WITH THE SCROLL, AND THE CONTAINER OF TEFILLIN<sup>16</sup> TOGETHER WITH THE TEFILLIN, EVEN IF IT [ALSO] CONTAINS MONEY. AND WHITHER MAY WE RESCUE THEM? INTO A

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

CLOSED ALLEY; BEN BATHYRA RULED:  
EVEN INTO AN OPEN ONE.<sup>17</sup>

**GEMARA.** Our Rabbis taught: If the fourteenth [of Nisan] falls on the Sabbath, the Passover sacrifice is flayed as far as the breast:<sup>18</sup> this is the view of R. Ishmael son of R. Johanan b. Berokah. But the Sages maintain: We flay the whole of it. As for R. Ishmael son of R. Johanan b. Berokah, it is well, [the reason being] that the requirements for the Sanctuary<sup>19</sup> have been fulfilled;<sup>20</sup> but what is the reason of the Rabbis? — Said Rabbah b. Bar Hanah in R. Johanan's name: Because Scripture saith, The Lord hath made every thing for his own purpose.<sup>21</sup> But what is there here 'for his own purpose?' R. Joseph said: So that it should not putrefy.<sup>22</sup> Raba said: So that Divine sacrifices should not lie like a *nebelah*. Wherein do they differ? — They differ where it is lying on a gold table,<sup>23</sup> or if it is a day of the north wind.<sup>24</sup> Now R. Ishmael son of R. Johanan b. Berokah, how does he dispose of this [verse], 'The Lord hath made every thing for his own purpose'? — [That teaches] that one must not draw out the emurim<sup>25</sup> before the stripping of the skin.<sup>26</sup> What is the reason? — Said R. Huna son of R. Nathan: On account of the threads.<sup>27</sup>

R. Hisda observed in Mar 'Ukba's name: What did his companions answer to R. Ishmael son of R. Johanan b. Berokah? They argued thus with him: If the sheath of a Scroll may be rescued together with the Scroll, shall we then not flay the Passover sacrifice of its skin?<sup>28</sup> How compare! There it is [mere] handling, whereas here it is work.<sup>29</sup> — Said R. Ashi, They differ in two things, viz., in respect of both handling and labor, and they argue thus with him: If the sheath of a Scroll may be saved together with the Scroll, shall we not handle the skin on account of the flesh.<sup>30</sup>

1. He was a judge.
2. Lit., 'make sport of him'.
3. Lit., 'taken away'.
4. The reading in Cod. Oxford is: and the law of the Evangelium has been given.
5. There is no passage in any known Gospel that a son and daughter inherit alike.

6. Lit., 'descend to'.
7. *Var. lec.*: but; v. Weiss, Dor, I, p. 233, n. 1.
8. Cf. Matt. V, 17 seq.
9. Alluding to the lamp which she presented him on the preceding day.
10. This story is discussed in Bacher, Ag. d. Pal. Am. 11, p. 424 n. V. also R.T. Herford, *op. cit.*, pp. 146-154, though his conjecture that the story ends with a covert gibe at Christianity is hardly substantiated.
11. As a Haftarah (q.v. [Glos.](#)) after the Reading of the Law: so Jast. V. Rashi; cf. *supra* 24a. [Aliter: They expounded a part of Scripture from the Hagiographa, etc. V. Bacher, Terminologie s.v. trsx
12. I.e., when the public lectures are given.
13. The text should read [H], as above, not [H].
14. But he does not state his own view there.
15. E.g., bills, documents relating to business transactions, etc.
16. I.e., the bag or box in which they are kept.
17. This is discussed *infra*.
18. Starting from the hind legs. One can then remove the fats which 'are to be burnt on the altar (these are called emurim, lit., 'devoted objects'), the burning being permitted on the Sabbath. Since the rest of the skin must be flayed only in order to reach the portion which he himself will eat in the evening, this is regarded as having a secular purpose, and therefore must be left for the evening.
19. Lit., 'the Most High'.
20. When it is flayed thus far, as explained *supra* note 1.
21. I.e., His honor. Prov. XVI, 4.
22. One may still fear putrefaction, but it is certainly not lying like a *nebelah*. Hence according to R. Joseph it must be completely stripped even so, but not according to Raba.
23. It is not in keeping with the honor due to God that the meat of the sacrifices offered to Him should turn putrid.
24. Which keeps the meat fresh.
25. V. n. 1.
26. As far as the breast.
27. Of wool, which would otherwise adhere to the fats, etc.
28. Surely the two are identical, for the sheath too is not sacred, just as the flaying of the skin after the breast has been reached serves a secular purpose only.
29. Flaying being a principal labor, v. *supra* 73a.
30. Rashi: R. Ishmael holding that once the emurim have been drawn out the animal may not be handled because of the skin, while the Rabbis argue that on the contrary since the flesh itself might be handled the skin may be likewise in virtue thereof. According to this they differ where the animal has only been partially flayed. Tosaf. interprets the passage differently.

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

## Shabbath 117a

How compare! There it [the sheath] had become as a stand to that which is permitted,<sup>1</sup> whereas here it [the skin] had become a stand to a thing that is forbidden!<sup>2</sup> Rather they say thus to him, If we may save the sheath of a Scroll together with the Scroll, though it also contains money,<sup>3</sup> shall we not handle the skin on account of the flesh? How compare! There it [the sheath] became a stand for something that is forbidden (the money) and something that is permitted [the Scroll]; whereas here the whole has become a stand for that which is forbidden? — Rather they say thus to him: If a sheath containing money may be brought from elsewhere to save a Scroll of the Law with it, shall we not handle the skin in virtue of the flesh? And how do we know that itself? Shall we say, since one need not throw them [the coins] out when it contains them,<sup>4</sup> he may bring it [the sheath] too? How compare! There, in the meanwhile the fire may alight [upon the Scroll];<sup>5</sup> but here, let them be thrown out in the meantime?<sup>6</sup> Rather said Mar son of R. Ashi: In truth it is as we originally explained it; and as to your objection, There it is (mere) handling, whereas here it is work, — [that is answered] e.g., that he does not require the skin.<sup>7</sup> But Abaye and Raba both say: R. Simeon agrees in a case of 'cut off its head but let it not die?'<sup>8</sup> — He removes it [the skin] in strips.<sup>9</sup>

AND WHITHER MAY WE RESCUE THEM, etc. What is an open [alley] and what is a closed [one]? — R. Hisda said: [[fit contains] three walls and two stakes,<sup>10</sup> it is a closed alley; three walls and one stake, it is an open alley. And both of them<sup>11</sup> are based on R. Eliezer[’s opinion]. For we learnt: To make an alley eligible,<sup>12</sup> Beth Shammai maintain: [It requires] a stake and a beam,<sup>13</sup> Beth Hillel say: Either a stake or a beam; R. Eliezer said: Two stakes.<sup>14</sup> Said Rabbah to him, If there are three walls and one stake, do you call it open!<sup>15</sup> Moreover, according to the Rabbis, let us save thither even foodstuffs and liquids?<sup>16</sup> Rather said Rabbah, [it is to be

explained thus]: [If it contains] two walls and two stakes,<sup>17</sup> it is a closed alley; two walls and one stake, it is an open alley, and both<sup>18</sup> are based on [the view of] R. Judah. For it was taught: Even more than this did R. Judah say: If one owns two houses on the opposite sides of the street, he can place a stake or a beam at each side and carry between them. Said they to him: A street cannot be made fit for carrying by an 'erub in this way.<sup>19</sup> Said Abaye to him, But according to you too, on [the view of] the Rabbis let us save thither even foodstuffs and liquids?<sup>20</sup>

1. Sc. the Scroll, which may be handled in any case, even if there is no fire.
2. Sc. the flesh, which may not be handled until the evening before which it is not required (Rashi). Tosaf.: the flesh may be handled now, but before the sacrifice was killed the whole animal was mukzeh.
3. Which by itself may not be handled.
4. V. Mishnah.
5. If one should first have to empty the sheath of its money.
6. Whilst carrying the sheath to the Scroll it can be emptied of its money without loss of time.
7. Hence the flaying is unintentional, as far as the skin is concerned.—On this explanation they differ only in respect of skinning the animal, as was first suggested.
8. v. p. 357, n. 8.
9. Not as one piece. It is not even real flaying them and only counts as a shebuth (Rashi).
10. I.e., it is a cul-de-sac leading off a street, and stakes are planted in the ground at either side of the opening. These stakes legally count as a fourth wall, and thus the alley is regarded as entirely enclosed.
11. The Rabbis and Ben Bathyra.
12. To rank technically as an 'alley' wherein carrying on the Sabbath is permitted under certain conditions.
13. A stake at the side of the entrance and a beam across it.
14. Ben Bathyra however holds that in order to save holy writings R. Eliezer too is more lenient.
15. Surely not, even if it be conceded that two stakes are required to make it fit.
16. I.e., where it is closed with two stakes carrying should be entirely permitted therein, and not restricted to holy writings. [The Rabbis state *infra* 120a that foodstuffs may be saved by carrying them into a courtyard furnished with an 'erub, but not into an alley.]
17. I.e., it is open at each end, and a stake is placed at both entrances.

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

18. V. n. 4.
19. V. *supra* 6a bottom for notes. Ben Bathyra holds that where the saving of holy writings is in question R. Judah is more lenient.
20. Seeing that in your opinion the Rabbis hold with R. Judah that two partitions and two stakes render the space fit for carrying.

## Shabbath 117b

Rather said R. Ashi: Three walls and one stake, that is a closed alley; three walls without a stake, that is an open alley. And even according to R. Eliezer who maintains [that] we require two stakes, that is only in respect of foodstuffs and liquids, but for a Scroll of the Law one stake is sufficient.

**MISHNAH.** FOOD FOR THREE MEALS MAY BE SAVED, THAT WHICH IS FIT FOR MAN, FOR MAN, THAT WHICH IS FIT FOR ANIMALS, FOR ANIMALS.<sup>1</sup> HOW SO? IF A FIRE BREAKS OUT SABBATH NIGHT,<sup>2</sup> FOOD FOR THREE MEALS MAY BE SAVED; [IF] IN THE MORNING, FOOD FOR TWO MEALS MAY BE SAVED; AT [THE TIME OF] MINHAH, FOOD FOR ONE MEAL.<sup>3</sup> R. JOSE SAID: AT ALL TIMES WE MAY SAVE FOOD FOR THREE MEALS.<sup>4</sup>

**GEMARA.** Consider: He labours<sup>5</sup> in that which is permissible;<sup>6</sup> then let us save more? — Said Raba: Since a man is excited over his property, if you permit him [to save more], he may come to extinguish [the fire]. Said Abaye to him, Then as to what was taught: If one's barrel [of wine] is broken on the top of his roof he may bring a vessel and place [it] underneath, provided that he does not bring another vessel and catch [the dripping liquid]<sup>7</sup> or another vessel and join it [to the roof]<sup>8</sup> what preventive measure is required there? — Here too it is a preventive measure lest he bring a utensil through the street.

[To turn to] the main text: If one's barrel is broken on the top of his roof, he may bring a vessel and place it underneath, provided that he does not bring another vessel and catch [the dripping liquid] or another vessel and join it [to the roof]. If guests happen to visit him, he may bring another vessel and catch

[the dripping liquid], or another vessel and join it [to the roof]. He must not catch [the liquid] and then invite [the guests], but must first invite [them] and then catch [the liquid]; and one must not evade the law in this matter.<sup>9</sup> In R. Jose son of R. Judah's name it was said: We may evade [the law]. Shall we say that they disagree in the [same] controversy [as that] of R. Eliezer and R. Joshua? For it was taught: If an animal<sup>10</sup> and its young<sup>11</sup> fall into a pit,<sup>12</sup> R. Eliezer said: One may haul up the first in order to slaughter it, and for the second he makes provision where it lies, so that it should not die. R. Joshua said: One may haul up the first in order to kill it, but he does not kill it, then he practices an evasion and hauls up the second, and kills whichever he desires!<sup>13</sup> — How so? perhaps R. Eliezer rules thus only there, because provisions can be made, but not here, seeing that that is impossible. And perhaps R. Joshua rules thus only there because suffering of dumb animals is involved; but not here that there is no suffering of dumb animals?<sup>14</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: If he saved bread [made] of fine flour, he must not save coarse bread; (if he saved) coarse bread, he may [still] save a fine [flour] bread.<sup>15</sup> And one may save on the Day of Atonement for the Sabbath,<sup>16</sup> but not on the Sabbath for the Day of Atonement,<sup>17</sup> and it goes without saying (that one must not rescue food) on the Sabbath for a Festival, or on a Sabbath for the following Sabbath.

Our Rabbis taught: If one forgets a loaf in an oven, and the day becomes holy upon him,<sup>18</sup> food for three meals may be saved,<sup>19</sup> and he may say to others, 'Come and save for yourselves.' And when he removes [the bread], he must not remove it with a *mardeh*<sup>20</sup> but with a knife.<sup>21</sup> But that is not so, for the School of R. Ishmael taught: Thou shalt not do any work:<sup>22</sup> the blowing of the *shofar* and the removal of bread (from the oven) are excluded as being an art, not work? — As much as is possible to vary [it]<sup>23</sup> we do so.

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

R. Hisda said: One should always make early [preparations]<sup>24</sup> against the termination of the Sabbath, for it is said, And it shall come to pass on the sixth day, that they shall prepare that which they bring in<sup>25</sup> — [i.e.,] immediately.

R. Abba said: On the Sabbath it is one's duty to break bread<sup>26</sup> over two loaves, for it is written, twice as much bread.<sup>27</sup> R. Ashi said: I saw that R. Kahana held two [loaves] but broke bread over one, observing, 'they gathered' is written,<sup>28</sup> R. Zera broke enough bread for the whole meal.<sup>29</sup> Said Rabina to R. Ashi: But that looks like greed? — Since he does not do this every day, he replied, but only now [the Sabbath], it does not look like greed, he replied.<sup>30</sup> R. Ammi and R. Assi, when they came across the bread of an 'erub, would commence (their meal) therewith,<sup>31</sup> observing, 'Since one precept has been performed with it,<sup>32</sup> let another precept be performed with it.'

**HOW SO? IF A FIRE BREAKS OUT, etc.**  
Our Rabbis taught: How many meals must one eat on the Sabbath? Three. R. Hidka said: Four. R. Johanan observed, Both expound the same verse: And Moses said, Eat that to-day; for to-day is a Sabbath unto the Lord: to-day ye shall not find it in the field.<sup>33</sup> R. Hidka holds: These three 'to-days' are [reckoned] apart from the evening;<sup>34</sup> whereas the Rabbis hold, They include [that of] the evening. We learnt, **IF A FIRE BREAKS OUT SABBATH NIGHT,**

1. I.e., three meals per person and per animal, taking into account what is fit for man and what is fit for beast.
2. Before the first meal has been eaten.
3. In each case food may be saved for as many meals as will yet be required for that Sabbath,
4. Whenever the fire breaks out.
5. Lit., 'troubles'.
6. Food may be handled on the Sabbath, and he carries it out into a courtyard provided with an 'erub (*infra* 120a), whither carrying is permitted in any case.
7. As it falls through the air.
8. I.e., set it near the roof, so that the liquid may flow along the roof and into the vessel. These are

forbidden because it is manifest that the vessels are brought in order to save the wine or oil.

9. I.e., he may not invite guests merely as a pretence, and when the wine is saved they will not drink it after all, but only guests who have not yet dined will drink it.
10. Lit., 'it'.
11. The reference is to animals that may be eaten. These may not be slaughtered together with their young on the same day. V. Lev. XXII, 28.
12. On a Festival.
13. V. Bez. 37a.
14. It is noteworthy that to save animals from suffering is regarded as a stronger reason for desecrating the Festival than to save one from personal loss.
15. There is no evasion in saying that he prefers the latter, hence it is still a Sabbath need.
16. This is permitted, as the food is required immediately the Sabbath commences.
17. Which falls on Sunday. This is forbidden, as he can procure food on the termination of the Fast.
18. I.e., the Sabbath commenced.
19. Before the bread is burnt.
20. A bakers shovel; the oven tool generally used for removing bread.
21. To emphasize that it is the Sabbath.
22. Ex. XX, 10.
23. Viz., the usual procedure, so that the Sabbath may not be treated like a weekday.
24. On Friday.
25. Ibid. XVI, 5.
26. I.e., to recite the benediction.
27. Ibid, 22.
28. Ibid. One merely requires two loaves before him, thus 'gathering' double the usual portion, but recites the benediction over one loaf.
29. I.e., he cut off so much bread, reciting the blessing over it.
30. But is manifestly in honor of the Sabbath.
31. I.e., they said the blessing over it.
32. Sc. that of 'erub.
33. Ibid. 25.
34. Each 'to-day' denotes one meal, and a fourth is the meal on Friday night.

## Shabbath 118a

**FOOD FOR THREE MEALS MAY BE SAVED:** surely that is where one has not [yet] eaten?<sup>1</sup> — No: it is where he has [already eaten]. **[IF] IN THE MORNING, FOOD FOR TWO MEALS MAY BE SAVED:** surely that is where one has not yet eaten? — No: [where] he has eaten. **AT [THE TIME OF] MINHAH, FOOD FOR ONE MEAL:** surely that is where one has not

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

eaten? — No: [where] he has eaten. But since the final section states, R. JOSE SAID: AT ALL TIMES WE MAY SAVE FOOD FOR THREE MEALS, it follows that the first Tanna holds [that] three [are required]. Hence it is clear that our Mishnah does not agree with R. Hisda.

Now, as to what we learnt: He who has food for two meals must not accept [relief] from the tamhuy: food for fourteen meals, must not accept from the kuppah,<sup>2</sup> — who [is the authority for this], [for] it is neither the Rabbis nor R. Hidka? If the Rabbis, there are fifteen meals; if R. Hidka, there are sixteen?<sup>3</sup> — In truth, it is the Rabbis, for we say to him [the recipient], 'What you require to eat at the conclusion of the Sabbath, eat it on the Sabbath.<sup>4</sup> Shall we say then that it agrees [only] with the Rabbis and not with R. Hidka? — You may even say [that it agrees with] R. Hidka: we say to him, 'What you require to eat on the eve of the Sabbath [before nightfall], eat it on the Sabbath.'<sup>5</sup> And the whole day of Sabbath eve [Friday] we make him spend in fasting?<sup>6</sup> Rather the author of this is R. Akiba, who said: Treat thy Sabbath like a weekday rather than be dependent on men.<sup>7</sup>

Now, as to what we learnt: 'A poor man travelling from place to place must be given not less than a loaf [valued] at a pundion when four se'ahs cost one *sela*';<sup>8</sup> if he stays overnight, he must be given the requirements for spending the night; while if he spends the Sabbath there, he must be given food for three meals<sup>9</sup> — shall we say that this is [according to] the Rabbis [only], not R. Hidka? — In truth, it may [agree with] R. Hidkah, [the circumstances being] e.g., where he [already] has one meal with him, so we say to him, 'Eat that which you have with you.' And when he departs, shall he depart empty-handed!<sup>10</sup> — We provide him with a meal to accompany him. 'What is meant by 'the requirements of spending the night?' — Said R. Papa: A bed and a bolster.

Our Rabbis taught: The plates in which one eats in the evening [Friday night] may be

washed for eating in them in the morning; [those which are used] in the morning may be washed to eat in them at midday; [those used] at midday are washed to eat in them at minhah; but from minhah and onwards they may no longer be washed;<sup>11</sup> but goblets, [drink-]ladles and flasks, one may go on washing [them] all day, because there is no fixed time for drinking.

R. Simeon b. Pazzi said in the name of R. Joshua b. Levi in Bar Kappara's name: He who observes [the practice of] three meals on the Sabbath is saved from three evils: the travails of the Messiah,<sup>12</sup> the retribution of Gehinnom,<sup>13</sup> and the wars of Gog and Magog.<sup>14</sup> 'The travails of the Messiah': 'day' is written here;<sup>15</sup> whilst there it is written, Behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet before the great and terrible day of the Lord comes.<sup>16</sup> 'The retribution of Gehinnom': 'day' is written here; whilst there it is written, That day is a day of wrath.<sup>17</sup> 'The wars of Gog and Magog': 'day' is written here; whilst there it is written, in that day when Gog shall come.<sup>18</sup>

R. Johanan said in R. Jose's name: He who delights in the Sabbath is given an unbounded heritage, for it is written, Then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord, and I will make thee to ride upon the high places of the earth; and I will feed thee

1. Thus proving that our Mishnah disagrees with R. Hidka.
2. Tamhuy is the charity plate, the food collected from contributors and distributed daily; kuppah (lit., 'heap', 'pile'), the communal charity, from which weekly grants were made every Friday for food. With two meals one has enough for the day; with fourteen he has enough for the week, hence he must not accept relief from either respectively; v. *Pe'ah* VIII, 7.
3. In the week.
4. Just before its termination.
5. I.e., after nightfall.
6. It is virtually a fast if he must postpone his second meal to the night.
7. Hence if he has fourteen meals he can eat two on the Sabbath rather than receive charity. — This saying of R. Akiba is sometimes quoted nowadays to show that one may even desecrate the Sabbath rather than descend to charity. It is quite obvious that R. Akiba had no such thing in

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

mind but merely meant that one should not seek to obtain the extra luxuries of the Sabbath through charity.

8. A pundion = one-twelfth of a *denar* = one forty-eighth of a *sela'*. A loaf of that size is sufficient for the average two meals.
9. V. *Pe'ah* *ibid.*
10. Surely not.
11. Since they are not required for the Sabbath any more.
12. The advent of the Messiah was pictured as being preceded by years of great distress.
13. Purgatory.
14. Also a time of intense suffering.
15. V. *supra* 117b bottom.
16. Mal. III, 2. (E.V. IV, 5). This is understood to refer to the advent of the Messiah.
17. Zeph. I, 15.
18. Ezek. XXXVIII, 18. Since 'day' is mentioned three times in connection with the Sabbath meals (*supra* 117b), their observance will save one from the bitter experiences of these three 'days'.

## Shabbath 118b

with the heritage of Jacob thy father, etc.<sup>1</sup> Not like Abraham, of whom it is written, Arise, walk through the land in the length of it, etc.;<sup>2</sup> nor like Isaac of whom it is written, for unto thee, and unto thy seed, I will give all these lands, etc.;<sup>3</sup> but like Jacob, of whom it is written, and thou shalt spread abroad to the west, and to the east, and to the north, and to the south.<sup>4</sup> R. Nahman b. Isaac said, He is saved from the servitude of the Diaspora: here it is written, and I will make thee to ride upon the high places of the earth; whilst there it is written, and thou shalt tread upon their high places.<sup>5</sup>

Rab Judah said in Rab's name: He who delights in the Sabbath is granted his heart's desires, for it is said, Delight thyself also in the Lord; And he shall give thee the desires of thine heart.<sup>6</sup> Now, I do not know what this 'delight' refers to; but when it is said, and thou shalt call the Sabbath a delight,<sup>7</sup> you must say that it refers to the delight of the Sabbath.<sup>8</sup>

Wherewith does one show his delight therein? — Rab Judah son of R. Samuel b. Shilath said in Rab's name: With a dish of

beets, large fish, and heads of garlic. R. Hiyya b. Ashi said in Rab's name: Even a trifle, if it is prepared in honor of the Sabbath, is delight. What is it [the trifle]? — Said R. Papa: A pie of fish-hash.

R. Hiyya b. Abba said in R. Johanan's name: He who observes the Sabbath according to its laws, even if he practices idolatry like the generation of Enosh,<sup>9</sup> is forgiven, for it is said, Blessed is Enosh<sup>10</sup> that doeth this ... [that keepeth the Sabbath *mehallelo* from profaning it]:<sup>11</sup> read not *mehallelo* but *mahul lo* [he is forgiven].

Rab Judah said in Rab's name: Had Israel kept the first Sabbath, no nation or tongue would have enjoyed dominion over them, for it is said, And it came to pass on the seventh day, that there went out some of the people for to gather;<sup>12</sup> which is followed by, Then came Amalek.<sup>13</sup> R. Johanan said in the name of R. Simeon b. Yohai: If Israel were to keep two Sabbaths according to the laws thereof, they would be redeemed immediately, for it is said, Thus saith the Lord of the eunuch that keep my Sabbaths,<sup>14</sup> which is followed by, even them will I bring to my holy mountain, etc.<sup>15</sup>

R. Jose said: May my portion be of those who eat three meals on the Sabbath. R. Jose [also] said: May my portion be of those who recite the entire Hallel<sup>16</sup> every day. But that is not so, for a Master said: He who reads Hallel every day blasphemes and reproaches [the Divine Name]?<sup>17</sup> — We refer to the 'Verses of Song'.<sup>18</sup>

R. Jose said: May my portion be of those who pray with the red glow of the sun.<sup>19</sup> R. Hiyya b. Abba said in R. Johanan's name: It is virtuous to pray with the red glow of the sun. R. Zera observed: What verse [intimates this]? They shall revere thee with [i.e., at the time of the sun [rise], and before the moon [shines],<sup>20</sup> throughout all generations.<sup>21</sup>

R. Jose also said: May my lot be of those who die with bowel trouble,<sup>22</sup> for a Master said, The majority of the righteous die of trouble

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

in the bowels. R. Jose also said: May my portion be of those who die on the way to the performance of a religious duty.<sup>23</sup> R. Jose also said: May my lot be of those who welcome the Sabbath in Tiberias and who let it depart in Sepphoris.<sup>24</sup> R. Jose also said: May my lot be of those who seat [pupils] in the *Beth Hamidrash*,<sup>25</sup> and not of those who order [them] to rise [depart] from the *Beth Hamidrash*.<sup>26</sup> R. Jose also said: May my lot be of those who collect charity, but not of those who distribute charity.<sup>27</sup> R. Jose also said: May my lot be of those who are suspected whilst innocent.<sup>28</sup> R. Papa said: I was suspected [of something] of which I was free.<sup>29</sup>

R. Jose said: I cohabited five times and planted five cedars in Israel. Who are they? R. Ishmael son of R. Jose, R. Eleazar<sup>30</sup> son of R. Jose, R. Halafta son of R. Jose, R. Abtilos son of R. Jose, and R. Menahem son of R. Jose. But there was Wardimos? — Wardimos and Menahem are identical, and why was he called Wardimos? Because his face was like a rose [*werad*]. Shall we say that R. Jose did not fulfill his marital duties?<sup>31</sup> — Rather say, I cohabited five times and repeated.<sup>32</sup>

R. Jose said: I have never called my wife 'my wife' or my ox 'my ox', but my wife [I called] 'my home,' and my ox 'my field'.

R. Jose said: I have never looked at my circumcised membrum. But that is not so, for Rabbi was asked, Why were you called 'Our holy Teacher?' Said he to them, I have never looked at my membrum?<sup>33</sup> — In Rabbi's case there was another thing to his credit, viz., he did not insert his hand beneath his girdle. R. Jose also said: The beams of my house have never seen the seams of my shirt.<sup>34</sup>

R. Jose also said: I have never disregarded the words of my neighbors. I know of myself that I am not a priest, [yet] if my neighbors were to tell me to ascend the dais,<sup>35</sup> I would ascend [it].<sup>36</sup> R. Jose also said: I have never in my life said anything from which I retracted.<sup>37</sup>

R. Nahman said: May I be rewarded<sup>38</sup> for observing three meals on the Sabbath. Rab Judah said: May I be rewarded for observing devotion in prayers.<sup>39</sup> R. Huna son of R. Joshua said: May I be rewarded for never walking four cubits bareheaded.<sup>40</sup> R. Shesheth said: May I be rewarded for fulfilling the precept of tefillin.<sup>41</sup> R. Nahman also said: May I be rewarded for fulfilling the precept of fringes.

R. Joseph asked R. Joseph son of Rabbah: Of what is thy father most observant? Of fringes, he replied. One day he was ascending a ladder<sup>42</sup> when a thread [of his fringes] broke, and he would not descend until [another] was inserted.

Abaye said: May I be rewarded for that when I saw that a disciple had completed his tractate,

1. Isa. LVIII, 14.
2. Gen. XIII, 17,
3. Ibid. XXVI, 3.
4. Ibid. XXVIII, 14.
5. Deut. XXXIII, 29. The underlying idea is probably the same as that of Heine's 'Princess Sabbath'.
6. Ps. XXXVII, 3.
7. Isa. ibid, 13.
8. The emphasis on the importance of observing the Sabbath with those meals and as a day of delight was meant according to Weiss (Dor I, 122) to counteract the ascetic tendencies of the Essenes.
9. Gen. IV, 26. According to tradition idolatry commenced in his days.
10. E.V. 'the man'.
11. Isa. LVI, 2.
12. Ex. XVI, 27. This refers to the manna, in connection with which the Sabbath is mentioned for the first time explicitly.
13. Ibid. XVII, 8.
14. Isa. LVI, 4.
15. Ibid. 7.
16. Lit. 'praise' Ps. CXIII-CXVIII which was inserted in the service on Festivals, Hanukkah, and New Moon — on the latter occasion, as well as from the third day of Passover, chs. CXV, 1-11 and CXVI, 1-11 are omitted.
17. Because its recital was instituted for special occasions only, and by reading it every day he treats it as a mere song.
18. The name given to Ps. CXLV-CL which are designated here as Hallel on account of the term

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

'praise' recurring in them; v. Elbogen, *Der Jüdische Gottesdienst*, p. 83, 2.

19. Rashi Jast.: The time in the morning and the evening when the sun appears to stand still or be silent, viz., dawn and sunset.
20. I.e., at sunset.
21. Ps. LXXII, 5. Cf. R. Johanan's statement in Ber. 9b on the wathikin (R. Zera quotes this verse there too, which makes it probable that the same time is referred to there and here); Elbogen, *op. cit.* p. 246.
22. The suffering involved effects atonement (Rashi).
23. I.e., while engaged in the performance of a good deed (Maharsha).
24. In Tiberias, which was situated in a valley, the Sabbath commenced rather earlier, whilst in Sepphoris, which was on a mountain, it terminated rather later than elsewhere.
25. Rashi: the ushers who collect the pupils.
26. To adjourn for meals.
27. It is very difficult to perform the latter with absolute impartiality, as personal predilections are apt to intervene.
28. Lit., 'and it is not in him'.
29. V. Ber. 8b.
30. *Var. lec.*: Eliezer.
31. Except on five occasions.
32. Cf. 'Er. 100b.
33. Which shows that this modesty was peculiar to him.
34. I.e., he did not turn his shirt inside out when he undressed but pulled it over his head whilst sitting up in bed, so that he remained covered as much as possible out of modesty.
35. When the priests recite the priestly blessing; v. Num. VI, 22-27.
36. Though he certainly would not recite the blessing with the other priests, which is forbidden, but merely stand there (Maharsha).
37. Rashi refers this] to his opinions on other people: even if unfavorable he did not retract even in the owner's presence, because he did not state them in the first place without being perfectly sure of their truth.
38. Lit., 'may it (sc. reward) come to me
39. I did not pray mechanically. — The same phrase is used in a derogatory and possibly opposite sense elsewhere, v. Ber. 55a, B.B. 164b.
40. Cf. *infra* 156b.
41. V. [Glos.](#) Rashi: he never walked four cubits without wearing his tefillin; similarly with respect to fringes.
42. Or, stairs.

## Shabbath 119a

I made it a festive day for the scholars. Raba said: May I be rewarded for that when a

disciple came before me in a lawsuit, I did not lay my head upon my pillow before I had sought [points in] his favour.<sup>1</sup> Mar son of R. Ashi said: I am unfit to judge in a scholar's lawsuit. What is the reason? He is as dear to me as myself, and a man cannot see [anything] to his own disadvantage.

R. Hanina robed himself and stood at sunset of Sabbath eve [and] exclaimed, 'Come and let us go forth to welcome the queen Sabbath.'<sup>2</sup> R. Jannai donned his robes, on Sabbath eve and exclaimed, 'Come, O bride, Come, O bride!'

Rabbah son of R. Huna visited the home of Rabbah son of R. Nahman, [and] was offered three se'ahs of oiled cakes. 'Did you know that I was coming?' asked he. 'Are you then more important<sup>3</sup> to us than it [the Sabbath]?' replied he.<sup>4</sup>

R. Abba bought meat for thirteen istira peshita<sup>5</sup> from thirteen butchers<sup>6</sup> and handed it over to them [his servants]<sup>7</sup> as soon as the door was turned<sup>8</sup> and urged them, 'Make haste, Quick Make haste, Quick!'<sup>9</sup>

R. Abbabu used to sit on an ivory stool and fan the fire. R. 'Anan used to wear an overall,<sup>10</sup> for the School of R. Ishmael taught: The clothes in which one cooks a dish for his master, let him not pour out<sup>11</sup> a cup [of wine] for his master in them. R. Safra would singe the head [of an animal]. Raba salted shibuta.<sup>12</sup> R. Huna lit the lamp. R. Papa plaited the wicks. R. Hisda cut up the beetroots. Rabbah and R. Joseph chopped wood. R. Zera kindled the fire. R. Nahman b. Isaac carried<sup>13</sup> in and out,<sup>14</sup> saying, 'If R. Ammi and R. Assi visited me, would I not carry for them?'<sup>15</sup> Others state: R. Ammi and R. Assi carried in and out, saying, 'If R. Johanan visited us, would we not carry before him?'<sup>16</sup>

Joseph-who-honors-the-Sabbaths had in his victory a certain gentile who owned much property. Soothsayers<sup>17</sup> told him, 'Joseph-who-honors-the-Sabbaths will consume all your property.'<sup>18</sup> — [So] he went, sold all his

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

property, and bought a precious stone with the proceeds, which he set in his turban. As he was crossing a bridge the wind blew it off and cast it into the water, [and] a fish swallowed it. [Subsequently] it [the fish] was hauled up and brought [to market] on the Sabbath eve towards sunset. 'Who will buy now?' cried they. 'Go and take them to Joseph-who-honors-the-Sabbaths,' they were told, 'as he is accustomed to buy.' So they took it to him. He bought it, opened it, found the jewel therein, and sold it for thirteen roomfuls<sup>19</sup> of gold *denarii*.<sup>20</sup> A certain old man met him [and] said, 'He who lends to the Sabbath,<sup>21</sup> the Sabbath repays him.'

Rabbi asked R. Ishmael son of R. Jose, The wealthy in Palestine, whereby do they merit [wealth]?<sup>22</sup> — Because they give tithes, he replied, as it is written, 'Asser te'asser<sup>23</sup> [which means], give tithes ['asser] so that thou mayest become wealthy [tith'asser].<sup>24</sup> Those in Babylon, wherewith do they merit [it]? — Because they honor the Torah, replied he. And those in other countries, whereby do they merit it? — Because they honor the Sabbath, answered he. For R. Hiyya b. Abba related: I was once a guest of a man in Laodicea,<sup>25</sup> and a golden table was brought before him, which had to be carried by sixteen men; sixteen silver chains were fixed in it, and plates, goblets, pitchers and flasks were set thereon, thereon,<sup>26</sup> and upon it were all kinds of food, dainties and spices. When they set it down they recited, The earth is the Lord's, and the fullness thereof;<sup>27</sup> and when they removed it [after the meal] they recited, The heavens are the heavens of the Lord, But the earth hath he given to the children of men.<sup>28</sup> Said I to him, 'My son! whereby hast thou merited this?' 'I was a butcher,' replied he, 'and of every fine beast I used to say, "'This shall be for the Sabbath"'. Said I to him, 'Happy art thou that thou hast [so] merited, and praised be the Omnipresent who has permitted thee to enjoy [all] this.'

The emperor said to R. Joshua b. Hanania,<sup>29</sup> 'Why has the Sabbath dish such a fragrant odor?' 'We have a certain seasoning,' replied

he, 'called the Sabbath, which we put into it, and that gives it a fragrant odor.' 'Give us some of it,' asked he. 'To him who keeps the Sabbath,' retorted he, 'it is efficacious; but to him who does not keep the Sabbath it is of no use.'

The Resh Galutha<sup>30</sup> asked R. Hamnuna: What is meant by the verse, [and thou shalt call ...] the holy of the Lord honourable?<sup>31</sup> — This<sup>32</sup> refers to the Day of Atonement, replied he, in which there is neither eating nor drinking, [hence] the Torah instructed, Honor it with clean [festive] garments. And thou shalt honor it:<sup>33</sup> Rab said: By fixing [it] earlier;<sup>34</sup> Samuel maintained: By postponing [it].<sup>35</sup> The sons of R. Papa b. Abba asked R. Papa: We, for instance, who have meat and wine every day, how shall we mark a change? If you are accustomed to [dine] early,<sup>36</sup> postpone it, if you are accustomed to [dine] late, have it earlier, answered he.

R. Shesheth used to place his scholars in a place exposed to the sun in summer, and in a shady place in winter, so that they should arise quickly.<sup>37</sup> R. Zera

1. Certainly not in a spirit of partiality, but because he had such a high opinion of scholars that he felt that they would not engage in a lawsuit unless they know right to be on their side (Maharsha).
2. Cf. Elbogen, *op. cit.*, p. 108.
3. Lit., 'better'.
4. We prepared them in honor of the Sabbath.
5. An *istira peshita*=a half *zuz*.
6. To make sure that some of it at least would be the best obtainable. 'Thirteen' is not meant literally, but merely denotes many; cf. P. 586, n. 4.
7. Or, paid them.
8. Lit., by the pivot of the door'.
9. All in honor of the Sabbath.
10. Whilst attending to the cooking, etc.
11. Lit., mix'.
12. A kind of fish, probably mullet.
13. Lit., 'carried'.
14. Whatever was necessary for the Sabbath.
15. E.g., place a seat for them.
16. The point of all these statements is that the Rabbis did not think it beneath their dignity to engage in menial labor in honor of the Sabbath.
17. Lit., 'Chaldeans'.
18. It will eventually pass into his possession.

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

19. R. Tam translates: vessels.
20. This, of course is an exaggeration, and merely implies much money, 'thirteen' often being used figuratively in that sense, cf. *supra* p. 585, n. 6; Hul. 95b (Rashi).
21. I.e., expends money in its honor.
22. The verb denotes to obtain through merit.
23. E. V. 'Thou shalt surely tithe', Deut. XIV, 22.
24. A play on words.
25. Several towns bore this name.
26. Kebu'oth denotes that they were fastened thereto — probably by the chains.
27. Ps. XXIV, 1.
28. Ps. CXV, 16.
29. The emperor referred to is Hadrian, his contemporary, with whom he had much intercourse; cf. Gen. Rab. X, 3; Hul. 59b, 60a; Ber. 56a.
30. V. P. 217, n. 7.
31. Isa. LVIII, 13.
32. 'The holy of the Lord'.
33. Ibid. With reference to the Sabbath.
34. One honors the Sabbath by dining at an earlier hour than usual.
35. To a later hour, as one eats then with a better appetite — this view would naturally commend itself to Samuel on medical grounds.
36. Rashi: with reference to the midday meal.
37. This was on the Sabbath. He himself was blind, and he did not wish them to stay too long in the *Beth Hamidrash*.

## Shabbath 119b

used to seek out pairs of scholars<sup>1</sup> and say to them, 'I beg of you, do not profane it.'<sup>2</sup>

Raba-others state, R. Joshua b. Levi said: Even if an individual prays on the eve of the Sabbath, he must recite, And [the heaven and the earth] were finished [etc.];<sup>3</sup> for R. Hamnuna said: He who prays on the eve of the Sabbath and recites 'and [the heaven and the earth] were finished,' the Writ treats of him as though he had become a partner with the Holy One, blessed be He, in the Creation, for it is said, Wa-yekullu [and they were finished]; read not wa-yekullu but wa-yekallu [and they finished].<sup>4</sup> R. Eleazar said: How do we know that speech is like action? Because it is said, By the word of the Lord were the heavens made.<sup>5</sup> R. Hisda said in Mar 'Ukba's name: He who prays on the eve of the Sabbath and recites and [the heaven and the earth] were finished, the two ministering

angels who accompany man place their hands on his head and say to him, and thine iniquity is taken away, and thy sin purged.<sup>6</sup>

It was taught, R. Jose son of R. Judah said: Two ministering angels accompany man on the eve of the Sabbath from the synagogue to his home, one a good [angel] and one an evil [one]. And when he arrives home and finds the lamp burning, the table laid and the couch [bed] covered with a spread, the good angel exclaims, 'May it be even thus on another Sabbath [too],' and the evil angel unwillingly responds 'amen'. But if not,<sup>7</sup> the evil angel exclaims, 'May it be even thus on another Sabbath [too],' and the good angel unwillingly responds, 'amen'.

R. Eleazar said: One should always set his table on the eve of the Sabbath, even if he needs only the size of an olive. While R. Hanina said: One should always set his table on the termination of the Sabbath, even if he merely requires as much as an olive.<sup>8</sup> Hot water after the termination of the Sabbath is soothing; fresh. [warm] bread after the termination of the Sabbath is soothing.<sup>9</sup>

A three-year old<sup>10</sup> calf used to be prepared for R. Abbahu on the termination of the Sabbath, of which he ate a kidney. When his son Abimi grew up he said to him, Why should you waste so much? let us leave over a kidney from Sabbath eve. So he left it over, and a lion came and devoured it.<sup>11</sup>

R. Joshua b. Levi said: He who responds, 'Amen, May His great Name be blessed,' with all his might, his decreed sentence<sup>12</sup> is torn up, as it is said, When retribution was annulled<sup>13</sup> in Israel, For that the people offered themselves willingly, Bless ye the Lord:<sup>14</sup> why when retribution was annulled? Because they blessed the Lord. R. Hiyya b. Abba said in R. Johanan's name: Even if he has a taint of idolatry, he is forgiven: it is written here, 'when retribution was annulled [bifroa' pera'oth]'; whilst elsewhere it is written, And Moses saw that the people were broken loose [parua']; for Aaron had let them loose.<sup>15</sup>

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

Resh Lakish said: He who responds 'Amen' with all his might, has the gates of Paradise opened for him, as it is written, Open ye the gates, that the righteous nation which keepeth truth [shomer emunim] may enter in:<sup>16</sup> read not 'shomer emunim' but 'she'omrim amen' [that say, amen]. What does 'amen' mean? — Said R. Hanina: God, faithful King.<sup>17</sup>

Rab Judah son of R. Samuel said in Rab's name: An [outbreak of] fire occurs only in a place where there is desecration of the Sabbath, for it is said, But if ye will not hearken unto me to hallow the Sabbath day and not to bear a burden ... then will I kindle a fire in the gates thereof, and it shall devour the palaces of Jerusalem, and it shall not be quenched.<sup>18</sup> What does 'and it shall not be quenched' mean? — Said R. Nahman b. Isaac: At the time when no people are available to quench it.

Abaye said: Jerusalem was destroyed only because the Sabbath was desecrated therein, as it is said, and they have hid their eyes from My sabbaths, therefore I am profaned among them.<sup>19</sup>

R. Abbahu said: Jerusalem was destroyed only because the reading of the *shema*<sup>20</sup> morning and evening was neglected [therein], for it is said, Woe unto them that rise up early in the morning, that they may follow strong drink [etc.]; and it is written, And the harp and the lute, the tabret and the pipe, and wine, are in their feasts: but they regard not the work of the Lord; and it is written, Therefore my people are gone into captivity, for lack of knowledge.<sup>21</sup>

R. Hamnuna said: Jerusalem was destroyed only because they neglected [the education of] school children; for it is said, pour it out [sc. God's wrath] because of the children in the street:<sup>22</sup> why pour it out? Because the child is in the street.<sup>23</sup>

'Ulla said: Jerusalem was destroyed only because they [its inhabitants] were not ashamed of each other, for it is written, Were

they ashamed when they committed abomination? nay, they were not at all ashamed [... therefore they shall fall].<sup>24</sup>

R. Isaac said: Jerusalem was destroyed only because the small and the great were made equal, for it is said, And it shall be, like people like priest; which is followed by, The earth shall be utterly emptied.<sup>25</sup> 25

R. Amram son of R. Simeon b. Abba said in R. Simeon b. Abba's name in R. Hanina's name: Jerusalem was destroyed only because they did not rebuke each other: for it is said, Her princes are become like harts that find no pasture:<sup>26</sup> Just as the hart, the head of one is at the side of the other's tail, so Israel of that generation hid their faces in the earth,<sup>27</sup> and did not rebuke each other.

Rab Judah said: Jerusalem was destroyed only because scholars were despised therein: for it is said, but they mocked the messengers of God, and despised his words, and scoffed at his prophets, until the wrath of the Lord arose against his people, till there was no remedy.<sup>28</sup> What does 'till there was no remedy' intimate? Said Rab Judah in Rab's name: He who despises a scholar, has no remedy for his wounds.

Rab Judah said in Rab's name: What is meant by. Touch not mine anointed, and do my prophets no harm?<sup>29</sup> Touch not mine anointed' refers to school children;<sup>30</sup> 'and do my prophets no harm', to disciples of the Sages. Resh Lakish said in the name of R. Judah the Prince:<sup>31</sup> The world endures only for the sake of the breath of school children. Said R. Papa to Abaye, What about mine and yours? Breath in which there is sin is not like breath in which there is no sin, replied he. Resh Lakish also said in the name of R. Judah the Prince: School children may not be made to neglect [their studies] even for the building of the Temple. Resh Lakish also said to R. Judah the Prince: I have this tradition from my fathers — others state, from your fathers: Every town in which there are no school children shall be destroyed. Rabina said: It shall be laid desolate.<sup>32</sup>

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

Raba said: Jerusalem was destroyed only because men of faith<sup>33</sup> ceased therein: for it is said, Run ye to and fro in the streets of Jerusalem, and see now, and know, and seek in the broad places thereof, if ye can find a man, if there be any that doeth justly, that seeketh faithfulness; and I will pardon her.<sup>34</sup> But that is not so? For R. Kattina said: Even at the time of Jerusalem's downfall men of faith did not cease therein, for it is said, When a man shall take hold of his brother in the house of his father, saying, Thou hast clothing, be thou our ruler:<sup>35</sup> [this means,] things wherewith men cover themselves as [with] a garment<sup>36</sup> are in thy hand. And let this stumbling<sup>37</sup> be under thy hand:<sup>38</sup>

1. Engaged in halachic discussions.
2. The Sabbath, by neglecting its delights and good cheer.
3. Gen. II, 1.
4. 'They' referring to God and to him who praises God for the Creation.
5. Ps. XXXIII, 6.
6. Isa. VI, 7.
7. If everything is in disorder and gloomy.
8. That too honors the Sabbath, just as a royal visitor is not allowed to depart without a retinue accompanying him.
9. That would not be difficult to obtain, as bread is baked very quickly in the East.
10. Or, a third grown; or, third born.
11. The calf that would have been killed.
12. If Heaven has decreed evil for him.
13. Sic. E. V.: 'For that the leaders took the lead'.
14. Judg. V, 2.
15. Ex. XXXII, 25; the reference is to the idolatrous worship of the Golden Calf.
16. Isa. XXVI, 2.
17. Interpreting it as an abbreviation: el melek ne'eman.
18. Jer. XVII, 27.
19. Ezek. XXII, 26. God's name is profane when the holy city lies in ruins.
20. V. [Glos.](#)
21. Isa. V. 11-13.
22. Jer. VI, 11.
23. Instead of having schools provided for him.
24. Ibid. 15.
25. Isa. XXIV, 2f. 'People' is understood as a synonym for the humble masses; 'priest' symbolizes the great.
26. Lam. I, 6.
27. A metaphor for deliberately shutting their eyes to evil.
28. II Chron. XXXVI, 16.
29. I Chron. XVI, 22.

30. Whom it was customary to anoint with oil, cf. *supra* 10b.
31. Nesi'ah, Judah II.
32. This is more thorough-going than the former.
33. I.e., men completely truthful and trustworthy.
34. Jer. V, 1.
35. Or, judge, Isa. III, 6.
36. Rashi: when questioned on learning they hide themselves, pretending not to hear, because they cannot answer.
37. E.V. 'ruin'.
38. Ibid.

## Shabbath 120a

things of which people are not sure<sup>1</sup> unless they [first] stumble over them<sup>2</sup> are in thy hands; [therefore] be thou our judge. In that day [yissa] shall he lift up [his voice] saying, I will not be an healer:<sup>3</sup> 'yissa' denotes naught but swearing, and thus it is said, Thou shalt not take [tissa] the name of the Lord [thy God in vain].<sup>4</sup> I will not be a binder up [hobesh]: I will not be of those who shut themselves up [hobeshe] in the *Beth Hamidrash*. And in my house in neither bread nor clothing: I possess no mikra,<sup>5</sup> mishnah, or gemara<sup>6</sup> — How does that follow: perhaps it is different there, for had he said to them, 'I have studied them' [the reasons of the Law], they would have retorted, 'Then tell [them] to us'? — Then let him say that he had learnt and forgotten: why [state], 'I will not be a binder up' at all?<sup>2</sup> — There is no difficulty: here it is in connection with learning;<sup>8</sup> there in connection with worldly affairs.

*MISHNAH*. ONE MAY SAVE A BASKET FULL OF LOAVES, EVEN IF IT CONTAINS [SUFFICIENT FOR] A HUNDRED MEALS, AND A ROUND CAKE OF PRESSED FIGS,<sup>2</sup> AND A BARREL OF WINE, AND HE [THE OWNER] MAY SAY TO OTHERS, 'COME AND SAVE FOR YOURSELVES'; AND IF THEY ARE WISE, THEY MAKE A RECKONING WITH HIM AFTER THE SABBATH.<sup>10</sup> WHITHER MAY THEY BE SAVED? INTO A COURTYARD PROVIDED WITH AN 'ERUB. BEN BATHYRA SAID: EVEN INTO A COURTYARD UNPROVIDED WITH AN 'ERUB. AND THITHER HE MAY CARRY OUT ALL. THE UTENSILS [HE REQUIRES] FOR

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

HIS USE;<sup>11</sup> AND HE PUTS ON ALL THAT HE CAN PUT ON AND WRAPS HIMSELF IN ALL WHEREWITH HE CAN WRAP HIMSELF;<sup>12</sup> R. JOSE SAID: [ONLY] EIGHTEEN GARMENTS.<sup>13</sup> THEN HE MAY PUT ON [GARMENTS] AFRESH<sup>14</sup> AND CARRY THEM OUT, AND SAY TO OTHERS, 'COME AND RESCUE WITH ME.'<sup>15</sup>

*GEMARA.* But he [the Tanna] teaches in the first clause,<sup>16</sup> three meals, but no more? — Said R. Huna, There is no difficulty: here it means that he comes to save [the whole basket simultaneously]; there he comes to collect [food]: if he comes to save, he may save all;<sup>17</sup> if he comes to collect, he may collect only for three meals. R. Abba b. Zabda said in R. Idi's name: Both are where one comes to collect, yet there is no difficulty: here it is into the same courtyard;<sup>18</sup> there it is into another courtyard.

R. Huna the son of R. Joshua asked: What if one spreads out his garments, collects and places [therein], collects and places [therein]?<sup>19</sup> Is it like one who comes to save,<sup>20</sup> or like one who comes to collect? — [Come and hear]:<sup>21</sup> Since Raba said, R. Shizbi misled R. Hisda by teaching, 'Provided that he does not procure a vessel which holds more than three meals', it follows that it is like one who comes to save,<sup>22</sup> and it is permitted. R. Nahman b. Isaac observed to Raba: Why is it an error? — He replied: Because it is stated, 'provided that he does not bring another vessel and catch [the dripping liquid] or another vessel and join it [to the roof]': [thus] only another vessel may not [be brought], but he may save as much as he desires in the same vessel.

AND A ROUND CAKE OF PRESSED FIGS, etc. What have we to do with a reckoning? Surely they acquire it from hefker?<sup>23</sup> — Said R. Hisda: They spoke here of pious conduct.<sup>24</sup> Will pious men take payment for the Sabbath? objected Raba.<sup>25</sup> Rather said Raba, We refer here to a God-fearing person, who does not wish to benefit from others, yet is unwilling to trouble for nothing,<sup>26</sup> and this is its meaning: AND IF THEY ARE WISE, that

they know that in such a case it is not payment for the Sabbath,<sup>27</sup> THEY MAKE A RECKONING WITH HIM AFTER THE SABBATH.

WHITHER MAY THEY BE SAVED, etc. Why does he state here [SAVE] FOR YOURSELVES, whilst there he states, RESCUE WITH ME? — I will tell you: in connection with food he states. FOR YOURSELVES, because food for three meals only is fit for himself; but in connection with garments he states, RESCUE WITH ME, because they are fit for him all day.<sup>28</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: He may put on, carry out, and take off, then again put on, carry out, and take off, even all day: this is R. Meir's view. R. Jose said: [Only] eighteen garments. And these are the eighteen garments: a cloak, undertunic,<sup>29</sup> hollow belt,<sup>30</sup> linen [sleeveless] tunic, shirt, felt cap, apron, a pair<sup>31</sup> of trousers, a pair of shoes, a pair of socks, a pair of breeches, the girdle round his loins, the hat on his head and the scarf round his neck.<sup>32</sup>

*MISHNAH.* R. SIMEON B. NANNOS SAID: ONE MAY SPREAD A GOAT SKIN<sup>33</sup> OVER A BOX, CHEST, OR TRUNK<sup>34</sup> WHICH HAS CAUGHT FIRE, BECAUSE HE SINGES;<sup>35</sup> AND ONE MAY MAKE A BARRIER WITH ALL VESSELS, WHETHER FULL [OF WATER] OR EMPTY, THAT THE FIRE SHOULD NOT TRAVEL ONWARD. R. JOSE FORBIDS IN THE CASE OF NEW EARTHEN VESSELS FILLED WITH WATER, BECAUSE SINCE THEY CANNOT STAND THE HEAT, THEY WILL BURST AND EXTINGUISH THE FIRE.<sup>36</sup>

*GEMARA.* Rab Judah said in Rab's name: If a garment catches fire on one side, water may be poured on to it on the other, and if it is [thereby] extinguished, it is extinguished. An objection is raised: If a garment catches fire on one side, one may take it off and cover himself with it, and if it is extinguished, if it is extinguished; and likewise if a Scroll of the Law catches fire, one may spread it out and read it, and if it is extinguished, it is extinguished?<sup>37</sup>

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

1. Lit., 'do not stand by them'.
2. They must first make mistakes before they arrive at certainty.
3. Or, a binder up.
4. Ex. XX, 7. This is an injunction against false swearing.
5. Scriptural knowledge.
6. Gemara, which was often substituted by the censors for Talmud, is generally understood to mean the discussion on the Mishnah; v. however Kaplan, Redaction of the Talmud pp. 195-7, where he maintains that Gemara does not mean discussions but the final decisions arising out of the discussions. — Returning to our text, we see that there were 'faithful', i.e., truthful men in Jerusalem who confessed their ignorance and refused office on that account.
7. This proves that he was animated by a desire for truth, and thus contradicts Raba.
8. In this respect they were truthful.
9. Although it is very large.
10. They may demand payment for their labor.
11. On that day e.g., plates, glasses, etc.
12. And thus saves them from the fire.
13. Which are normally worn; v. Gemara *infra*.
14. Having taken off the first; this is the first Tanna's view, not R. Jose's.
15. In the same manner.
16. Sc. the Mishnah *supra* 117b.
17. In the basket, no matter how much it contains.
18. Sc. that of the house which is on fire.
19. More than three meals.
20. The whole simultaneously, since it is all to be carried out together.
21. V.
22. For Raba evidently holds that one may bring a vessel and collect more than for three meals — the reference is to the Baraita *supra* 117b: 'if one's barrel burst on the top of his roof', etc.
23. V. [Glos.](#) Seeing that he tells them to save it for themselves, it is theirs altogether.
24. A pious man will not take advantage of the fire to keep the food for himself.
25. Surely not.
26. *Hasiduth* (piety) however is a higher stage than God-fearingness.
27. Since it is actually hefkter and they do not stipulate for payment beforehand.
28. He may wish to change many times during the day, so that he needs all for himself.
29. Jast.: an easy dress worn in the house and, under the cloak, in the street, but in which it was unbecoming to appear in public.
30. A money bag.
31. Lit., 'two'.
32. Some of these translations are only approximate: Felt-cap and hat, as well as 'trousers' and 'breeches' were obviously garments both worn at the time.
33. Rashi: which is damp.

34. Lit., 'turret'. — Three kinds of boxes or chests are meant.
35. But does not burn it and at the same time it protects the boxes.
36. Which is forbidden as a principal labor, v. *supra* 73a.
37. In each case probably the motion extinguishes it if the flame is very small. But the Tanna does not permit water.

## Shabbath 120b

— He rules as R. Simeon b. Nannos.<sup>1</sup> Yet perhaps R. Simeon b. Nannos said [merely], **BECAUSE HE SINGES:** but did he rule [thus] of indirect extinguishing?<sup>2</sup> — Yet, since the final clause teaches, **R. JOSE FORBIDS IN THE CASE OF NEW EARTHEN VESSELS FILLED WITH WATER, BECAUSE SINCE THEY CANNOT STAND THE HEAT THEY WILL BURST AND EXTINGUISH THE FIRE,** it follows that the first Tanna permits it.

Our Rabbis taught: If a lamp is on a board, one may shake [tip up] the board and it [the lamp] falls off, and if it is extinguished, it is extinguished. The School of R. Jannai said: They learnt this only if one forgot [it there]; but if he placed [it there], it [the board] became a stand for a forbidden article.<sup>3</sup> A Tanna taught: If a lamp is behind a door, one may open and close [it] naturally, and if it is extinguished<sup>4</sup> it is extinguished. Rab cursed this [ruling]. Said Rabina to R. Aha the son of Raba — others state, R. Aha the son of Raba to R. Ashi — why did Rab curse this? Shall we say because Rab holds with R. Judah,<sup>5</sup> whereas the Tanna teaches as R. Simeon? Because Rab holds with R. Judah, if one teaches as R. Simeon, shall he curse him! — Here, he replied, even R. Simeon agrees, for Abaye and Raba both said: R. Simeon agrees in a case of 'cut off his head and let him not die.'<sup>6</sup>

Rab Judah said: One may open a door opposite a fire on the Sabbath.<sup>7</sup> Abaye cursed this. What are the circumstances? If there is a normal wind [blowing], what is the reason of the one who forbids?<sup>8</sup> — If there is an abnormal wind, what is the reason of the

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

one who permits?<sup>9</sup> — In truth, it refers to a normal wind: one Master holds, we prohibit preventively;<sup>10</sup> whilst the other Master holds, We do not prohibit preventively.

ONE MAY MAKE A BARRIER, etc. Shall we say that the Rabbis hold, Indirect extinguishing<sup>11</sup> is permitted, while R. Jose holds that it is forbidden? But we know them [to maintain] the reverse. For it was taught: One may make a barrier of empty vessels and of full vessels which are not liable to burst; metal vessels. R. Jose said: The vessels of Kefar Shihin and Kefar Hananiah<sup>12</sup> too are not likely to burst!<sup>13</sup> And should you answer, Reverse our Mishnah while R. Jose of the Baraitha argues on the view of the Rabbis,<sup>14</sup> [it may be asked], But can you reverse them? Surely Rabbah b. Tahlifa said in Rab's name: 'Which Tanna holds that indirect extinguishing is forbidden? R. Jose!' Hence in truth you must not reverse it, the whole of the Baraitha being [the view] of R. Jose but there is a lacuna, and it was thus taught: One may make a barrier with empty vessels and with full vessels that are not likely to burst, and these are the vessels which are not likely to burst: metal vessels, and the vessels of Kefar Shihin and Kefar Hananiah too are not likely to burst. For R. Jose maintains: The vessels of Kefar Shihin and Kefar Hananiah too are not likely to burst.

Now, the Rabbis are self-contradictory and R. Jose is self-contradictory. For it was taught: If one has the [Divine] Name written on his skin, he must not bathe nor anoint [himself] nor stand in an unclean place. If he must perform an obligatory tebillah, he must wind a reed<sup>15</sup> about it and descend and perform tebillah. R. Jose said: He may at all times descend and perform tebillah in the ordinary way, provided that he does not rub [it]?<sup>16</sup> — There it is different, because Scripture saith, And ye shall destroy their name out of that place. Ye shall not do so unto the Lord your God:<sup>17</sup> only [direct] action is forbidden, but indirect action is permitted. If so, here too it is written, thou shalt not do any work:<sup>18</sup> only [direct] action

is forbidden, but indirect action is permitted? — Since a man is excited over his property if you permit him [indirect action], he may come to extinguish it. If so, the Rabbis are self-contradictory: if there, though a man is excited over his property, it is permitted, how much more so here? — Now, is that logical:<sup>19</sup> this reed, how is it meant? If it is wound tightly, it is an interposition;<sup>20</sup> [while] if it is not wound tightly the water enters. ([You speak of] 'an interposition' that follows from the ink?<sup>21</sup> — The reference is to wet [ink for it was taught: Blood, ink, honey, and milk, if dry [on the skin] constitute an interposition; if moist, they do not constitute an interposition.) Yet still there is the difficulty?<sup>22</sup> — Rather said Raba b. Shila, This is the reason of the Rabbis: because they hold one must not stand nude in the presence of the Divine Name. Hence it follows that R. Jose holds that one may stand nude in the presence of the Divine Name?<sup>23</sup> — He places his hand upon it. Then according to the Rabbis too, let him place his hand upon it? He may chance to forget and remove it. Then according to R. Jose too, he may forget and remove it? — Rather [reply thus]. If a reed is available that is indeed so.<sup>24</sup> The discussion is about going to seek a reed:<sup>25</sup> the Rabbis hold,

1. Just as the fire may be arrested by a goatskin, so may it be arrested by water, seeing that it is not poured directly on the flame.
2. Such as water.
3. Sc. the lamp, which may not be handled on the Sabbath, and then the same applies to the board too; cf. *supra* 117a and note a.l.
4. By the draught.
5. That even an unintentional action is forbidden.
6. V. p. 357, n. 8.
7. Medurah is a fire for heating, e.g., in the fire place, and the door is opened for the draught to fan it.
8. It is generally insufficient to fan it into a blaze, hence it is not a case of 'cut off his head', etc.
9. It will certainly make it burn up.
10. Because if that is permitted, one will think that the door may be opened even if an abnormal wind is blowing.
11. Lit., 'a cause of extinguishing'.
12. Kefar means a village or country town. The former was probably near Shihin in the vicinity of Sepphoris; the latter was a town in Galilee. The earthen vessels made there were fire proof.

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

13. This shows that he too permits only such. The Baraitha is thus not actually the reverse of the Mishnah, but generally speaking we see that R. Jose is more lenient in the former, whereas in the Mishnah he is more stringent (Tosaf.).
14. Thus R. Jose himself holds that even if they are likely to burst they are permitted, but he argues that even on the more stringent view of the Rabbis the vessels of Kefar Shihin, etc. should be permitted too.
15. As assumed at present in order to prevent effacement of the Name.
16. Intentionally with his hands. — Thus the Rabbis forbid even an indirect action, whereas R. Jose forbids only a direct action.
17. Deut. XII, 3f.
18. Ex. XX, 9.
19. That the need of a reed according to the Rabbis is to prevent effacement.
20. Between the water and the flesh, which invalidates tebillah.
21. With which the Name is written. This interrupts the thread of argument: if you object to the reed because it is an interposition, what of the ink itself?
22. About the reed. Why do the Rabbis insist on a reed? — This difficulty is raised to show that the Rabbis' view has nothing to do with the question whether indirect action is permitted or not.
23. Surely not,
24. All agree that it must be used — even R. Jose, the reason being that one may not stand nude in the presence of the Name.
25. I.e., whether one must postpone the tebillah until he obtains it.

## Shabbath 121a

Tebillah in its [due] time is not obligatory,<sup>1</sup> hence we seek [it]; whereas R. Jose holds, Tebillah in its [due] time is obligatory, hence we do not seek [it].

Now, does then R. Jose hold, Tebillah in its [due] time is obligatory? Surely it was taught: A *zab* and a *zabah*, a male leper and a female leper, he who cohabits with a *niddah*,<sup>2</sup> and he who is defiled through a corpse, [perform] their tebillah by day.<sup>3</sup> A *niddah* and woman in confinement [perform] their tebillah at night.<sup>4</sup> A *ba'al keris*<sup>5</sup> must proceed with tebillah at any time of the day.<sup>6</sup> R. Jose said: [If the mishap happened] from minhah and beyond he need not<sup>7</sup> perform tebillah.<sup>8</sup> — [The author of] that is R. Jose son of R.

Judah who maintained: [One] tebillah at the end suffices for her.<sup>2</sup>

**MISHNAH.** IF A GENTILE COMES TO EXTINGUISH, WE DO NOT SAY TO HIM, 'EXTINGUISH IT' OR 'DO NOT EXTINGUISH,' BECAUSE HIS RESTING IS NOT OUR OBLIGATION.<sup>10</sup> BUT IF A MINOR COMES TO EXTINGUISH, WE MUST NOT PERMIT HIM,<sup>11</sup> BECAUSE HIS RESTING IS OUR OBLIGATION.

**GEMARA.** R. Ammi said: In the case of a conflagration they [the Rabbis] permitted one to announce, 'Whoever extinguishes [it] will not lose [thereby].' Shall we say that this supports him: IF A GENTILE COMES TO EXTINGUISH, WE DO NOT SAY TO HIM, EXTINGUISH OR DO NOT EXTINGUISH, BECAUSE HIS RESTING IS NOT OUR OBLIGATION: thus we [merely] may not say to him, Extinguish [it],' but we may say, 'Whoever extinguishes [it] will not lose [thereby].' Then consider the second clause: WE DO NOT SAY TO HIM ... DO NOT EXTINGUISH but neither may we say to him, 'Whoever extinguishes [it] will not lose [thereby]?'<sup>12</sup> Rather no deduction can be made from this.<sup>13</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: It once happened that a fire broke out in the courtyard of Joseph b. Simai in Shihin, and the men of the garrison at Sepphoris<sup>14</sup> came to extinguish it, because he was a steward of the king.<sup>15</sup> But he did not permit them, in honor of the Sabbath, and a miracle happened on his behalf, rain descended and extinguished [it]. In the evening he sent two *sela'* to each of them, and fifty to their captain. But when the Sages heard of it they said, He did not need this, for we learnt: IF A GENTILE COMES TO EXTINGUISH, WE DO NOT SAY TO HIM, 'EXTINGUISH' OR 'DO NOT EXTINGUISH'.

BUT IF A MINOR COMES TO EXTINGUISH, WE DO NOT PERMIT HIM, BECAUSE HIS RESTING IS OUR OBLIGATION. You may infer from this [that] if a minor eats nebeloth,<sup>16</sup> it is the duty

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

of *Beth din* to restrain him?<sup>17</sup> — Said R. Johanan: This refers to a minor acting at his father's desire.<sup>18</sup> Then by analogy, in respect to the Gentile, he [too] acts at the Jew's desire: is this permitted? — A Gentile acts at his own desire.<sup>19</sup>

**MISHNAH. A DISH MAY BE INVERTED OVER A LAMP, THAT THE BEAMS SHOULD NOT CATCH [FIRE], AND OVER AN INFANT'S EXCREMENT, AND OVER A SCORPION, THAT IT SHOULD NOT BITE. R. JUDAH SAID: AN INCIDENT CAME BEFORE R. JOHANAN B. ZAKKAI IN ARAB,<sup>20</sup> AND HE SAID, I FEAR ON HIS ACCOUNT [THAT HE MAY BE LIABLE TO] A SIN-OFFERING.<sup>21</sup>**

**GEMARA. Rab Judah and R. Jeremiah b. Abba and R. Hanan b. Raba visited the home of Abin of Neshikya.<sup>22</sup> For Rab Judah and R. Jeremiah b. Abba**

1. Even an obligatory tebillah need not be performed just when it is due.
2. Which defiles him — such coition is strictly forbidden.
3. The seventh day from their defilement. They can perform tebillah any time after dawn, even if it is not yet seven full days of twenty-four hours each from the time of defilement, and even if this falls on the Day of Atonement.
4. The evening following the day which completes their period of uncleanness, the full period being required in their case. This holds good even if the evening belongs to the Day of Atonement.
5. Lit., 'one whom a mishap has befallen' — a euphemism for one who discharged semen. By Rabbinical law he requires tebillah before he can engage in the study of Torah.
6. Lit., 'the whole day'. Even if he discharged semen in the late afternoon of the Day of Atonement, he may perform tebillah on the same day and need not wait for the evening, because tebillah in its right time is obligatory. [A non-obligatory bath is prohibited on the Day of Atonement.]
7. [Var. lec. he may not, v. Tosaf. a.l.]
8. Because tebillah at its right time is not obligatory, which is the point of the objection. The circumstances here are that he has already recited all the prayers of the day (Tosaf.), or at least minhah, while the ne'ilah (concluding) service may be recited at night.
9. The reference is to a woman who gave birth without knowing exactly when, what, and whether it was with or without a gonorrhoeic

discharge. The first view is that all possibilities must be taken into account and she must perform tebillah at the due times posited by these. R. Jose b. R. Judah, however, rules that a single tebillah, performed at the end of the whole period that is in doubt, is sufficient, though actually the right time may have been earlier, for in any case tebillah at the time when it becomes due is not obligatory.

10. Lit., 'their obligation'. It is not the duty of Israelites to see that he rests on the Sabbath, hence we need not forbid him. On the other hand by Rabbinical law one must not instruct a Gentile to work — hence we may not tell him to extinguish the fire.
11. Lit., 'we do not hearken to him'.
12. For the second clause merely states that it is unnecessary to stop him, which implies, however, that one must not give him a hint to extinguish.
13. For one clause of the Mishnah must be exact, even in respect of its implication, whereas the other clause is not to be stressed so far, and it is not known which is exact.
14. [The Acropolis mentioned in Josephus, Vita 67].
15. [Agrippa II, v. Klein, S., Beitrage p. 66, n. 1 and Graetz, *MGWJ*, 1881, p. 484].
16. V. Glos.; i.e., any forbidden food.
17. Lit., 'to keep him away'. — In Yeb. 114a this is in doubt.
18. But where he acts entirely of his own accord it may not be so.
19. Though he knows that the Jew too desires it, he may nevertheless act on his own accord. But a minor is more likely to be directly influenced by what he understands to be his father's wish.
20. [Near Sepphoris, v. Klein Beitrage P. 75].
21. Since the snake was not pursuing him, his action may constitute trapping, which involves a sin-offering.
22. A town in Babylonia.

## Shabbath 121b

couches were brought; for R. Hanan b. Raba none was brought.<sup>1</sup> Now, he found him reciting to his son, **AND OVER AN INFANT'S EXCREMENT**, on account of the infant.<sup>2</sup> Said he to him, 'Abin! a fool recites nonsense to his son:<sup>3</sup> surely that itself is fit for dogs!<sup>4</sup> And should you say that it was not fit for him from yesterday,<sup>5</sup> surely it was taught: Flowing rivers and gushing springs are as the feet of all men?<sup>6</sup> Then how shall I recite it? — Say: Over the excrement of fowls, on account of an infant.<sup>7</sup> But deduce it<sup>8</sup> because it is [as] a vessel for excrements.<sup>9</sup>

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

And should you answer, The vessel of excrements is only [permitted] in virtue of the utensil,<sup>10</sup> yet that itself may not [be carried out], — but a mouse was found in R. Ashi's spices, and he said to them [his servants], 'Take it by the tail and throw it out!'<sup>11</sup> — This refers to a dung heap.<sup>12</sup> But what business has an infant with a dung heap?<sup>13</sup> — It is in the courtyard.<sup>14</sup> But in a courtyard too it is a vessel of excrements? — It refers to a dung heap in the courtyard.

AND OVER A SCORPION, THAT IT SHOULD NOT BITE. R. Joshua b. Levi said: All [animals, etc.] that cause injury<sup>15</sup> may be killed on the Sabbath. R. Joseph objected: Five may be killed on the Sabbath, and these are they: the Egyptian fly, the hornet of Nineweh, the scorpion of Adiabene,<sup>16</sup> the snake in Palestine, and a mad dog anywhere. Now, who [is the authority?] Shall we say, R. Judah? Surely he maintains, One is guilty on account of a labor not required for itself?<sup>17</sup> Hence it must be R. Simeon, and only these are permitted, but not others? — Said R. Jeremiah, And who tells us that this is correct: perhaps it is corrupt? Said R. Joseph: I recited it and I raised the objection, and I can answer it: This is where they are pursuing him, and is unanimous.<sup>18</sup>

A tanna recited before Rabbah son of R. Huna: If one kills snakes or scorpions on the Sabbath, the spirit of the pious<sup>19</sup> is displeased with him. He retorted, And as to those pious men, the spirit of the Sages is displeased with them. Now, he disagrees with R. Huna, for R. Huna saw a man kill a wasp. Said he to him, 'Have you wiped them all out?'<sup>20</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: If one chances upon snakes and scorpions, and he kills them, it is manifest that he had chanced upon them in order to kill them; if he does not kill them, it is manifest that he had chanced upon them that they should kill him, but that a miracle was performed by Heaven on his behalf. 'Ulla said: — others state, Rabbah b. Bar Hanah said in R. Johanan's name — That is when they hiss at him.<sup>21</sup>

R. Abba b. Kahana said: One [of them] once fell in the *Beth Hamidrash*, and a Nabatean<sup>22</sup> arose and killed it.<sup>23</sup> Said Rabbi: A similar one must have attacked him. The scholars asked: 'A similar one must have attacked him' [means] that he had done well, or not?<sup>24</sup> — Come and hear: For R. Abba, son of R. Hiyya b. Abba, and R. Zera were sitting in the anteroom of R. Jannai's academy, [when] something issued from between them.<sup>25</sup> [So] they asked R. Jannai: May one kill snakes and scorpions on the Sabbath? Said he to them: I kill a hornet, how much more so snakes and scorpions! But perhaps that is [only] incidentally,<sup>26</sup> for Rab Judah said: One can tread down saliva incidentally:<sup>27</sup> and R. Shesheth said, One can tread down a snake incidentally, and R. Kattina said, One may tread down a scorpion incidentally.<sup>28</sup>

Abba b. Martha, who is Abba b. Minyomi, owed money to the house of the Resh Galutha. [So] they brought him [before the Resh Galutha]; he distressed him [and] he<sup>29</sup> spat out saliva,<sup>30</sup> [whereupon] the Resh Galutha ordered, 'Bring a vessel and cover it.' Said he to them, 'You do not need this, [for] thus did Rab Judah say: One can tread down saliva incidentally.' 'He is a scholar,' remarked he [the Resh Galutha]; 'let him go'.

R. Abba b. Kahana also said in R. Hanina's name: The candlesticks<sup>31</sup> of Rabbi's household may be handled on the Sabbath.

R. Zera asked him: [Does that mean] where they can be taken up with one hand, or [even] with two hands?

1. He had to sit on the ground.
2. To prevent him from dabbling with it.
3. This rude remark was made in spleen at his host's discourtesy.
4. *Mukeneth*, Lit., 'stands prepared'. Hence it may be handled and therefore one can carry it out altogether; why then overturn a dish upon it?
5. Sc. Friday; thus it is newly-created, as it were, on the Sabbath (technically called *nolad v. Glos.*), and as such may not be handled.
6. On the Sabbath or Festival an article may be carried, where carrying is permitted through an 'erub, only where its owner may go, i.e., it is 'as the feet of its owner'. But this does not apply to

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

the water of a flowing river, and every man may carry it whither he himself may go, though not all may go to the same place (v. Bez. 39a). Now, that which comes on the Sabbath from without the tehum (v. [Glos.](#)) may not be taken anywhere within the tehum. But although the water of a flowing river does come from without, it may be carried within. This shows that though that particular water was not there on the Friday, it is regarded as fit on the Sabbath, because it was naturally expected. Hence the same applies to the excrement: though it did not exist before the Sabbath, it was expected, and therefore may be handled, seeing that it can be put to a legitimate use.

7. V. p. 600, n. 9. But this may not be handled itself, because it is not fit for dogs. — He interprets the Mishnah thus.
8. That one may carry it out.
9. Which may be cleared away on account of its repulsiveness.
10. Which contains the excrements.
11. And a mouse is the same as excrement.
12. Which stands apart.
13. Which was usually in the street.
14. It is now assumed that this refers to the excrement, not the dung heap.
15. Rashi: that kill.
16. A district of Assyria between the rivers Lycus and Caprus.
17. *Supra* 12a, 31b; the present killing falls within the same category.
18. I.e., R. Joshua's statement refers to this case. But in the Baraitha they are not pursuing him, and it is taught on R. Simeon's view.
19. Heb. hasidim. Here probably no particular sect is meant. Weiss, Dor, I. 109, maintains that the early hasidim are probably referred to.
20. Sarcastically. I.e., you have achieved nothing, and should not have done it on the Sabbath.
21. Otherwise it is not to be assumed that they were meant to kill him.
22. Rashi, a Jew from Nabatea.
23. This was on a Sabbath.
24. Did Rabbi speak seriously or sarcastically?
25. Or, the question came up (for discussion) between them.
26. Lit., 'in one's simplicity' — i.e., not intentionally, but in the course of his walking.
27. I.e., on Sabbath, despite the possibility of leveling thereby some grooves in the soil.
28. Thus the question remains unanswered.
29. Abba.
30. There happened to be saliva spat out. V. Rashi.
31. Rashi: a one-piece lamp; v. p. 202., n. 6.

## Shabbath 122a

Such as those of your father's house, he replied.<sup>1</sup>

R. Abba b. Kahana also said in R. Hanina's name: The litters<sup>2</sup> of Rabbi's household may be handled on the Sabbath. R. Zera asked him: [Does that mean] those that can be moved with one hand, or [even] with two hands? Such as those of your father's house, replied he.

R. Abba b. Kahana also said: R. Hanina permitted Rabbi's household to drink wine [carried]<sup>3</sup> in gentile coaches<sup>4</sup> [sealed] with one seal,<sup>5</sup> and I do not know whether it is because he agrees with R. Eliezer<sup>6</sup> or because of the [Gentile's] fear of the Nasi's household.<sup>7</sup>

**MISHNAH.** IF A GENTILE LIGHTS A LAMP, AN ISRAELITE MAY MAKE USE OF ITS LIGHT; BUT IF [HE DOES IT] FOR THE SAKE OF THE ISRAELITE, IT IS FORBIDDEN. IF HE DRAWS WATER<sup>8</sup> TO GIVE HIS OWN ANIMAL, TO DRINK, AN ISRAELITE MAY WATER [HIS] AFTER HIM; BUT IF [HE DRAWS IT] FOR THE ISRAELITES SAKE, IT IS FORBIDDEN. IF A GENTILE MAKES A STAIRWAY TO DESCEND BY IT,<sup>9</sup> AN ISRAELITE MAY DESCEND AFTER HIM; BUT IF ON THE ISRAELITES ACCOUNT, IT IS FORBIDDEN. IT ONCE HAPPENED THAT R. GAMALIEL AND THE ELDERS WERE TRAVELING IN A SHIP, WHEN A GENTILE MADE A STAIRWAY FOR GOING DOWN, AND R. GAMALIEL, AND THE ELDERS DESCENDED BY IT.

**GEMARA.** Now these are [all] necessary. For if we were informed [about] a lamp, that is because a lamp for one is a lamp for a hundred; but as for water, [I might say] let us forbid it,<sup>10</sup> lest he come to increase [the quantity drawn] on the Israelite's account.<sup>11</sup> What is the need of [the ruling about] a stairway?<sup>12</sup> He tells us the story of R. Gamaliel and the elders.

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

Our Rabbis taught: if a Gentile gathers herbs,<sup>13</sup> an Israelite may feed [his cattle therewith] after him, but if [he gathers] on the Israelite's account, it is forbidden. If he draws water to give his cattle to drink, an Israelite may water [his] after him, but if on the Israelite's account, it is forbidden. When is that? If he does not know him; but if he knows him it is forbidden. But that is not so? For R. Huna said in R. Hanina's name: A man may stand his cattle on grass on the Sabbath,<sup>14</sup> but not on mukzeh<sup>15</sup> on the Sabbath!<sup>16</sup> — It means that he stands in front of it [the animal],<sup>17</sup> and so it goes [there] and eats.

The Master said: 'When is that? If he does not know him; but if he knows him, it is forbidden.' But R. Gamaliel [is a case where] he knew him?<sup>18</sup> — Said Abaye: It was not [made] in his presence.<sup>19</sup> Raba said: You may even say that it was in his presence: 'a lamp for one is a lamp for a hundred.'<sup>20</sup> An objection is raised: R. Gamaliel said to them, 'Since he did not make it in our presence, let us go down by it?' — Say: 'Since he made it, let us go down by it.'

Come and hear: If a city inhabited by Israelites and Gentiles contains baths where there is bathing on the Sabbath, if the majority are Gentiles, one [an Israelite] may bathe therein immediately;<sup>21</sup> if the majority are Israelites, one must wait until hot water could be heated.<sup>22</sup> — There, when they heat, they do so with a view to the majority.<sup>23</sup>

Come and hear: If a lamp is burning at a banqueting party;<sup>24</sup> if the majority are Gentiles, one may make use of its light; if the majority are Israelites, it is forbidden; if half and half, it is forbidden?<sup>25</sup> — There too, when they light it,

1. Small ones. But heavy ones generally have an appointed place and may not be moved.
2. For carrying people.
3. V. MS.M.
4. Left in the charge of Gentiles.
5. To prevent the Gentiles from tampering with it. Normally two seals are required.

6. In A.Z. 31a, that for wine only one seal is required.
7. Which would prevent the Gentile from tampering with the wine.
8. From a pit in the street.
9. Rashi: a gangway from a large ship to dry land.
10. Even when the Gentile draws it for his own use.
11. Whilst ostensibly drawing it for himself.
12. That is analogous to a lamp — the same stairway suffices for many as for one.
13. As animal fodder.
14. I.e., on grass attached to the soil, and we do not fear that he may thereby come to cut grass for his animal.
15. Fodder stored away for later use; this may not be handled on the Sabbath as mukzeh (v. [Glos.](#)); hence its designation.
16. Lest he take it and feed the animal. But grass cut on the Sabbath is also mukzeh and may not be handled, since it was not fit for handling detached before the Sabbath.
17. Barring its way to elsewhere and so making it go on to the detached grass; but he does not actually lead the animal himself; then it is permitted.
18. Since he travelled with R. Gamaliel in the boat.
19. Then the Gentile certainly did not make it for him.
20. He needed the gangway for himself, and there is no extra work even if he had R. Gamaliel in mind. But one may cut more grass on the Jew's account.
21. After the Sabbath, because it was heated primarily for Gentiles.
22. After the Sabbath, so as not to benefit from the heating of the water on the Sabbath. Now, the water had to be heated for the Gentiles in any case, and there is no real difference between heating for one or for many; further, it was not heated in the Jews' presence, yet one must not benefit from it. This contradicts both Abaye and Raba.
23. Hence it is regarded as specifically for Jews.
24. Having been lit on the Sabbath.
25. This contradicts Raba.

## Shabbath 122b

they do so with a view to the majority.

Samuel visited the house of Abin of Toran.<sup>1</sup> A Gentile came and lit a lamp, [whereupon] Samuel turned his face away.<sup>2</sup> — On seeing that he [the Gentile] had brought a document and was reading it, he observed, 'He has lit it for himself'; [so he [too] [Samuel] turned his face to the lamp.

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

## CHAPTER XVII

**MISHNAH.** ALL UTENSILS MAY<sup>1</sup> BE HANDLED ON THE SABBATH AND THEIR DOORS<sup>4</sup> WITH THEM, EVEN IF THEY ARE DETACHED, FOR THEY ARE NOT LIKE THE DOORS OF A HOUSE, WHICH ARE NOT OF MUKAN.<sup>5</sup> A MAN MAY TAKE A HAMMER TO SPLIT NUTS, A CHOPPER TO CUT [A ROUND OF] PRESSED FIGS, A SAW FOR SAWING CHEESE, A SPADE TO SCOOP DRIED FIGS,<sup>6</sup> A WINNOWING SHOVEL AND A PITCHFORK TO PLACE [FOOD] UPON IT FOR A CHILD, A REED OR A WHORL TO STICK [FOOD], A SMALL NEEDLE<sup>7</sup> TO REMOVE A THORN, AND A SACK [NEEDLE] TO OPEN A DOOR THEREWITH.<sup>8</sup>

**GEMARA.** ALL UTENSILS MAY BE HANDLED, ... EVEN IF THEY ARE DETACHED on the Sabbath,<sup>9</sup> while it goes without saying [if detached] on a weekday;<sup>2</sup> on the contrary, on the Sabbath they stand 'prepared' in virtue of their origin;<sup>10</sup> [whereas if detached] on a weekday, they do not stand 'prepared' in virtue of their origin?<sup>11</sup> Said Abaye, This is its meaning: ALL UTENSILS MAY BE HANDLED ON THE SABBATH, THEIR DOORS WITH THEM, EVEN IF THEY ARE DETACHED on a weekday, they may be handled on the Sabbath.

Our Rabbis taught: The door of a box, chest, or coffer<sup>12</sup> may be removed, but not replaced; that of a hen-roost may neither be removed nor replaced. As for that of a hen-roost, it is well! he holds that since they [the hen-roosts] are attached to the ground, [the interdict of] building applies to the ground and that of demolishing applies to the ground;<sup>13</sup> but as for that of a box, chest, or coffer, what is his opinion? If he holds, [The interdict of] building applies to utensils, then that of demolishing [too] applies to utensils; whilst if there is no [prohibition of] building in respect to utensils, there is no [prohibition of] demolishing in respect to utensils [either]?<sup>14</sup> — Said Abaye: In truth he holds: There is [the prohibition of] building in the case of utensils, and there is [that of]

demolishing in respect of utensils, but he means, Those that were removed [may not be replaced].<sup>15</sup> Said Raba to him, There are two objections to this: one, since he teaches that they may be removed; and two, how [explain] 'but not replaced?' — Rather said Raba: He holds, [The interdict of] building does not apply to utensils, and the interdict of demolishing does not 'apply to utensils, yet it is a preventive measure, lest he fix it firmly'.<sup>16</sup>

**A MAN MAY TAKE A HAMMER, etc.** Rab Judah said: [This means,] a nut hammer to split nuts therewith, but not a smith's [hammer]: he holds, An article whose function is a forbidden labor is forbidden [even] when required for itself.<sup>17</sup> Said Rabbah to him: If so, when the second clause teaches, A WINNOWING SHOVEL AND A PITCH-FORK, TO PLACE [FOOD] UPON IT FOR A CHILD, are a winnowing shovel and a pitch-fork set aside specially for a child?<sup>18</sup> Rather said Rabbah: [it means] a smith's hammer to split nuts therewith; he holds,

1. MS.M. To Abitoran.
2. So as not to benefit from it.
3. Tosaf. reads: ALL UTENSILS WHICH MAY, etc. for in fact there are many that may not be handled.
4. Those that have doors or lids, e.g., a chest or coffer.
5. v. Glos. The doors of a house, if detached, may not be handled on the Sabbath, because they are not parts of utensils which stand 'prepared' for handling. But the doors of utensils are like the utensils themselves.
6. Out of the barrel.
7. Lit., 'hand-needle'.
8. If the key is lost.
9. This is now the assumed meaning and implication of the Mishnah.
10. Lit., 'father'. If they became detached on the Sabbath since they were fit to handle at the beginning of the Sabbath, when they were part of the whole, they remain so for the whole Sabbath.
11. For when the Sabbath commenced they were not part of the utensil.
12. Lit., 'tower' or 'turret' — a large box or chest.
13. I.e., it is like fitting or removing a house door, which constitutes building and demolishing; v. *supra* 73a.
14. Thus removing and refitting should be the same.

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

15. Thus only one law is stated; the doors of a chest, box, and coffer, if detached (before the Sabbath), may not be refitted.
16. Nailing or screwing it on, which is certainly labor; hence he must not put it back at all.
17. For a permitted labor. I.e., since the normal function of a smith's hammer is to perform labor forbidden on the Sabbath, it may not be handled even for a permitted purpose.
18. Surely not!

## Shabbath 123a

An article whose function is a forbidden labor is permitted when required for itself.

Abaye raised an objection to Rabbah: A mortar,<sup>1</sup> if containing garlic, may be moved;<sup>2</sup> if not, it may not be moved?<sup>3</sup> — The author of this is R. Nehemiah, he replied, who maintains, A utensil may be handled only for the purpose of its [normal] use.<sup>4</sup> He objected to him: Yet both hold alike that if he has [already] cut meat upon it, it may not be handled?<sup>5</sup> — He thought of answering him that this agrees with R. Nehemiah, but when he heard R. Hinena b. Shalmia's dictum in Rab's name: All agree in respect of the dyer's pins, tubs, and beams;<sup>6</sup> since one is particular about them he appoints a [special] place for them; so here too one appoints a special place for it [the pestle].<sup>7</sup>

It was stated, R. Hiyya b. Abba said in R. Johanan's name: We learnt [in our Mishnah] of a goldsmith's hammer; R. Shaman b. Abba said: We learnt of a spice hammer. He who says a spice [hammer], all the more so a goldsmith's [hammer].<sup>8</sup> He who says a goldsmith's, — but one is particular about a spice [hammer].<sup>9</sup>

A REED OR A WHORL, etc. Our Rabbis taught: If an unripe fig was hidden in straw,<sup>10</sup> or a cake which was hidden in live coals,<sup>11</sup> and part thereof is uncovered, it may be handled;<sup>12</sup> but if not, it may not be handled. R. Eleazar b. Taddai said: One impales them on a reed or a whorl, and they [the straw or coals] are shaken off of their own accord. R. Nahman said: The *halachah* is as R. Eleazar b. Taddai. Shall we say that

R. Nahman holds, Indirect<sup>13</sup> handling is not designated handling?<sup>14</sup> Surely R. Nahman said: 'A radish, if it is the right way up, is permitted; if it is reversed,<sup>15</sup> it is forbidden.<sup>16</sup> — R. Nahman retracted from that [ruling].

A SMALL NEEDLE TO REMOVE A THORN, etc. Raba son of Rabbah sent to R. Joseph: Let our Master teach us, What of a needle from which the eye or the point has been removed?<sup>17</sup> We have learnt it, he replied: A SMALL NEEDLE TO REMOVE A THORN: now, what does it matter to the thorn whether it has an eye or not? He [thereupon] put an objection to him: If the eye or the point of a needle is removed, it is clean?<sup>18</sup> — Said Abaye: You oppose defilement to the Sabbath! [For] defilement we require a working utensil,<sup>19</sup> [whereas] in respect to the Sabbath we require anything that is fit, and this too is fit for removing a splinter. Raba observed, He who raises the objection does so rightly: since it is not a utensil in respect to defilement, it is not a utensil in respect to the Sabbath.

An objection is raised: A needle, whether with or without an eye, may be handled on the Sabbath, while one with an eye was specified only in respect to defilement?<sup>20</sup> — Abaye interpreted it on the view of Raba as referring to unfinished utensils, for sometimes he may decide to use it thus and make it rank as a utensil; but if the eye or point is removed one throws it away among the rubbish.<sup>21</sup>

Causing a new-born babe to vomit,<sup>22</sup> R. Nahman forbids, while R. Shesheth permits. R. Nahman said: Whence do I rule thus? Because we learnt: One must not use an emetic<sup>23</sup>

1. For pounding garlic.
2. On account of the garlic, to which the mortar is merely subsidiary.
3. Since its essential function is forbidden, it may not be moved even for a permitted purpose, which refutes Rabbah.
4. V. *supra* 36a. Whereas our Mishnah disagrees with R. Nehemiah.

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

5. The reference is to a pestle: Beth Shammai rule that it must not be handled on a Festival for cutting meat thereon, because its normal use, sc. pounding, is forbidden on a Festival; Beth Hillel permit it, so as not to hinder the joy of the Festival. But if the meat has already been cut upon it, so that the permissive reason no longer holds good, Beth Hillel admits that it may not be handled.
6. Rashi and Jast.
7. Whence it is not to be moved for any other purpose but its own. This lays a stronger prohibition upon it; hence it may not be handled.
8. That it may be used, and the more so is an ordinary smith's hammer — in agreement with Rabbah.
9. Not to use it for anything else, lest it become too soiled for subsequent use on spices.
10. For it to ripen. Straw is mukzeh for making bricks.
11. Before the Sabbath.
12. Since the straw or the coals themselves need not be handled.
13. Lit., 'from the side'.
14. V. *supra* 43b.
15. Lit., 'from top to bottom ... from bottom to top'.
16. The reference is to a detached radish stored in loose earth in the ground: if it is the right side up, one may pull it out, because since the top of the radish is broader than the bottom he does not dislodge any earth; but if reversed, the loose soil will naturally cave in, hence it is tantamount to handling the soil and is forbidden, though it is only indirect handling.
17. Does it still rank as a utensil and permitted to be handled on the Sabbath?
18. Which shows that it is not a utensil.
19. But if the eye or point is removed the needle is no longer a utensil.
20. V. *supra* 52b. This refutes Raba.
21. Not regarding it as a utensil at all.
22. By inserting the finger in its mouth in order to relieve it of its phlegm (Jast.). Rashi: To manipulate and ease a child's limbs.
23. In order to leave room for mere food.

## Shabbath 123b

on the Sabbath.<sup>1</sup> And R. Shesheth?<sup>2</sup> — There it is unnatural, whereas here it is natural<sup>3</sup> R. Shesheth said, Whence do I rule thus? Because we learnt: A SMALL NEEDLE TO REMOVE A THORN.<sup>4</sup> And R. Nahman? — There it is [externally] deposited,<sup>5</sup> whereas here it is not [externally] deposited.<sup>6</sup>

*MISHNAH.* A CANE FOR OLIVES,<sup>7</sup> IF IT HAS A BULB ON TOP,<sup>8</sup> IS SUSCEPTIBLE TO DEFILEMENT; IF NOT, IT IS NOT SUSCEPTIBLE TO DEFILEMENT. IN BOTH CASES IT MAY BE HANDLED ON THE SABBATH.

*GEMARA.* Why so? It is a flat wooden utensil, and these are not susceptible to uncleanness; what is the reason? We require [something] similar to a 'sack'?<sup>2</sup> — It was taught in R. Nehemiah's name: When he turns the olives he reverses it and looks at it.<sup>10</sup>

*MISHNAH.* R. JOSE SAID: ALL UTENSILS MAY BE HANDLED, EXCEPT A LARGE SAW AND THE PIN OF A PLOW.<sup>11</sup>

*GEMARA.* R. Nahman said: A fuller's trough<sup>12</sup> is like the pin of a plow. Abaye said: A cobbler's knife and a butcher's chopper and a carpenter's adze are like the pin of a plow.<sup>13</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: At first they [the Sages] ruled, Three utensils may be handled on the Sabbath: A fig-cake knife,<sup>14</sup> a pot soup ladle,<sup>15</sup> and a small table-knife. Then<sup>16</sup> they permitted [other articles], and they permitted again [still more], and they permitted still further, until they ruled: All utensils may be handled on the Sabbath except a large saw and the pin of a plow. What is meant by 'then they permitted [other articles], and they permitted again [still more], and they permitted still further'? — Said Abaye: [First] they permitted an article whose function is for a permitted purpose, provided it was required for itself;<sup>17</sup> then they further permitted an article whose function is for a permitted purpose, even when its place is required; then they further permitted an article whose function is for a forbidden purpose, provided it was required for itself,<sup>18</sup> but not when its place is required. Yet still [these might be handled] with one hand only, but not with two hands,<sup>19</sup> until they [finally] ruled, All utensils may be handled on the Sabbath even with both hands. Raba observed to him, Consider: he [the Tanna] teaches, they permitted [other things], what

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

difference is it whether they are required for themselves or their place is needed?<sup>20</sup> Rather said Raba: [First] they permitted an article whose function is for a permitted purpose, both when required itself or when its place is required; then they further permitted [it to be moved] from the sun to the shade;<sup>21</sup> then they further permitted an article whose function is for a forbidden purpose [to be moved] only when it is required for itself or when its place is required, but not from the sun to the shade. Yet [it might] still [be moved] by one person only, but not by two,<sup>22</sup> until thy ruled: All utensils may be handled on the Sabbath, even by two persons.

Abaye put an objection to him: A mortar containing garlic may be handled; if not, it may not be handled?<sup>23</sup> — We treat here of [moving it] from the sun to the shade. He refuted him: And both hold alike that if he had cut meat upon it, it may not be handled?<sup>24</sup> Here too it means from the sun to the shade.

R. Hanina said: This Mishnah<sup>25</sup> was taught in the days of Nehemiah the son of Hacaliah, for it is written, In those days I saw in Judah some treading winepresses on the Sabbath, and bringing in sheaves.<sup>26</sup>

R. Eleazar said: [The laws about] canes, staves, fastenings, and mortar<sup>27</sup> were all learnt before the permission re [the handling of] utensils. 'Canes', for we learnt: Neither the placing of the canes nor their removal supersedes the Sabbath.<sup>28</sup> 'Staves, as we learnt: There were thin smooth staves there, which one placed on his shoulder and his fellow's shoulder, then he suspended [the sacrifice upon them] and skinned it.<sup>29</sup> R. Eleazar said: If the fourteenth [of Nisan] fell on a Sabbath, one placed

which is similar to repairing a utensil (cf. *supra* 106a).

7. Used for stirring a mass of maturing olives to see whether they are fit for pressing.
8. Closing one end of the reed.
9. Which has a receptacle. The reference is to Lev. XI, 32.
10. Viz., at the oil which penetrates the hollow reed; for this a bulbous (closed) top is required, which turns the cane into a utensil technically containing a receptacle.
11. One is very particular not to use these for any purpose but their own, and this makes them mukzeh.
12. Rashi: (i) A sieve-like perforated tub placed above the linen; water is poured over it, whereby the linen is sprinkled through the holes. Or (ii) the same, the linen being placed inside and incense is burnt underneath, so that the fragrance ascends and perfumes the garments.
13. They may not be handled.
14. I.e., for cutting a cake of pressed figs.
15. [H] (v. *infra* p. 612, n. 5). Rashi: for removing the scum of the soup.
16. When they saw that the people became more strict in Sabbath observance.
17. I.e., when it was required for use, but not when its place was required.
18. To use it in a permitted labor.
19. I.e., if too heavy for one hand they might not be handled.
20. When they permitted the one they would certainly simultaneously permit the other.
21. To avoid scorching; though here neither the article itself is required for use, nor the place where it lies.
22. Cf. p. 611, n. 7.
23. Abaye can explain that it may not be handled when its place only is required, since its normal function is forbidden; but how can Raba explain it?
24. V. *supra* a for notes.
25. Sc. the first ruling which permitted only three utensils to be handled but forbade all others.
26. Neh. XIII, 15. To counteract this laxity the Rabbis had to be particularly severe. — v. Halevy: Dorothe, I, 3, pp. 310-345 for the dates of the Rabbinical enactments, and particularly pp. 344 seqq. for the present passage. Weiss, Dor, I, p. 57, n. 2 argues that the Greek form of the word [H] (this is the form given in Kel. XIII, 2, though it is variously corrupted elsewhere [G] = [G]) proves that this ruling must be much later, certainly not before the Greeks spread in Palestine and the Jews became acquainted with them. This is not conclusive: the original enactment may have employed a Hebrew word which was changed later in the academies, when the Greek form became more familiar.

1. v. *infra* 147a.
2. How does he explain that?
3. Hence it is the same as feeding an infant.
4. And this is similar.
5. The thorn is laid in the flesh, as it were, but has not entered the system.
6. But is within the system, and to bring it out by causing vomiting is like mending a person,

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

27. The Gemara proceeds to state these laws.
28. Canes were placed between the loaves of showbread, to permit the air to circulate about them, so that they should not become moldy. The loaves were set from one Sabbath to the next. Since the canes might not be handled then, they would have to be removed on Friday and rearranged at the conclusion of the Sabbath. Thus for a short while the loaves would be without them.
29. These staves were placed in the Temple court and used for the Passover sacrifice in the manner stated.

## Shabbath 124a

his hand upon his fellow's shoulder, and his fellow's hand [rested] upon his shoulder, and so [the animal] was suspended and skinned.<sup>1</sup> 'A fastening', as we learnt: If a door-bolt has on its top a fastening contrivance,<sup>2</sup> R. Joshua said: One may shift it from one door and hang it on another on the Sabbath;<sup>3</sup> R. Tarfon said: It is like all utensils, and may be moved about in a courtyard. 'A mortar': that which we have stated.<sup>4</sup> Said Rabbah, Whence [does that follow]: perhaps in truth I may argue that they were learnt after the permission re utensils. [Thus:] what was the reason of [placing] canes? On account of moldiness; but in that short while<sup>5</sup> they would not become moldy. As for the staves, it was possible [to act] as R. Eleazar [stated]. The fastening may be as R. Jannai, who said: We treat here of a courtyard not provided with an 'erub:<sup>6</sup> [now,] R. Joshua holds, The inside of the door<sup>7</sup> is as within, so one carries a utensil of the house through the courtyard;<sup>8</sup> whereas R. Tarfon holds that the inside of the door is as without, so one carries a utensil of the courtyard in the courtyard. As for a mortar, that agrees with R. Nehemiah.<sup>9</sup>

**MISHNAH.** ALL UTENSILS MAY BE HANDLED WHETHER REQUIRED OR NOT REQUIRED. R. NEHEMIAH SAID: THEY MAY BE HANDLED ONLY WHEN REQUIRED.

**GEMARA.** What does REQUIRED AND NOT REQUIRED mean? — Rabbah<sup>10</sup> said: REQUIRED: an article whose function is for a permitted purpose [may be moved] when

required itself; NOT REQUIRED: an article whose function is for a permitted purpose [may be moved] when its place is required;<sup>11</sup> but an article whose function is for a forbidden purpose may [be handled] only when required itself,<sup>12</sup> but not when its place is required. Whereupon R. Nehemiah comes to say that even an article whose function is for a permitted purpose [may be handled] only when required itself, but not when its place [alone] is required. Said Raba to him: If its place is required — do you call it: NOT REQUIRED! Rather said Raba: REQUIRED: an article whose function is for a permitted purpose [may be handled] whether required itself or its place is required: NOT REQUIRED [means] even from the sun to the shade; whilst an article whose function is for a forbidden purpose [may be moved] only when required itself or its place is required but not from the sun to the shade. Whereupon R. Nehemiah comes to say that even an article whose function is for a permitted purpose [may be moved] only when required itself or its place is required — but not from the sun to the shade.

Now, R. Safra, R. Aha b. Huna, and R. Huna b. Hanina sat and reasoned: According to Rabbah on R. Nehemiah's view, how may we move plates?<sup>13</sup> Said R. Safra to them, By analogy with a pot of excrement.<sup>14</sup> Abaye asked Rabbah: According to you on R. Nehemiah's view, how may we move plates? — R. Safra our colleague has answered it, By analogy with a pot of excrement, he replied.

Abaye objected to Raba: A mortar, if containing garlic, may be handled; if not, it may not be handled? — We treat here of [moving it] from the sun to the shade. He [further] objected to him: And both hold alike that if he had already cut meat upon it, it may not be moved?<sup>15</sup> — Here too it means from the sun to the shade. Now, as to what we learnt: 'One may not support a pot with a leg, and the same applies to a door',<sup>16</sup> — but surely a *log* on a Festival is an article whose function is for a permitted purpose,<sup>17</sup> which shows that an article whose function is for a

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

permitted purpose 'may not [be handled] whether required itself or its place is needed?'<sup>18</sup> — There this is the reason: since on the Sabbath it is an article whose function is for a forbidden purpose, is it preventively forbidden on Festivals on account of the Sabbath.<sup>19</sup> And should you say, Let the Sabbath itself be permitted, since an article whose function is for a forbidden purpose may be [handled] when required itself or its place is required, — that is only where it comes within the category of a utensil, but not where it does not come within the category of a utensil.<sup>20</sup>

Yet do we enact a preventive measure? Surely we learnt: Produce<sup>21</sup> may be dropped down through a skylight<sup>22</sup> on Festivals, but not on the Sabbath?<sup>23</sup> — Do we then not preventively prohibit? Surely we learnt: The only difference between Festivals and the Sabbath is in respect of food for consumption?<sup>24</sup> — Said R. Joseph, There is no difficulty: the one is [according to] R. Eliezer; the other, R. Joshua. For it was taught: If an animal<sup>25</sup> and its young fall into a pit, — R. Eliezer said: One may haul up the first in order to kill it, and for the second provisions are made where it lies that it should not die. R. Joshua said: One hauls up the first in order to kill it, but he does not kill it, then he practices an evasion and hauls up the second, and kills whichever he desires.<sup>26</sup> How so? Perhaps R. Eliezer rules [thus] only there, because provisions can be made, but not where provisions cannot be made. Or perhaps R. Joshua rules thus only there, since an evasion is possible; but not where an evasion is impossible? Rather said R. Papa: There is no difficulty: one is [according to] Beth Shammai; the other, Beth Hillel. For we learnt, Beth Shammai say:

1. But the staves might not be used then.
2. This had a thick head and could be used as a pestle.
3. Shometah implies that it may be pushed from one to the other, but not picked up in the usual way.
4. *Supra* 123b. Now R. Eleazar maintains that all these prohibitions held good only before the

extended permission in respect to utensils, by which they were abolished.

5. V. p. 612, n. 7.
6. Many houses open into the courtyard. Utensils may not be carried from the houses into the yard, but those already in the yard from before the Sabbath may be moved about therein.
7. Where the fastening contrivance is to be found.
8. Which if done in the normal way is forbidden; therefore it may only be shifted' (v. n. 4).
9. Who maintains that no utensil may be moved for any but its normal use. Hence all four may have been taught after the extended permission was given: the first two remain forbidden because there was no need for handling them at all, the third is connected with the interdict of carrying from one domain to another, whilst the fourth represents an individual view.
10. Alfasi and Asheri read: Abaye.
11. Though the article itself is not.
12. For a permitted labor.
13. After eating the last Sabbath meal, seeing that they are not required for further use on the Sabbath.
14. Which may be removed because it is repulsive, and the same applies to dirty plates.
15. V. *supra* 123a notes.
16. On Festivals. V. Bez. 32b
17. Sc. it is used for fuel.
18. For even the first is forbidden here, and the second all the more so.
19. If the former is permitted, it may be thought that the latter too is permitted.
20. A *log* does not rank as a utensil.
21. Spread out on the roof to dry.
22. When it is about to rain.
23. v. Bez. 35b. Thus we do not argue as in n. 5.
24. Which may be prepared on Festivals, e.g., by baking, cooking, etc. but not on the Sabbaths. Thus on all matters they are alike.
25. Lit., 'it'.
26. V. *supra* 117b for notes. Just as R. Joshua permits both animals to be brought up so he permits one to lower the produce on a Festival to avoid financial loss.

## Shabbath 124b

One may not carry out an infant, a lulab,<sup>1</sup> or a Scroll of the Law into the street;<sup>2</sup> but Beth Hillel permit it.<sup>3</sup> But perhaps you know<sup>4</sup> Beth Shammai [to rule thus only in respect of] carrying out; do you know them [to rule likewise in respect of] handling? — Is then handling itself not [forbidden on account of] carrying out?<sup>5</sup>

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

Now, Rab too holds this [view] of Raba. For Rab said: [Moving] a hoe lest it be stolen is unnecessary handling, and is forbidden.<sup>6</sup> Thus only when it is in order that it should not be stolen, but if it is required for itself or its place is required, it is permitted. But that is not so? For R. Kahana visited Rab's house, whereupon he ordered, Bring a *log* of wood<sup>7</sup> for Kahana to sit. [Now] surely that was to imply that a thing whose function is for a forbidden purpose<sup>8</sup> [may be handled] only when required itself,<sup>9</sup> but not [merely] when its place is required? — This is what he said to them: Remove the *log* from Kahana's presence.<sup>10</sup> Alternatively, there it was [moved] from the sun to the shade.<sup>11</sup>

R. Mari b. Rachel<sup>12</sup> had some pillows<sup>13</sup> lying in the sun. He went to Raba and asked him, May these be moved? — It is permitted replied he.<sup>14</sup> [But] I have others?<sup>15</sup> — They are of use for guests. I have [some] for guests too? — You have revealed your opinion that you agree with Rabbah,<sup>16</sup> observed he: to all others it is permitted, but to you it is forbidden.

R. Abba said in the name of R. Hiyya b. Ashi in Rab's name: Table brushes<sup>17</sup> [made] of cloth may be handled on the Sabbath, but not [those made] of palm[-twigs];<sup>18</sup> R. Eleazar maintained: Even [those made] of palm[-twigs]. What are we discussing: Shall we say [where they are handled] when required in themselves or their place is required, shall Rab rule here 'but not [those made] of palm[-twigs]'? Surely Rab agrees with Raba?<sup>19</sup> Again, if it means from the sun to the shade, shall R. Eleazar rule here 'even [those made] of palms'?<sup>20</sup> — In truth [it means] from the sun to the shade: say, And thus did R. Eleazar rule.<sup>21</sup>

**MISHNAH.** ALL UTENSILS WHICH MAY BE HANDLED ON THE SABBATH, THEIR FRAGMENTS MAY BE HANDLED TOO,<sup>22</sup> PROVIDED, HOWEVER, THAT THEY CAN PERFORM SOMETHING IN THE NATURE OF WORK. [THUS]: THE FRAGMENTS OF A KNEADING TROUGH [THAT CAN BE USED] TO COVER THE MOUTH OF A BARREL

THEREWITH, [AND] THE FRAGMENTS OF A GLASS, TO COVER THEREWITH THE MOUTH OF A CRUSE. R. JUDAH MAINTAINED: PROVIDED THAT THEY CAN PERFORM SOMETHING IN THE NATURE OF THEIR OWN [FORMER] WORK;<sup>23</sup> [THUS:] THE FRAGMENTS OF A KNEADING TROUGH, TO POUR A THICK MASS THEREIN;<sup>24</sup> OR OF A GLASS, TO POUR OIL THEREIN.

**GEMARA.** Rab Judah said in Samuel's name: The controversy is only if they were broken from the eve of the Sabbath, one Master holding: Only [provided they are fit for] something in the nature of their own [former] work, but not for something in the nature of a different work; whereas the other Master holds: Even [if fit] for something in the nature of a different work. But if they are broken on the Sabbath, all agree that they are permitted,<sup>25</sup> since they are *mukan*<sup>26</sup> in virtue of their origin.<sup>27</sup>

R. Zutra objected: 'We may heat [an oven] with utensils, but not with fragments of utensils'<sup>28</sup> Now when were these broken? Shall we say that they were broken from the eve of the Festival, then they are simply pieces of wood.<sup>29</sup> Hence it must surely be on the Festival, yet he teaches, 'We may heat with utensils, but not with fragments of utensils'<sup>30</sup> — Rather if stated, it was thus stated: Rab Judah said in Samuel's name: The controversy is only if they are broken on the Sabbath, one Master holding that they are *mukan*, whilst the other Master holds that they are *nolad*.<sup>31</sup> But [if broken] on Sabbath eve, all hold that they are permitted, since they were *mukan* for work from the day time.<sup>32</sup>

One [Baraita] taught: We may heat with utensils, but not with fragments of utensils; another was taught: Just as we may heat with utensils, so may we heat with fragments of utensils: whilst a third taught: We may heat neither with utensils nor with fragments of utensils. One agrees with R. Judah, one with R. Simeon, and the last with R. Nehemiah.<sup>33</sup>

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

R. Nahman said: The bricks that are left over from a building may be handled, since they are fit to sit on.<sup>34</sup> [But] if he places them in rows, then he has certainly set them apart.<sup>35</sup>

R. Nahman said in Samuel's name: A small shard may be moved about in a courtyard, but not in a *karmelith*.<sup>36</sup> But R. Nahman [giving] his own [view] maintained: Even in a *karmelith*,<sup>37</sup> but not in the street; whereas Raba said: Even in the street.<sup>38</sup> Now, Raba is consistent with his view. For Raba was walking in the manor of Mahoza,<sup>39</sup> when his shoes become soiled with clay; [so] his attendant came, took a shard, and wiped it off. The Rabbis (his disciples) rebuked him.<sup>40</sup> Said he, It is not enough that they have not learnt — they would even teach! If it were in a courtyard, would it not be fit for covering a utensil? Here too I have a use for it.

Rab Judah said in Samuel's name: The bung of a barrel which is broken in pieces may be handled on the Sabbath. It was taught likewise: If a bung is broken in pieces [both] it and the fragments thereof may be handled on the Sabbath. But one must not trim a fragment thereof to cover a vessel or support the legs of a bed<sup>41</sup> therewith; but if one throws it away on the dung heap, it is forbidden.<sup>42</sup> R. Papa demurred: If so, if one throws away his robe, is that too prohibited?<sup>43</sup> Rather said R. Papa:

1. The palm branch; v. Lev. XXIII, 40.
2. On Festivals, for only the preparation of food is permitted. Hence the Mishnah stating that this is the only difference, etc. agrees with Beth Shammai.
3. Therefore the law that produce may be dropped, etc. agrees with Beth Hillel.
4. Lit., 'hear'.
5. Carrying out naturally involves handling, and the latter was forbidden on account of the former. — So Rashi in Bez. 37a. which seems the correct interpretation on the present reading. But the reading there, as well as a variant here, is: 'is not handling a (pre)requisite of carrying out'? (v. Rashi and Marginal Gloss.). Hence handling is forbidden because it partakes of the nature of carrying out. Thus when Beth Shammai prohibit carrying out they also prohibit handling.
6. Just as moving it from the sun to the shade.

7. BaH. Rashi and Jast. translate: a trap.
8. A *log* is used as fuel, which, of course, is forbidden on the Sabbath. Trapping too (according to Rashi's translation) is forbidden.
9. And therefore he emphasized that it was wanted for a seat.
10. That he may sit in its place.
11. Therefore he emphasized the true purpose, so that they might not think that it was moved for that reason alone.
12. His father at the time of his conception was not a Jew; hence he is called by his mother's name.
13. Or, bolsters.
14. In accordance with his view *supra* a, q.v.
15. So I do not need these for themselves.
16. Or, Abaye, *supra* a.
17. For clearing the crumbs off the table, which is permitted.
18. I.e., brooms used for sweeping the floor, which is forbidden.
19. Permitting this.
20. None permit this.
21. Like Rab, the former version of R. Eleazar's view being incorrect.
22. Lit., 'with them'. (The words are, however, rightly omitted in MS.M.)
23. I.e., similar to that performed by the whole utensil.
24. Like the dough kneaded in the trough.
25. Whatever their present use.
26. V. [Glos.](#)
27. v. p. 214, n. 5.
28. On Festivals.
29. Which may certainly be used.
30. Which refutes Samuel's view reported by Rab Judah.
31. Newly created (v. [Glos.](#)). As a fragment it has only just come into existence, and therefore must not be used on the Sabbath.
32. I.e., from before the commencement of the Sabbath they stood to be used as fuel, and so they are regarded as ready for their new function.
33. (i) R. Judah: both mukzeh and nolad are forbidden, hence the prohibition of fragments. (ii) R. Simeon: mukzeh and nolad are permitted, hence both fragments and vessel are permissible; (iii) R. Nehemiah: a utensil may be handled on the Sabbath or Festival only for its normal function, hence the prohibition of both.
34. And the last few may possibly be kept for that purpose.
35. For another building; hence they are mukzeh and must not be handled.
36. In the former vessels may generally be found for which the shard can be used as a cover, but not in the latter.
37. Where people sometimes sit down; one can cover saliva with this.

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

38. Since it is a utensil in a courtyard, it remains so elsewhere.
39. V. p. 277, n. 8. and B. B., Sonc. ed., p. 60, n. 4.
40. Lit., 'lifted their voice against him'.
41. V. p. 199, n. 2. Here, however, it is probably meant literally.
42. Because the owner has shown that it has ceased to be a utensil in his eyes.
43. Surely not!

## Shabbath 125a

If he threw it away whilst yet day<sup>1</sup> it is forbidden.

Bar Hamduri said in Samuel's name: Shreds of reeds detached from a mat may be handled on the Sabbath. What is the reason? — Said Raba, Bar Hamduri explained it to me: What is the [reed-] mat itself fit for? For covering the earth. These too are fit for covering dirt.

R. Zera said in Rab's name: Pieces of silk of aprons may not be handled on the Sabbath. Said Abaye: This refers to rags less than three [fingerbreadths] square, which are of no use to rich or poor.<sup>2</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: The fragments of an old oven<sup>3</sup> are like all utensils which may be handled in a courtyard: this is R. Meir's view. R. Judah said: They may not be handled. R. Jose testified in the name of R. Eleazar b. Jacob concerning the fragments of an old oven that they may be handled on the Sabbath, and concerning its lid [of the oven] that it does not require a handle.<sup>4</sup> Wherein do they differ? — Said Abaye: where they perform something in the nature of work,<sup>5</sup> but not in the nature of their own [former] work,<sup>5</sup> R. Judah being consistent with his view, and R. Meir with his.<sup>6</sup> Raba demurred: If so, instead of disputing about the fragments of an oven, let them dispute about the fragments of utensils in general? Rather said Raba: They dispute about the fragments of the following oven. For we learnt: If he sets it [the oven] over the mouth of a pit or a cellar and places a stone there, — R. Judah said: If one can heat it from underneath and it is [thereby] heated above, it is unclean; if not, it is clean. But the Sages maintain: Since

it can in any wise be heated, it is unclean.<sup>7</sup> And wherein do they differ? In this verse; Whether oven, or range of pots, it shall be torn down: they are unclean, shall be unclean unto you.<sup>8</sup> R. Judah holds: Where tearing down is wanting it is unclean, whilst where tearing down is not wanting it is not unclean.<sup>9</sup> Whereas the Rabbis hold: 'They shall be unclean unto you' [implies] in all cases.<sup>10</sup> But the Rabbis too, surely it is written, 'it shall be torn down'? — That is [intended] in the opposite direction:<sup>11</sup> for one might argue, Since it is attached to the ground, it is like the very ground itself;<sup>12</sup> therefore it informs us [otherwise].<sup>13</sup> And the other [R. Judah] too, surely 'they shall be unclean unto you' is written? — That [is explained] as Rab Judah's dictum in Samuel's name. For Rab Judah said in Samuel's name: They differ only in respect of the first firing,<sup>14</sup> but at the second firing,<sup>15</sup> even if it is suspended to a camel's neck.<sup>16</sup> 'Ulla observed: And as for the first firing, according to the Rabbis, even if it is suspended from a camel's neck!<sup>17</sup> R. Ashi demurred: If so, instead of disputing about the fragments of the oven, let them dispute about the oven itself;<sup>18</sup> [for] seeing that the oven itself, according to R. Judah, is not a utensil, need the fragments [be mentioned]? Rather said R. Ashi: In truth it is as we originally stated, and (the controversy is) where it [the fragment] can serve as a [baking] tile,<sup>19</sup> whilst R. Meir argues on R. Judah's opinion. [Thus:] according to my view, even if they [the fragments] can perform something in the nature of [any] work;<sup>20</sup> but even on your view, you must at least agree with me [here] that in such a case, it is its own work. But R. Judah [argues]: It is dissimilar. There it is heated from within, here it is heated from without; there it stands, here it does not stand.

'R. Jose testified in the name of R. Eleazar b. Jacob concerning the fragments of an old oven, that they may be handled on the Sabbath, and concerning its lid, that it does not require a handle.' Rabina said: In accordance with whom do we handle

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

nowadays the oven lids of the town Mehasia<sup>21</sup> which have no handle? In accordance with whom? R. Eleazar b. Jacob.

**MISHNAH.** IF A STONE [IS PLACED] IN A PUMPKIN SHELL,<sup>22</sup> AND ONE CAN DRAW [WATER] IN IT AND IT [THE STONE] DOES NOT FALL OUT,<sup>23</sup> ONE MAY DRAW [WATER] IN IT; IF NOT, ONE MAY NOT DRAW WATER IN IT.<sup>24</sup>

1. I.e., on Friday before the commencement of the Sabbath.
2. Cf. *supra* 26b.
3. I.e., one that has already been fired, so that the clay whereof it is made is hardened and fit for its work.
4. In order that it shall be permissible to handle it on the Sabbath. There is also an opposing view, v. *infra* 126b.
5. E.g., they are fit for covering a barrel, but one cannot bake in them.
6. As expressed in the Mishnah *supra* 124b.
7. The reference is to an oven. In ancient days this consisted merely of walls, without a separate bottom, and was set upon the ground and plastered thereto. Now, here the oven is set over the walls of a pit, not actually on the ground, and a stone is placed between the oven and the pit as a wedge. R. Judah maintains that if the oven is so placed, e.g., its walls almost correspond to those of the pit, that if a fire is made beneath the oven, in the pit's atmosphere, the oven itself is heated (sufficiently for its work), it is an 'oven' in the technical sense (as stated below) and is susceptible to defilement. But if the fire must be placed in the atmosphere of the oven, it is not an 'oven' and cannot be defiled. (Rashi).
8. Lev. XI, 35.
9. Yuttaz, fr. nathaz, is generally applicable to the tearing down or demolishing of anything attached to the soil, e.g., a house. Now, since the Bible orders that if an oven is defiled it shall be torn down, it follows that it must be so closely joined to the soil that one can speak of tearing it down. Otherwise the Scriptural law does not apply to it, because technically it is 'torn down' from the very time that it is fixed. Hence in the present case if it is not so closely joined to the ground that one can make a fire in the pit on which it stands and thereby heat the oven, it is likewise 'torn down' ab initio, and therefore is not an 'oven' which can be defiled. By 'unclean' and 'not unclean' susceptibility and non-susceptibility to uncleanness is meant.
10. For the repetition is emphatic.

11. Sc. it teaches not leniency but greater stringency, as explained.
12. Which of course, cannot be defiled.
13. Viz., that even where it shall be 'torn down', as defined in n. 2, is applicable, it is still liable to defilement, and all the more so where it is inapplicable.
14. I.e., it had never yet been fired when it was set over the pit. The first firing hardens the clay and technically completes the manufacture of the oven, and R. Judah holds that in this case it cannot be completed at all, for the reasons stated, and so it never becomes an oven.
15. I.e., it was originally set upon the ground in the usual manner, fired, and then removed to the pit.
16. It is unclean, since
17. Wherever it is, it is unclean. — It is in reference to the fragments of this oven that R. Meir and R. Judah dispute, seeing that in the first place it was not absolutely completed.
18. Whether it may be handled on the Sabbath.
19. Tiles which were heated to bake something placed upon them. Thus it can still be used in a manner akin to its original function, but not altogether so, for originally one baked inside the oven, whereas now the food to be baked must be placed on top.
20. They may be handled.
21. V. p. 39, n. 6.
22. Used for drawing water. As the pumpkin was too light to sink, a stone was used to weigh it.
23. Being securely fastened.
24. The stone is then like any other stone, which may not be handled, and the pumpkin too may not be handled, because it serves as a stand for a forbidden article (cf. *supra* 117a top).

## Shabbath 125b

### IF A [VINE-] BRANCH<sup>1</sup>

it is already an 'oven' from the first firing. This extended possibility of defilement is taught by the emphatic repetition, 'and it shall be unclean unto you.' IS TIED TO A PITCHER,<sup>2</sup> ONE MAY DRAW [WATER] WITH IT ON THE SABBATH. AS FOR THE STOPPER OF A SKYLIGHT, R. ELIEZER SAID: WHEN IT IS FASTENED<sup>3</sup> AND SUSPENDED,<sup>4</sup> ONE MAY CLOSE [THE SKYLIGHT] WITH IT; IF NOT, ONE MAY NOT CLOSE (THE SKYLIGHT) WITH IT.<sup>5</sup> BUT THE SAGES MAINTAIN: IN BOTH CASES WE MAY CLOSE [THE SKYLIGHT] WITH IT.

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

**GEMARA.** We learnt elsewhere: If a stone is on the mouth of a cask (e.g., of wine), one tilts it on a side and it falls off.<sup>6</sup> Rabbah said in R. Ammi's name in R. Johanan's name: They learnt this only if one forgets (it there); but if he places [it there],<sup>7</sup> it [the barrel] becomes a stand for a forbidden article.<sup>8</sup> Whereas it. Joseph said in R. Assi's name in R. Johanan's name: They learnt this only if one forgets [it there]; but if he places [it there], it (the stone) becomes a covering of the barrel.<sup>9</sup> Rabbah said: An objection is raised against my teaching: **IF A STONE [IS PLACED] IN A PUMPKIN SHELL, AND ONE CAN DRAW WATER IN IT AND IT DOES NOT FAIL OUT, ONE MAY DRAW WATER IN IT?**<sup>10</sup> But it is not [analogous]: there, since it is firmly fastened, it is made as a wall [of the vessel]. R. Joseph said: An objection is also raised against my teaching: **IF NOT, ONE MAY NOT DRAW WATER IN IT?**<sup>11</sup> But it is not [analogous]: there, since he did not fasten it firmly, he really made it as nought.<sup>12</sup>

Wherein do they differ? One Master (R. Ammi) holds: An act of labor is required,<sup>13</sup> while the other Master [R. Assi] holds: An act of labor is not required. Now, they are consistent with their views. For when R. Dimi came,<sup>14</sup> he said in R. Hanina's name-others state, R. Zera said in R. Hanina's name: Rabbi once went to a certain place and found a course of stones,<sup>15</sup> whereupon he said to his disciples, Go out and intend [them],<sup>16</sup> so that we can sit upon them to-morrow; but Rabbi did not require them [to perform] an act of labor. But R. Johanan said, Rabbi did require them [to perform] an act of labor. What did he say to them?<sup>17</sup> — R. Ammi said: He said to them, Go out and arrange them in order.<sup>18</sup> R. Assi said: He said to them, 'Go out and scrape them' [free of mortar, etc.].<sup>19</sup> It was stated: R. Jose b. Saul said: It was a pile of beams;<sup>20</sup> R. Johanan b. Saul said: It was a ship's sounding pole.<sup>21</sup> Now he who says [that it was] a sounding pole, all the more so a pile [of beams];<sup>22</sup> but he who says that [it was] a pile, but one is particular about a sounding pole.<sup>23</sup>

**IF A VINE-BRANCH IS TIED, etc.** Only if it is tied, but not otherwise? Must we say that our Mishnah does not agree with R. Simeon b. Gamaliel? For it was taught: As for the dried branches of a palm tree which one cut down for fuel, and then he changed his mind, [intending them] for sitting [thereon], he must tie them together.<sup>24</sup> R. Simeon b. Gamaliel said: He need not tie them together. — Said R. Shesheth, You may even say [that it agrees with] R. Simeon b. Gamaliel: we treat here of one [a branch] that is attached to its parent stock.<sup>25</sup> If so, he makes use of what is attached to the soil?<sup>26</sup> — It is below three.<sup>27</sup> R. Ashi said: You may even say that it refers to a detached [branch]: it is a preventive measure, lest he cut (i.e., shorten) it.<sup>28</sup>

**AS FOR THE STOPPER OF A SKYLIGHT, etc.** Rabbah b. Bar Hanah said in R. Johanan's name: All agree that we may not make for the first time a temporary building on a Festival, whilst on the Sabbath it goes without saying. They differ only in respect of adding [to a building]: R. Eleazar maintaining. We may not add on a Festival, whilst on the Sabbath it goes without saying; whereas the Sages rule: We may add on the Sabbath, whilst it is superfluous to speak of a Festival.

**BUT THE SAGES MAINTAIN: IN BOTH CASES WE MAY CLOSE (THE SKYLIGHT) WITH IT.** What does 'IN BOTH CASES' mean? — R. Abba said in R. Kahana's name:

1. Or, rod.
2. To let it down into the well.
3. By a cord to the wall.
4. In the air, the cord being too short to allow it to reach the ground.
5. For it looks like adding to the building.
6. If he wishes to draw wine, v. *infra* 142b.
7. Before the Sabbath.
8. Sc. the stone, which may not be handled.
9. Hence the stone itself may be handled and removed, and it is unnecessary to tilt the barrel.
10. Which shows that the stone is now part of the vessel.
11. Which shows that it is not part of the vessel.

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

12. Since the pumpkin is not fit for drawing water, as the stone will fall out. But here it is enough for his purpose to place the stone upon the barrel, therefore the stone becomes part of the barrel in virtue of that act.
13. For the stone to count as part of the barrel, and mere placing is not an act of labor.
14. V. p. 12, n. 9.
15. Arranged in order, and waiting to be used in building. This renders them mukzeh.
16. Express your intention of sitting on them tomorrow (the Sabbath), so that they may not be mukzeh.
17. In R. Johanan's view.
18. That they may be ready for sitting upon without further handling, R. Ammi holding, as above, that mere disposition does not make them a utensil.
19. But they can be arranged for sitting on the Sabbath itself. Thus these views are consistent with those expressed above.
20. Not stones.
21. With which the depth of the water is sounded.
22. They certainly could have sat upon the latter.
23. Not to use it for anything else, lest it be bent or warped. Therefore it is mukzeh and must not be handled.
24. V. *supra* 50a.
25. Sc. the vine. Hence if it is not tied to the pitcher before the Sabbath, it remains part of the wine and must not be handled.
26. Even if tied before the Sabbath it is still that and is forbidden.
27. Handbreadths from the ground. Such may be used, v 'Erub. 99b.
28. On the Sabbath, if it is not fastened to the pitcher before. Hence even R. Simeon b. Gamaliel agrees.

## Shabbath 126a

Whether it is fastened or not, providing that it was prepared.<sup>1</sup> Said R. Jeremiah to him, But let the Master say, Whether it is suspended or not, providing that it is fastened;<sup>2</sup> for Rabbah b. Bar Hanah said in R. Johanan's name: Just as there is a controversy here, so is there a controversy in respect of a dragging bolt.<sup>3</sup> For we learnt: With a dragging bolt, one may lock [the door] in the Temple, but not in the country;<sup>4</sup> but one that is laid apart [on the ground]<sup>5</sup> is forbidden in both places. R. Judah said: That which is laid apart [is permitted] in the Temple; and that which is dragged, in the country. Now it was taught: Which is a

dragging bolt wherewith we may close (a door] in the Temple but not in the country? That which is fastened (to the door] and suspended — one end reaching the ground. R. Judah said: Such is permitted even in the country. But which is forbidden in the country? That which is neither fastened nor suspended — but which one removes and places in a corner. Further, R. Joshua b. Abba said in 'Ulla's name: Who is the Tanna of 'a dragging bolt?'<sup>6</sup> It is R. Eleazar!<sup>7</sup> Said he to him, I hold with the following Tanna. For it was taught: If a private individual prepares<sup>8</sup> a cane for opening and shutting [a door] therewith: if it is tied and suspended to the door, he may open and shut [it] therewith; if it is not tied and suspended may not open and shut [it] therewith. R. Simeon b. Gamaliel ruled: If it is prepared<sup>2</sup> even if it is not fastened.<sup>10</sup>

R. Judah b. Shilath said in R. Assi's name in R. Johanan's name: The *halachah* is as R. Simeon b. Gamaliel. Now, did R. Johanan say thus? Surely we learnt: All lids of vessels

1. For this purpose before the Sabbath.
2. Before the Sabbath, i.e., explain the Mishnah stringently, instead of leniently.
3. Lit., 'a bolt that is dragged'. I.e., a door-bolt, fastened to the door, but one end thereof drags on the floor.
4. 'Country' is employed technically to denote all places except the Temple. — Since it is fastened to the door, it is as though built thereto, and therefore the prohibition of handling it is only a Rabbinical one, which was imposed in the country but not in the Temple.
5. It is not fastened at all, but when removed from the sockets it is simply placed on the ground.
6. Requiring both that it be fastened and suspended.
7. Whereas R. Judah will agree with the Rabbis. From this passage we see that all agree that it must be tied.
8. I.e., sets aside.
9. I.e., since it has been devoted to this purpose.
10. It may be used for opening and shutting. R. Abba rules in accordance with this.

## Shabbath 126b

which have a handle on the Sabbath. Whereon R. Judah b. Shila said in R. Assi's

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

## CHAPTER XVIII

name in R. Johanan's name: Providing that they have the character of utensils.<sup>1</sup> And should you answer, Here too [it means] where it ranks as a utensil,<sup>2</sup> — does then R. Simeon b. Gamaliel require it to have the character of a utensil? Surely it was taught: As for the dried branches of a palm tree which one cut down for fuel and then changed his mind, [intending them for sitting thereon], he must tie them together.<sup>3</sup> R. Simeon b. Gamaliel said: He need not tie them together!<sup>4</sup> — R. Johanan agrees with him in one<sup>5</sup> and disagrees with him in the other.<sup>6</sup> R. Isaac the smith<sup>7</sup> lectured at the entrance of the Resh Galutha:<sup>8</sup> The *halachah* is as R. Eliezer. R. Amram objected: And from their words we learn that we may close (a skylight), measure [a mikweh], and tie [a temporary knot] on the Sabbath!<sup>9</sup> — Said Abaye to him, What is your view: because it is taught anonymously?<sup>10</sup> [But the Mishnah concerning] a dragging bolt is also anonymous!<sup>11</sup> — Yet even so an actual incident is weightier.<sup>12</sup>

**MISHNAH.** ALL LIDS OF UTENSILS WHICH HAVE A HANDLE MAY BE HANDLED ON THE SABBATH. SAID R. JOSE, WHEN IS THAT SAID? IN THE CASE OF LIDS OF GROUND [BUILDINGS],<sup>13</sup> BUT THE LIDS OF UTENSILS MAY IN ANY CASE BE HANDLED ON THE SABBATH.

**GEMARA.** R. Judah b. Shila said in R. Assi's name in R. Johanan's name: Provided that they have the character of a utensil. All agree: Covers of ground [buildings may be handled] only if they have a handle but not otherwise; covers of utensils, even if they have no handle. Where do they differ? In respect of utensils joined to the ground: one Master holds: We forbid (them) preventively,<sup>14</sup> while the other Master holds, We do not forbid preventively. Another version: Where do they differ? In respect of an oven cover:<sup>15</sup> one Master likens it to the cover of a ground [building], while the other Master likens it to the cover of utensils.

**MISHNAH.** ONE MAY CLEAR AWAY EVEN FOUR OR FIVE BASKETS OF STRAW OR PRODUCE [GRAIN] TO MAKE ROOM FOR GUESTS OR ON ACCOUNT OF THE NEGLECT OF THE *BETH HAMIDRASH*,<sup>16</sup> BUT NOT THE STORE.<sup>17</sup> ONE MAY CLEAR AWAY CLEAN *TERUMAH*, *DEM'AI*,<sup>18</sup> THE FIRST TITHE WHOSE *TERUMAH* HAS BEEN SEPARATED,<sup>19</sup> REDEEMED SECOND TITHE AND *HEKDESH*,<sup>20</sup> AND DRY LUPINES, BECAUSE IT IS FOOD FOR GOATS.<sup>21</sup> BUT [ONE MAY] NOT [CLEAR AWAY] *TEBEL*,<sup>18</sup> THE FIRST TITHE WHEREOF *TERUMAH* HAS NOT BEEN TAKEN, UNREDEEMED SECOND TITHE OR *HEKDESH*, *LOF*<sup>22</sup> OR MUSTARD. R. SIMEON B. GAMALIEL PERMITS [IT] IN THE CASE OF *LOF*, BECAUSE IT IS FOOD FOR RAVENS.<sup>23</sup> AS FOR BUNDLES OF STRAW,<sup>24</sup> TWIGS, OR YOUNG SHOOTS, IF THEY WERE PREPARED AS ANIMAL FODDER, THEY MAY BE MOVED; IF NOT, THEY MAY NOT BE MOVED.<sup>25</sup>

**GEMARA.** Seeing that five may be cleared away, need four be stated? — Said R. Hisda: [It means] four out of five.<sup>26</sup> Some there are who state, Four of a small store,<sup>27</sup> and five of a large store. And what does BUT NOT THE STORE mean?<sup>28</sup> That one must not commence [dealing] with a store for the first time;<sup>29</sup> and which [Tanna] rules [thus]? It is R. Judah, who accepts [the interdict of] *mukzeh*. But Samuel said: [It means] four or five

1. I.e., the lids themselves must be fit for use as vessels. But how can a cane rank as a utensil?
2. E.g., if the cane may be used for stirring olives in the vat.
3. V. p. 226, n. 1.
4. They may be handled without tying, though they are certainly not utensils.
5. That if it is prepared it need not be tied.
6. Holding that they must have the character of a utensil.
7. Many of the Rabbis were tradesmen or workers; e.g., R. Johanan the cobbler; R. Papa, who was a brewer; Hillel at one time a wood-cutter.
8. V. p. 217, 11. 7.

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

9. V. Mishnah *infra* 157a. The reference there is to a cloth that is not fastened and suspended, and yet we may close a skylight with it.
10. You assume that that proves the *halachah* is so, for otherwise you could simply answer that it represents the Rabbis' view only and is not a final ruling.
11. And there R. Eliezer's view is stated.
12. In the Mishnah *infra* 157 it is not merely a theoretical ruling but bears on actual practice. Therefore one may assume that it states the final ruling, and this refutes R. Isaac.
13. E.g., the lid or cover of a pit built in the ground. When they have a handle they are obviously not part of the pit and are meant to be put on and taken off. But otherwise they seem to be there permanently: hence placing them there is like building, and removing them is like demolishing.
14. Lest they be confused with the lid of ground buildings.
15. V. p. 620, n. 8 for its construction.
16. Caused by lack of room for the disciples.
17. Explained *infra*.
18. V. [Glos.](#)
19. The first tithe belonged to the Levite; a tenth thereof, called *terumah* ('septs ration'), was given to the priest.
20. The second tithe was to be eaten by an Israelite owner in Jerusalem. Both it and *hekdesch*, q.v. [Glos.](#), could be redeemed, whereby they became like ordinary produce, save in a few respects, and then consumed. (*Hekdesch*, if an animal dedicated as a sacrifice, might be redeemed only if it received a blemish.)
21. Var *lec.*: for the poor.
22. *Jast.*: a plant similar to colocasia, with edible leaves and root, and bearing beans. It is classified with onions and garlic.
23. Which some wealthy people bred.
24. Or, stubble.
25. This is the reason of the others too which may not be moved, viz., because they cannot be used even as animal fodder.
26. If the entire store consists of five, only four may be removed, but not all, lest depressions in the ground are revealed which may be leveled on the Sabbath.
27. *Var. lec.* omit: 'Some there are ... small store'.
28. It cannot mean that the whole store must not be cleared away, since on the present interpretation that is already implied in the first clause.
29. If he had not already started using it for food, either for himself or for his animals, before the Sabbath, it is *mukzeh* and must not be touched.

## Shabbath 127a

just as people speak; yet if one desires even more may be cleared away. And what does **BUT NOT THE STORE** mean? That one must not complete[ly remove] the whole of it, lest he come to level up depressions;<sup>1</sup> but one may indeed commence therewith.<sup>2</sup> And who [rules thus]? It is R. Simeon, who rejects [the interdict of] *mukzeh*.

**Our Rabbis taught:** One must not commence with a store for the first time, but he may make a path through it to enter and go out. 'He may make a path!' but surely you say, 'One must not commence'? — This is its meaning: one may make a path through it with his feet as he enters and goes out.<sup>3</sup>

**Our Rabbis taught:** If produce is heaped together [for storage] and one commenced [using] it on the eve of the Sabbath, he may take supplies from it on the Sabbath; if not, he may not take supplies from it on the Sabbath: this is R. Simeon's view; but R. Aha permits it. Whither does this tend!<sup>4</sup> — Rather say: this is R. Aha's view; but R. Simeon permits it.

**A Tanna taught:** What is the standard quantity for produce that is heaped together? — A *lethek*.<sup>5</sup> R. Nehumi b. Zechariah asked Abaye: What is the standard quantity for produce that is heaped together? Said he to him, Surely it was said: The standard quantity for produce that is heaped together is a *lethek*.

**The scholars asked:** These four or five baskets that are stated, [does it mean] only in four or five baskets, but not more,<sup>6</sup> which shows that it is better to minimize one's walking; or perhaps it is better to minimize the burden?<sup>2</sup> Come and hear: For one [Baraitha] taught: One may clear away even four or five tubs of pitchers of wine and oil; whereas another was taught: In ten or fifteen. Surely they differ in this, viz., one Master holds: It is better to minimize the walking; while the other Master holds: It is better to reduce the burden? — No: All hold that it is

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

better to reduce the walking: do you think that ten or fifteen refers to 'tubs'? [No]; it refers to the pitchers, yet there is no contradiction: here [in the first the reference is] where they can be carried [only] singly in a tub;<sup>8</sup> whereas there, where they can be carried in twos, and there, where they can be carried in threes,<sup>9</sup> of the size of the jugs of Harpania.<sup>10</sup>

The scholars asked: These four or five that are stated, [does it mean] even if he has more guests; or perhaps it all depends on the [number of] guests? And should you say that it all depends on the number of guests, can one person clear [them] away for all of them, or perhaps each man must do so for himself? — Come and hear: For Rabbah said in R. Hiyya's name: Rabbi once went to a certain place; seeing that the place was too cramped for the disciples, he went out to a field and found it full of sheaves, whereupon Rabbi cleared the whole field of the sheaves. While R. Joseph related in R. Oshaia's name: R. Hiyya once went to a certain place; seeing that the place was too cramped for the disciples, he went out to a field and found it full of sheaves, whereupon R. Hiyya cleared the whole field of the sheaves.<sup>11</sup> This proves that it all depends on the [number of] guests. But still the question remains, Can one person clear [them] away for all, or perhaps each man must do so for himself? — Come and hear: 'And Rabbi cleared the sheaves.' Then on your view, did Rabbi personally clear [them]?<sup>12</sup> But he gave orders that it [the field] be cleared, yet after all each [acted] for himself.<sup>13</sup>

**TO MAKE ROOM FOR THE GUESTS, etc.**  
R. Johanan said: Hospitality to wayfarers<sup>14</sup> is as 'great' as early attendance at the *Beth Hamidrash*, since he [the Tanna] states, **TO MAKE ROOM FOR GUESTS OR ON ACCOUNT OF THE NEGLECT OF THE BETH HAMIDRASH.** R. Dimi of Nehardea said: It is 'greater' than early attendance at the *Beth Hamidrash*, because he states, **TO MAKE ROOM FOR GUESTS, and then, AND ON ACCOUNT OF THE NEGLECT**

**OF THE BETH HAMIDRASH.** Rab Judah said in Rab's name: Hospitality to wayfarers is greater than welcoming the presence of the *Shechinah*, for it is written, And he said, My lord, if now I have found favor in thy sight, pass not away, etc.<sup>15</sup> R. Eleazar said: Come and observe how the conduct of the Holy One, blessed be He, is not like that of mortals. The conduct of mortals [is such that] an inferior person cannot say to a great[er] man, Wait for me until I come to you; whereas in the case of the Holy One, blessed be He, it is written, and he said, My Lord, if now I have found, etc.

R. Judah b. Shila said in R. Assi's name in R. Johanan's name: There are six things, the fruit of which man eats in this world, while the principal remains for him for the world to come, viz.: Hospitality to wayfarers, visiting the sick, meditation in prayer, early attendance at the *Beth Hamidrash*, rearing one's sons to the study of the Torah, and judging one's neighbor in the scale of merit.<sup>16</sup> But that is not so? For we learnt: These are the things which man performs and enjoys their fruits in this world, while the principal remains for him for the world to come, viz.: honoring one's parents, the practice of loving deeds,<sup>17</sup> and making peace between man and his fellow, while the study of the Torah surpasses them all:<sup>18</sup> [this implies], these only, but none others?

1. V. p. 629, n. 11.
2. I.e., the reverse of n. 3.
3. This is not handling.
4. Surely it should be reversed, since R. Simeon always rejects mukzeh.
5. Half a *kor*=fifteen se'ahs. But less does not constitute a store, and the prohibition of mukzeh does not apply to it in any case.
6. I.e., must they actually be carried away thus, but not broken up into smaller quantities and then removed?
7. Hence they may certainly be broken up into smaller quantities.
8. Being too large to be carried more than one at a time.
9. Which gives ten or fifteen pitchers in five piles.
10. [H], jugs enclosed in wicker-work. Harpania was a rich agricultural town of Mesene, south of Babylon, famous for its wicker-work

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

manufactured from the fiber of palm leaves; v. Obermeyer, p. 200.

11. To make room for the disciples.
12. Surely not.
13. Thus the question remains unanswered.
14. The word means both guests and wayfarers.
15. Gen. XVIII, 3; he thus left God, as it were, to attend to the wants of the three wayfarers. [On this interpretation he was speaking to God, and begged Him to remain whilst he saw to his guests v. Shebu. 35b.]
16. I.e., seeking a favorable interpretation of his actions, even when they look suspicious.
17. Not merely alms-giving.
18. Not because knowledge in itself is a great virtue, but because it is the foundation and condition of real piety; cf. Ab. II, 6; also, 'Learning is great, because it leads to (good) deeds'.

## Shabbath 127b

— These too are included in the practice of loving deeds. Another version: these are included in those.<sup>1</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: He who judges his neighbor in the scale of merit is himself judged favorably. Thus a story is told of a certain man who descended from Upper Galilee and was engaged by an individual in the South for three years. On the eve of the Day of Atonement<sup>2</sup> he requested him, 'Give me my wages that I may go and support my wife and children.' 'I have no money,' answered he. 'Give me produce,' he demanded; 'I have none,' he replied. 'Give me land.' — 'I have none.' 'Give me cattle.' — 'I have none. 'Give me pillows and bedding.' — 'I have none.' [So] he slung his things behind him and went home with a sorrowful heart.<sup>3</sup> After the Festival his employer took his wages in his hand together with three laden asses, one bearing food, another drink, and the third various sweetmeats, and went to his house. After they had eaten and drunk, he gave him his wages. Said he to him, 'When you asked me, "Give me my wages," and I answered you, "I have no money," of what did you suspect me?' 'I thought, Perhaps you came across cheap merchandise and had purchased it therewith.' 'And when you requested me, "Give me cattle," and I answered, "I have no

cattle," of what did you suspect me?' 'I thought, they may be hired to others.' 'When you asked me, "Give me land," and I told you, "I have no land," of what did you suspect me?' 'I thought, perhaps it is leased to others.' 'And when I told you, "I have no produce," of what did you suspect me?' 'I thought, Perhaps they are not tithed.' 'And when I told you, "I have no pillows or bedding," of what did you suspect me?' 'I thought, perhaps he has sanctified all his property to Heaven.' 'By the [Temple] service!' exclaimed he, 'it was even so; I vowed away all my property because of my son Hyrcanus, who would not occupy himself with the Torah, but when I went to my companions in the South they absolved me of all my vows. And as for you, just as you judged me favorably, so may the Omnipresent judge you favorably.'

Our Rabbis taught: It happened that a certain pious man<sup>4</sup> ransomed an Israelite maiden [from captivity]; at the inn he made her lie at his feet. On the morrow he went down, had a ritual bath, and learnt with his disciples. Said he to them, 'When I made her lie at my feet, of what did you suspect me?' 'We thought, perhaps there is a disciple amongst us who[se character] is not clearly known<sup>5</sup> to our Master.'<sup>6</sup> 'When I descended and had a ritual bath, of what did you suspect me?' 'We thought, perhaps through the fatigue of the journey the Master was visited by nocturnal pollution.' 'By the [Temple] Service!' exclaimed he to them, 'it was even so. And just as you judged me favorably, so may the Omnipresent judge you favorably.'

Our Rabbis taught: The scholars were once in need of something from a noblewoman where all the great men of Rome were to be found. Said they, 'Who will go?' 'I will go,' replied R. Joshua. So R. Joshua and his disciples went. When he reached the door of her house, he removed his tefillin<sup>7</sup> at a distance of four cubits, entered, and shut the door in front of them. After he came out he descended, had a ritual bath, and learnt with

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

his disciples. Said he to them, 'When I removed my tefillin, of what did you suspect me?' 'We thought, our Master reasons, "Let not sacred words enter a place of uncleanness".' 'When I shut [the door], of what did you suspect me?' 'We thought, perhaps he has [to discuss] an affair of State with her.' 'When I descended and had a ritual bath, of what did you suspect me?' 'We thought, perhaps some spittle spurted from her mouth upon the Rabbi's garments.'<sup>8</sup> 'By the [Temple] Service!' exclaimed he to them', 'it was even so; and just as you judged me favorably, so may the Omnipresent judge you favorably.'

**WE MAY CLEAR AWAY CLEAN TERUMAH**, etc. But that is obvious? — It is necessary [to teach it] only where it is lying in the hand of an Israelite; you might say, Since It Is of no use<sup>9</sup> for him, it is forbidden [to handle it]; he [the Tanna] informs us therefore [that] since it is fit for a priest it is permitted.

**DEM'AI**, etc. But dem'ai is not fit for him? — Since if he desired he could renounce [ownership of] his property and become a poor man, whereby it would be fit for him, it is fit for him now too. For we learnt: The poor may be fed with dem'ai and billeted soldiers may be given dem'ai. And R. Huna said, It was taught: Beth Shammai maintain: The poor may not be given dem'ai as food, nor billeted soldiers; but Beth Hillel rule: The poor may be given dem'ai as food, and [likewise] billeted soldiers.<sup>10</sup>

**AND THE FIRST TITHE WHOSE TERUMAH HAS BEEN SEPARATED**. But that is obvious? — It is necessary [to teach it] only where he anticipated [the separation of] the first tithe in the ears, and separated *terumah* of tithe but not the great *terumah*.<sup>11</sup> And this is as the following dictum of R. Abbahu in the name of Resh Lakish: First tithe which one anticipated in the ears is exempt from the great *terumah*, for it is said, then ye shall offer up an heave-offering of it for the Lord, a tithe of the tithe.<sup>12</sup> I ordered thee [to offer] a tithe of the tithe, but not the

great *terumah* plus the *terumah* of the tithe of the tithe. R. Papa said to Abaye: If so, even if he anticipates it in the stack,<sup>13</sup> he should be exempt? — For your sake Scripture writes, out of all your gifts ye shall offer every heave-offering of the Lord.<sup>14</sup> And what [reason] do you see [to interpret thus]?<sup>15</sup> — The One has become corn [dagan], while the other has not become corn.<sup>16</sup>

**AND THE SECOND TITHE**, etc. But that is obvious? — It is necessary [to teach it] only where the principal has been given but not the fifth:<sup>17</sup> thus he informs us that the fifth is not indispensable.<sup>18</sup>

**AND DRY LUPINES**, etc. Only dry, but not moist. What is the reason? Since it is bitter, she [the goat] will not eat it.

1. Hospitality and visiting the sick belong to the practice of loving deeds; early attendance at the *Beth Hamidrash* and rearing one's children to the study of the Torah are included in the study of the Torah; while judging one's neighbor favorably enables peace to be made between a man and his fellow and between a husband and wife, as each can be persuaded to take a charitable view of the other's actions. As for meditation in prayer, Rashi includes it in the practice of loving deeds — to one's own soul — as it is written, the man of love doeth good to his own soul (Prov. XI, 17). Maharsha includes it in peacemaking between God and man.
2. Alfasi and Asheri read: Festival.
3. Lit., 'with blasting of spirit'.
4. [H], the phrase generally designates either R. Judah b. Baba or R. Judah b. ila'i (Rashi).
5. Lit., 'tested', 'examined'.
6. So you could not trust him.
7. Which were then worn during the day.
8. Which by rabbinical law affects levitical purity; cf. *supra* 15b, 17b.
9. Lit., 'not fit'.
10. V. Dem. III, I.
11. The great *terumah* is a portion of the produce, unspecified by Scriptural law, which the Israelite must give to the priests; for *terumah* of the tithe, v. n. on Mishnah. The great *terumah* was to be separated first and then first tithe. But here the order was reversed, and the Israelite separated the tithe whilst the grain was yet in the ears.
12. Num. XVIII, 26.
13. I.e., when it is no longer in the ears but has been piled up in stacks.

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

14. Num. XVIII, 29; i.e., all is an extension, and shows that the offering is due even in such a case. 'For your sake' or, 'concerning you' — to refute this possibility.
15. To apply the limitation of the first verse to the one case and the extension if the second to the other- perhaps it should be reversed.
16. The priestly due, i.e., the great *terumah*, is 'the first-fruits of thy corn' (Deut. XVIII, 4). Hence once it is piled up as corn it is due, and one cannot evade his obligations by reversing the order of the gifts.
17. When one redeemed the second tithe he had to add a fifth of its value.
18. To the validity of the redemption, and the redeemed produce may be consumed anywhere, even though the fifth has not been added.

## Shabbath 128a

**BUT NOT *TEBEL***, etc. That is obvious? — It is necessary [to teach it] only of *tebel* made so by Rabbinical law, e.g., if it was sown in an unperforated pot.<sup>1</sup>

**NOR THE FIRST TITHE**, etc. That is obvious? — It is necessary [to teach it] only where it had been anticipated in the pile, the tithe having been separated but not the great *terumah*. You might argue as R. Papa proposed to Abaye:<sup>2</sup> hence he [the Tanna] informs us [that it is] as Abaye answered him.

**NOR THE SECOND TITHE**, etc. That is obvious? — It is necessary [to teach it] only where they have been redeemed, but not in accordance with their laws; [i.e.,] the [second] tithe was redeemed by un-coined metal,<sup>3</sup> for the Divine Law states, And thou shalt bind up [we-zarta] the money in thine hand,<sup>4</sup> [implying], that which bears a figure [zurah];<sup>5</sup> [and] *hekdesch* which was secularized by means of land,<sup>6</sup> for the Divine law states, Then he shall give the money and it shall be assured to him.<sup>7</sup>

**NOR LOF**. Our Rabbis taught: We may handle *hazab*,<sup>8</sup> because it is food for gazelles, and mustard, because it is food for doves. R. Simeon b. Gamaliel said: We may also handle fragments of glass, because it is food for ostriches. Said R. Nathan to him: If so, let

bundles of twigs be handled, because they are food for elephants. And R. Simeon b. Gamaliel?<sup>9</sup> Ostriches are common, [whereas] elephants are rare. Amemar observed: provided he has ostriches. R. Ashi said to Amemar: Then when R. Nathan said to R. Simeon b. Gamaliel, 'let bundles of dried branches be handled, because they are food for elephants', — if one has elephants, why not? But [he means,] they are fit for [elephants]; so here too they are fit for [ostriches].<sup>10</sup>

Abaye said: R. Simeon b. Gamaliel, R. Simeon, R. Ishmael, and R. Akiba, all hold that all Israel are royal children. 'R. Simeon R. Gamaliel', as stated.<sup>11</sup> 'R. Simeon': for we learnt: Royal children may anoint their wounds with oil, since it is their practice to anoint themselves thus on weekdays. R. Simeon said: All Israel are royal children. 'R. Ishmael and R. Akiba': for it was taught: If one is a debtor for a thousand *zuz*, and wears a robe a hundred *manehs* in value, he is stripped thereof and robed with a garment that is fitting for him. It was taught in the name of R. Ishmael, and it was taught in the name of R. Akiba: All Israel are worthy of that robe.

**BUNDLES OF STRAW, TWIGS**, etc. Our Rabbis taught: Bundles of straw, bundles of branches, and bundles of young shoots,<sup>12</sup> if one prepared them as animal fodder, may be handled; if not, they may not be handled. R. Simeon b. Gamaliel said: Bundles which can be taken up with one hand may be handled; with two hands, may not be handled. As for bundles of *si'ah*,<sup>13</sup> hyssop and *koranith*:<sup>14</sup> if they were brought in for fuel, one must not draw on them [for food] on the Sabbath; [if brought in] as animal fodder, he may draw on them on the Sabbath; and he may break [it] with his hand and eat [thereof], provided that he does not break it with a utensil. And he may crush it and eat, provided that he does not crush a large quantity with a utensil: the words of R. Judah. But the Sages maintain: He may crush [it] with the tips of his fingers and eat, provided, however, that

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

he does not crush a large quantity with his hands in the [same] way as he does on weekdays; the same applies to ammitha, the same applies to higgam [rue], and the same applies to other kinds of spices. What is ammitha? Ninya.<sup>15</sup> [What is] si'ah? — Said Rab Judah: Si'ah is zithre;<sup>16</sup> ezob is abratha [hyssop];<sup>17</sup> koranith is what is called koranitha. But there was a certain man who asked, 'Who wants koranitha,' and it transpired [that he meant] thyme? — Rather si'ah is zithre, ezob is abratha, and koranitha is hashe [thyme].

It was stated: Salted meat may be handled on the Sabbath; unsalted<sup>18</sup> meat, — R. Huna says: It may be handled; R. Hisda rules: It may not be handled. 'R. Huna says: It may be handled'? But R. Huna was Rab's disciple, and Rab agrees with R. Judah who accepts [the prohibition of] mukzeh?<sup>19</sup> — In [the interdict of] mukzeh in respect of eating he agrees with R. Judah;<sup>20</sup> in [the interdict] of mukzeh as regards handling he agrees with R. Simeon.<sup>21</sup>

'R. Hisda rules: It may not be handled.' But R. Isaac b. Ammi visited R. Hisda's house and he saw a [slaughtered] duck being moved from the sun into the shade, and R. Hisda observed, I see here a financial loss.<sup>22</sup> — A duck is different, because it is fit as raw meat.

Our Rabbis taught: Salted fish may be handled; unsalted fish may not be handled;<sup>23</sup> meat, whether unsalted or salted, may be handled; [and this is taught anonymously as R. Simeon].<sup>24</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: Bones may be handled because they are food for dogs;

1. Cf. *supra* 95a Mishnah. By Scriptural law it is not *tebel* at all, and one would think that the produce might therefore be handled.
2. That it is exempt; *supra* 127b bottom.
3. Asimon. V. B.M. 47b for the meaning of the term.
4. Deut. XIV, 25.
5. The image stamped on a coin. This connects *zarta* with *zurah*.
6. I.e., land was given in order to redeem it.

7. I.e., it can be redeemed by money, but not by land. Actually there is no such verse, but v. B.M., Sonc. ed., 321, n. 1.
8. Jast.: a shrubby plant, probably *cistus*.
9. How does he answer this?
10. And they may be handled even if one has no ostriches.
11. He permits lof to be handled because it is food for ravens, which only wealthy people — who are the same as princes — kept.
12. BaH on the basis of Tur O.H. 308, 28 omits the last-mentioned here, though retaining it in the Mishnah.
13. Jast.: a plant classified with hyssop. *Satureia Thymbra* (savory).
14. Jast.: thyme or *origanum*.
15. Jast.: Bishop's weed. Rashi: mint.
16. *Satureia*; v. n. 1.
17. Used as a remedy for indigestion, v. *supra* 109b.
18. Lit., 'unsavory'.
19. Which applies to unsalted meat, since it is not fit for food.
20. That which is normally unfit for food may not be eaten, even if its owner wishes.
21. That it is permitted.
22. If you leave it in the sun. Thus they moved it at his orders.
23. Because it cannot be eaten, nor will it be given to dogs, as one does not give to dogs what can be made fit for man.
24. Hence raw meat is permitted. Rashal, however, deletes the bracketed passage; v. Tosaf.

## Shabbath 128b

putrid meat, because it is food for beasts; uncovered water,<sup>1</sup> because it is fit for a cat. R. Simeon b. Gamaliel said: It may not be kept at all, because of the danger.<sup>2</sup>

**MISHNAH.** A BASKET MAY BE OVERTURNED BEFORE FLEDGLINGS, FOR THEM TO ASCEND OR DESCEND.<sup>3</sup> IF A FOWL RUNS AWAY [FROM THE HOUSE], SHE IS PUSHED [WITH THE HANDS] UNTIL SHE RE-ENTERS. CALVES AND FOALS MAY BE MADE TO WALK, AND A WOMAN MAY MAKE HER SON WALK.<sup>4</sup> R. JUDAH SAID: WHEN IS THAT? IF HE LIFTS ONE [FOOT] AND PLACES [ANOTHER] DOWN; BUT IF HE DRAGS THEM IT IS FORBIDDEN.<sup>5</sup>

**GEMARA.** Rab Judah said in Rab's name: If an animal falls into a dyke, one brings pillows and bedding and places [them] under it, and if it ascends it ascends. An objection is raised:

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

If an animal falls into a dyke, provisions are made for it where it lies so that it should not perish. Thus, only provisions, but not pillows and bedding? — There is no difficulty: here it means where provisions are possible; there, where provisions are impossible. If provisions are possible, well and good;<sup>6</sup> but if not, one brings pillows and bedding and places them under it. But he robs a utensil of its readiness [for use]?<sup>7</sup> — [The avoidance of] suffering of dumb animals is a Biblical [law], so the Biblical law comes and supersedes the [interdict] of the Rabbis.<sup>8</sup>

**IF A FOWL RUNS AWAY.** We may only push [it], but not make it walk. We have here learnt what our Rabbis taught: An animal, beast, or bird may be made to walk in a courtyard, but not a fowl. Why not a fowl? — Said Abaye, Because she raises herself.<sup>9</sup>

One [Baraita] taught: An animal, beast, and bird may be made to walk in a courtyard, but not in the street; a woman may lead her son in the street, and in the courtyard it goes without saying. Another taught: An animal, beast, and bird may not be carried<sup>10</sup> in a courtyard, but we may push them that they should enter. Now this is self-contradictory. You say, We may not carry, which implies that we may certainly make them walk; then you say, we may only push but not lead? — Said Abaye: The second clause refers to a fowl.

Abaye said: When one kills a fowl he should [either] press its legs on the ground or else lift them up,<sup>11</sup> lest it places its claws on the ground and tears its organs loose.<sup>12</sup>

**MISHNAH.** ONE MAY NOT DELIVER AN ANIMAL [IN GIVING BIRTH] ON A FESTIVAL, BUT ONE MAY ASSIST IT. WE MAY DELIVER A WOMAN ON THE SABBATH, SUMMON A MIDWIFE FOR HER FROM PLACE TO PLACE, DESECRATE THE SABBATH ON HER ACCOUNT, AND TIE UP THE NAVEL-STRING. R. JOSE SAID: ONE MAY CUT [IT] TOO. AND ALL THE REQUIREMENTS OF CIRCUMCISION MAY BE DONE ON THE SABBATH.

**GEMARA.** How may we assist? Rab Judah said: The new-born [calf, lamb, etc.] is held so that it should not fall on the earth. R. Nahman said: The flesh is compressed in order that the young should come out. It was taught in accordance with Rab Judah. How do we assist? We may hold the young so that it should not fall on the ground, blow into its nostrils,<sup>13</sup> and put the teat into its mouth that it should suck. R. Simeon b. Gamaliel said: We stimulate pity<sup>14</sup> to a clean animal<sup>15</sup> on a Festival. What was done? — Said Abaye: A lump of salt was brought and placed in its womb so that it [the mother] might remember its travails<sup>16</sup> and have pity upon it; and we sprinkle the water of the after-birth<sup>17</sup> upon the newly-born [animal] so that its mother might smell it and have pity upon it. Yet only [in the case of] a clean [animal], but not an unclean one. What is the reason? An unclean animal does not spurn its young, and if it does spurn it, it does not take it back.<sup>18</sup>

**ONE MAY DELIVER A WOMAN, etc.** Consider: He [the Tanna] teaches, **ONE MAY DELIVER A WOMAN AND SUMMON A MIDWIFE FOR HER FROM PLACE TO PLACE, then what does AND DESECRATE THE SABBATH ON HER ACCOUNT** add? — It adds the following taught by the Rabbis: If she needs a lamp, her neighbor may kindle a lamp for her. And if she needs oil, her neighbor brings her oil<sup>19</sup> in her hand;<sup>20</sup> but if that in her hand is insufficient, she brings it in her hair; and if that in her hair is insufficient, she brings it to her in a vessel.

The Master said: 'If she needs a lamp, her neighbor may kindle a lamp for her.' That is obvious? — This is necessary [to be taught] only in the case of a blind [woman]: you might argue, Since she cannot see it, it is forbidden; hence he informs us that we tranquillize her mind, [as] she reasons, if there is anything [required] my friend will see it and do it for me.

'If she needs oil, etc.' [But] deduce it on the grounds of wringing out?<sup>21</sup> — Rabbah and R. Joseph both answer: [The interdict of]

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

wringing out does not apply to hair. R. Ashi said: You may even say that wringing out does apply to hair: she brings it to her in a vessel by means of her hair,<sup>22</sup> [because] as much as we can vary it we do so.<sup>23</sup>

Rab Judah said in Samuel's name: If a woman is in confinement, as long as the uterus is open, whether she states, 'I need it,' or 'I do not need it,' we must desecrate the Sabbath on her account. If the uterus is closed, whether she says,

1. V. p. 533, n. II.
2. To a human being who may drink it.
3. Into or from the hen-coop.
4. The verb refers to the short hop-like steps made by a child when he is just learning to walk.
5. As the mother in effect carries him. The reference is to a public domain.
6. Lit., 'yes'.
7. Because once he places the bedding under the animal, he may no longer remove it on Sabbath, v. *supra* 43a.
8. The prohibition of depriving a utensil on a sabbath of its readiness for use, with the result that one carries it. This is forbidden as mukzeh. The broad humaneness of this is striking, particularly when it is remembered that it antedates by many centuries any similar view elsewhere. Cf. *supra* 117b, p. 577, n. 6.
9. But ducks when held by their wings actually walk.
10. Lit., 'you may not remove' (their feet from the ground simultaneously).
11. So that they cannot touch the ground at all.
12. Viz., the windpipe and the gullet. If these are torn loose before being cut the animal or bird is unfit for food.
13. To clear them of their mucus, etc.
14. [I.e., arouses the maternal instinct of the animal for its young. Tosef. reads: 'pity in'].
15. I.e., one permitted as food.
16. In giving birth.
17. Water in which the placenta was soaked.
18. Lit., 'bring it near' — in spite of these expedients.
19. Through the street.
20. But not in a vessel, if it can be avoided.
21. I.e., if she brings it in her hair she must then wring it out, which is just as much forbidden as carrying it in a vessel. Since this is so, why not carry it ordinarily?
22. The vessel is attached to her hair.
23. When the Sabbath must be desecrated, we do it in as unusual a manner as possible.

## Shabbath 129a

'I need it' or 'I do not need it,' we may not desecrate the Sabbath for her:<sup>1</sup> that is how R. Ashi recited it. Mar Zutra recited it thus: Rab Judah said in Samuel's name: If a woman is in confinement, as long as the uterus is open, whether she says, 'I need it' or 'I do not need it,' we desecrate the Sabbath for her. If the uterus is closed, if she says, 'I need it,' we desecrate the Sabbath for her; if she does not say, 'I need it,' we do not desecrate the Sabbath for her.<sup>2</sup> Rabina asked Meremar: Mar Zutra recited it in the direction of leniency, [while] R. Ashi recited it in the direction of stringency; which is the law? — The law is as Mar Zutra, replied he: where [a matter of] life is in doubt we are lenient.

From when is the opening of the uterus? — Abaye said: From when she sits on the seat of travail. R. Huna son of R. Joshua said: From when the blood slowly flows down; others state, From when her friends carry her by her arms.<sup>3</sup> For how long is the opening of the uterus? — Abaye said: Three days: Raba said in Rab Judah's name: Seven; others maintain: Thirty.

The scholars of Nehardea said: A lying-in woman [has three periods: from] three [days after confinement], seven [days], and thirty [days]. From three [days], whether she says, 'I need it' or she says, 'I do not need it,'<sup>4</sup> we desecrate the Sabbath for her. [From] seven [days], if she says 'I need it,' we desecrate the Sabbath for her; if she says, 'I do not need it,' we do not desecrate the Sabbath for her. [From] thirty days, even if she says, 'I need it,' we may not desecrate the Sabbath for her,<sup>5</sup> yet we may do so by means of a Gentile,<sup>6</sup> as R. 'Ulla the son of R. Ilai, who said: All the requirements of an invalid may be done by means of a Gentile on the Sabbath, and as R. Hamnuna, who said: In a matter entailing no danger [to life], one bids a Gentile and he does it.

Rab Judah said in Samuel's name: For a woman in confinement [the period is] thirty

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

days. In respect of what law? The scholars of Nehardea said: In respect of a ritual bath.<sup>7</sup> Raba observed: We said this only if her husband is not with her;<sup>8</sup> but if her husband is with her, he makes her warm. Even as R. Hisda's daughter performed tebillah within thirty days in her husband's absence,<sup>9</sup> caught a chill, and was carried in a bed to Raba at Pumbeditha.

Rab Judah said in Samuel's name: We may make a fire for a lying-in woman on the Sabbath [in the winter].<sup>10</sup> Now it was understood from him, only for a lying-in woman, but not for an invalid; only in winter, but not in summer. But that is not so: there is no difference between a lying-in woman and any [other] invalid, and summer and winter are alike. [This follows] since it was stated, R. Hiyya b. Abin said in Samuel's name: If one lets blood and catches a chill, a fire is made for him even on the Tammuz [summer] solstice.<sup>11</sup> A teak chair was broken up for Samuel;<sup>12</sup> a table [made] of juniper-wood was broken up for Rab Judah. A footstool was broken up for Rabbah, whereupon Abaye said to Rabbah, But you are infringing, thou shalt not destroy?<sup>13</sup> 'Thou shalt not destroy' in respect of my own body is more important to me, he retorted.

Rab Judah said in Rab's name: One should always sell [even] the beams of his house and buy shoes for his feet. If one has let blood and has nothing to eat, let him sell the shoes from off his feet and provide the requirements of a meal therewith. What are the requirements of a meal? — Rab said: Meat; while Samuel said: Wine. Rab said meat: life for life. While Samuel said, Wine: red [wine] to replace red [blood].

(Mnemonic: *SHeNiMSaR.*)<sup>14</sup> For Samuel on the day he was bled<sup>15</sup> a dish of pieces of meat was prepared; R. Johanan drank until the smell [of the wine] issued from his ears; R. Nahman drank until his milt swam [in wine]; R. Joseph drank until it [the smell] issued from the puncture of bleeding.<sup>16</sup> Raba sought Wine of a [vine] that had had three [changes of] foliage.<sup>17</sup>

R. Nahman b. Isaac said to his disciples: I beg of you, tell your wives on the day of blood-letting, Nahman is visiting us.<sup>18</sup> Now, all artifices are forbidden, save the following article, which is permitted. Viz., if one is bled and cannot [buy wine],<sup>19</sup> let him take a bad *zuz*<sup>20</sup> and go to seven shops until he has tasted as much as a *rebi'ith*.<sup>21</sup> But if not,<sup>22</sup> let him eat seven black dates, rub his temples with oil, and sleep in the sun. Ablat<sup>23</sup> found Samuel sleeping in the sun. Said he to him, O Jewish Sage! can that which is injurious be beneficial? It is a day of bleeding, replied he.<sup>24</sup> Yet it is not so, but there is a day when the sun is beneficial for the whole year, [viz.,] the day of the Tammuz [summer]<sup>25</sup> solstice, and he said to himself, I will not reveal it to him.<sup>26</sup>

(Mnemonic: *Sparingly, wind, taste, tarry.*) Rab and Samuel both Say: If one makes light of the meal after bleeding his food will be made light of by Heaven, for they Say; He has no compassion for his own life, shall I have compassion upon him! Rab and Samuel both say: He who is bled, let him, not sit where a wind can enfold [him], lest the cupper drained him [of blood] and reduced it<sup>27</sup> to [just] a *rebi'ith*,<sup>28</sup> and the wind come and drain him [still further], and thus he is in danger. Samuel was accustomed to be bled in a house [whose wall consisted] of seven whole bricks,<sup>29</sup> and a half brick [in thickness]. One day he bled and felt himself [weak]; he examined [the wall] and found a half-brick missing.

Rab and Samuel both say: He who is bled must [first] partake of something and then go out; for if he does not eat anything, if he meets a corpse his face will turn green; if he meets a homicide he will die; and if he meets

1. As there is no danger of life. Asheri, however, reads: If she says, 'I need it', we desecrate (the Sabbath); if she does not say, 'I need it', we do not desecrate.
2. Asheri reads: If she says, 'I do not need it', we do not desecrate (the Sabbath); if she does not say, 'I do not need it', we do desecrate.
3. I.e., when she cannot walk.

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

4. *Var. lec.*: or she does not say, 'I need it'; similarly *infra*.
5. For she certainly does not need it and is in no danger.
6. Lit., 'Syrian'.
7. Which she must not take until thirty days for fear of a cold.
8. After the ritual bath, which she takes in order to eat *terumah*, etc.
9. Lit., 'not in her husband's presence'.
10. Lit., 'in the rainy season'. This is bracketed in the text.
11. Tammuz is the fourth month of the year, corresponding to about July.
12. For a fire, other wood being unavailable.
13. Deut. XX, 19. q.v.; this is understood as a general prohibition of wasteful destruction of any sort.
14. V. p. 110, n. 1. SH=SHemuel (Samuel); N=R. Johanan; M=R. Nahman; S=R. Joseph; R=Raba.
15. Lit., 'when he did the thing'.
16. I.e., the hole made in his flesh when he was bled. Jast. s.v. [H] translates: until the puncture was healed up.
17. I.e., wine in its third year.
18. That they may prepare substantial meals!
19. Having no money.
20. I.e., a worn-out one which is not accepted as current coin.
21. A quarter of a *log*. Wine was tasted before buying; at each shop he would taste the wine and then proffer the coin, which, of course, would be refused.
22. He does not even possess such a coin.
23. A Persian sage and friend of Samuel, v. A.Z. 30a.
24. And I require heat.
25. *Var. lec.* Tebeth (winter).
26. Samuel possessed medical knowledge and did not wish to reveal trade secrets.
27. Lit., 'set it'.
28. Which was held to be the minimum quantity of blood which can sustain life.
29. A whole brick is three handbreadths.

## Shabbath 129b

a swine,<sup>1</sup> it [the meeting] is harmful in respect of something else.<sup>2</sup>

Rab and Samuel both say: One who is bled should tarry awhile and then rise, for a Master said: In five cases one is nearer to death than to life. And these are they: When one eats and [immediately] rises, drinks and rises, sleeps and rises, lets blood and rises, and cohabits and rises.

Samuel said: The correct interval for blood-letting is every thirty days; in middle age<sup>3</sup> one should decrease [the frequency];<sup>4</sup> at a [more] advanced age<sup>5</sup> he should again decrease [the frequency]. Samuel also said: The correct time for bloodletting is on a Sunday Wednesday and Friday, but not on Monday or Thursday, because a Master said: He who possesses ancestral merit may let blood on Monday and Thursday, because the Heavenly Court and the human court are alike then.<sup>6</sup> Why not on Tuesday? Because the planet Mars rules at even-numbered hours of the day.<sup>7</sup> But on Friday too it rules at even-numbered hours? Since the multitude are accustomed to it,<sup>8</sup> 'the Lord preserveth the simple.'<sup>9</sup>

Samuel said: A Wednesday<sup>10</sup> which is the fourth [of the month], a Wednesday which is the fourteenth, a Wednesday which is the twenty-fourth a Wednesday which is not followed by four [days]<sup>11</sup> — [all] are dangerous.<sup>12</sup> The first day of the month and the second [cause] weakness; the third is dangerous. The eve of a Festival [causes] weakness; the eve of Pentecost is dangerous, and the Rabbis laid an interdict upon the eve of every Festival on account of the Festival of Pentecost, when there issues a wind called Taboah,<sup>13</sup> and had not the Israelites accepted the Torah it would absolutely have killed them.<sup>14</sup>

Samuel said: If one eats a grain of wheat and [then] lets blood, he has bled in respect of that grain only.<sup>15</sup> Yet that is only as a remedy,<sup>16</sup> but if it is to ease one,<sup>17</sup> it does ease.<sup>18</sup> When one is bled, drinking [is permissible] immediately; eating until half a *mil*.<sup>19</sup> The scholars asked: [Does this mean], immediate drinking is beneficial, but after that it is injurious; or Perhaps [after that] it is neither harmful nor beneficial? — The question stands over. The scholars asked: Is eating beneficial only until half a *mil*, but before or after it is harmful; or perhaps it is [then] neither harmful nor beneficial? The question stands over.

# SHABBOS – 101a-129b

Rab announced: A hundred gourds for one *zuz*, a hundred heads for one *zuz*, a hundred lips for nothing.<sup>20</sup> R. Joseph said: When we were at R. Huna's academy, on a day that the scholars took a holiday they would say, 'This is a day of lips,' but I did not know what they meant.

**WE TIE UP THE NAVEL-STRING.** Our Rabbis taught: We tie up the navel-string. R. Jose said: We cut [it] too; and we hide the after-birth, so that the infant may be kept warm. R. Simeon b. Gamaliel said: princesses hide [it] in bowls of oil, wealthy women in wool fleeces, and poor women in soft rags.

R. Nahman said in Rabbah b. Abbuha's name in Rab's name: The *halachah* is as R. Jose. R. Nahman also said in Rabbah b. Abbuha's name in Rab's name: The Sages agree with R. Jose in the case of the navel-string of twins, that we cut them. What is the reason? Because they pull upon each other.<sup>21</sup>

R. Nahman also said in Rabbah b. Abbuha's name in Rab's name: All that is mentioned in the chapter of rebuke<sup>22</sup> is done for a lying-in woman on the Sabbath. As it is said, And as for thy nativity, in the day thou wast born thy navel was not cut, neither wast thou washed in water to cleanse thee' thou wast not salted at all, nor swaddled at all.<sup>23</sup> 'And as for thy nativity, in the day thou wast born': hence an infant may be delivered on the Sabbath; 'thy navel was not cut': hence the navel-string is cut on the Sabbath: 'neither wast thou washed in water to cleanse thee': hence the infant is washed on the Sabbath; 'thou wast not salted at all': hence the infant is salted on the Sabbath; 'nor swaddled at all': hence the infant is swaddled on the Sabbath.<sup>24</sup>

1. Lit., 'something else'.
2. Viz., leprosy, which this may cause.
3. Lit., 'at the middle stages', viz., from forty onwards (Rashi).
4. The body then begins to lose heat, and frequent bleeding may be injurious.
5. Rashi: from the age of sixty.
6. The court used to meet on Mondays and Thursdays, v. B.K. 82a. One's transgressions are punished in a time of natural risk. Cf. *supra* 32a.

7. Jast. Ma'adim lit., means the reddener. The hours as well as the months were thought to stand under the influence of planets which molded their nature. The planet Mars represented war and pestilence and retribution, whilst the even-numbered hours of the day were regarded as particularly susceptible to disaster. This double combination was therefore very dangerous, and bloodletting might have serious results.
8. Sc. bleeding on Friday.
9. Ps. CXVI, 6.
10. Lit., 'fourth' day of the week.
11. In the same month (Rashi).
12. For bleeding.
13. Lit., 'slaughter'.
14. Lit., 'their flesh and blood.'
15. I.e., bleeding immediately after a meal serves only to lighten one of that meal, but has no wider effects.
16. If it is done as a remedy it is ineffective.
17. E.g., if one suffers from high blood-pressure.
18. Even if performed immediately after a meal.
19. I.e., as long as it takes to walk that distance—about nine minutes; v. *supra* 34b, 35a.
20. Rashi: gourds and animal-heads are but slightly beneficial, and they are worth having only when a hundred can be bought for one *zuz*; but the lips of animals are quite worthless. Tosaf., reading with R. Han. [H] instead of [H] translates: a hundred (surgeons') horns (i.e., bleedings) for one *zuz*, a hundred heads (i.e., hair cuttings) for one *zuz*, a hundred lips (trimmings of moustaches) for nothing, as this was free if done at the same time as the bleeding or hair cutting. Thus 'a day of lips' became a proverbial description of a day without profit.
21. Which endangers their lives.
22. Wherein Ezekiel rebukes the Jews; ch. XVI.
23. Ezek. XVI, 4.
24. no note.