

# I.

---

## BAVLI SHABBAT CHAPTER ONE

### FOLIOS 2A-20B

#### 1:1

- A. [Acts of] transporting objects from one domain to another [which violate] the Sabbath (1) are two, which [indeed] are four [for one who is] inside, (2) and two which are four [for one who is] outside.
- B. How so?
- C. [If on the Sabbath] the beggar stands outside and the householder inside,
- D. [and] the beggar stuck his hand inside and put [a beggar's bowl] into the hand of the householder,
- E. or if he took [something] from inside it and brought it out,
- F. the beggar is liable, the householder is exempt.
- G. [If] the householder stuck his hand outside and put [something] into the hand of the beggar,
- H. or if he took [something] from it and brought it inside,
- I. the householder is liable, and the beggar is exempt.
- J. [If] the beggar stuck his hand inside, and the householder took [something] from it,
- K. or if [the householder] put something in it and he [the beggar] removed it —
- L. both of them are exempt.
- M. [If] the householder put his hand outside and the beggar took [something] from it,

N. or if [the beggar] put something into it and [the householder] brought it back inside,

O. both of them are exempt.

**I.1**

A. [...Are two, which are four:] *We have learned in the Mishnah there:*

B. Oaths are of two sorts, which yield four subdivisions [on account of each of which one may be liability on one count].

C. [2B] Awareness of [having sinned through] uncleanness is of two sorts, which yield four subdivisions.

D. Transportation [of objects from one domain to the other] on the Sabbath is of two sorts, which yield four subdivisions.

E. The symptoms of the presence of the skin disease [of Lev. 13-14, Heb.: negaim] are of two sorts, which yield four subdivisions [M. Shebu. 1:1A-D].

F. *Now what differentiates the present passage, in which the Tannaite formulation proceeds, are two, which [indeed] are four [for one who is] inside, and two which are four [for one who is] outside, from the counterpart passage, in which it is taught only, which yield four subdivisions, without further elaboration?*

G. *Here, a passage in which the principal interest concerns the Sabbath, we deal both with generative categories and also their secondary amplifications, while in the parallel, in which the principal interest does not concern the Sabbath, the Tannaite formulation encompasses the generative classification but not the secondary amplification thereof.*

H. *But as to the generative categories, what are they? They are only carrying out from one domain to another. And these are only two [and not four]! [The poor man takes an article out, the householder puts an article into the poor man's hand, so where are the "two that are four"? (Freedman).] And should you say, two of them involve liability and two others [are forbidden but] don't involve liability, lo, there is the comparable matter of the symptoms of the presence of the skin disease, so, just as in that classification, all reference pertains to liability [in that case, to uncleanness and the purification rites], so here, too, all classifications involve liability!*

I. *Rather, said R. Pappa, "Here, where the principal interest concerns the Sabbath, the Tannaite formulation covers both liability and the absence of liability, but there, where the principal interest is not in the Sabbath, what is*

*subject to liability is covered, what is not subject to liability is not covered in the Tannaite formulation."*

- J. *Now what are the instances of liability? They are only carrying out from one domain to another. And these are only two [and not four]!*
- K. *There are two subdivisions of carrying out and two of carrying in.*
- L. *But the language at hand refers explicitly only to carrying out!*

M. *Said R. Ashi, "The Tannaite formulation treats bringing in as carrying out. On what basis [do I think so]? Since we learn in the Mishnah: He who carries an object out from one domain to another is liable. Doesn't this mean, if he carries it in from public domain to private domain, and yet it is classified as 'carrying out'? And how come? Because any act of removing an object from its original place is classified by the Tannaite authority as 'carrying out.'"*

N. *Said Rabina, "A close reading of our Mishnah paragraph also yields the same result, with its use of [acts of] transporting objects out from one domain to another, forthwith spelled out in terms of bringing in an object from public to private domain [the beggar stuck his hand inside and put [a beggar's bowl] into the hand of the householder]."*

O. *That is decisive proof.*

- II.1** A. *[...Two which are four:] Raba said, "The formulation of the Tannaite rule focuses upon domains, and domains for the purposes of the Sabbath are two."*
- B. *Said R. Mattenah to Abbayye, "Are there eight [two, which indeed are four for one who is inside, and two which are four for one who is outside]? There really are twelve." [Freedman: In addition to the four acts that involve liability, there are eight that do not, two acts of removal by the poor man without putting the object down, and reversing these, two acts of depositing by the poor man without removing the object; these four are to be viewed from the standpoint of the householder, yielding eight in all.]*
- C. *But according to your reasoning, there really are sixteen [Freedman: for the two actions that involve liability for the poor man are likewise to be regarded from the standpoint of the householder and vice versa, which yield another four].*
- D. *He said to him, "But that's no problem. As to the [3A] first clause, an action that not only involves no liability but also is permitted is not addressed at all in the Tannaite formulation [Freedman: if the man without extends his hand and*

places an article into the hand of the man within, the latter commits no action at all, being passive throughout, and therefore he has done nothing forbidden on the Sabbath]. *But as to the latter clause, in which the action is not culpable but is in any event forbidden, that is a problem*” [to explain why these are not counted as separate actions (Freedman)].

E. *But with reference to the entirety of laws that pertain to the Sabbath, is there any action that on the one side is specified as not culpable and on the other side is permitted? [The laws deal only with what is not permitted, but may or may not be punishable.] For hasn't Samuel said, "Every reference to 'exempt' in the matter of the Sabbath bears the meaning, 'exempt but forbidden,' except for these three, in which the action is both exempt and permitted: Trapping a deer, capturing a snake, and manipulating an abscess"?*

F. *What Samuel finds it necessary to point out concerns only exemptions involving an affirmative action, but as for exemptions in which there is no positive action at all, there are a great many.*

- G. [Reverting to the question at hand:] *In any event, do we really have twelve [and not sixteen]?*
- H. *Actions that are not culpable, but that can lead to liability for a sin-offering, are taken into account; actions through which one cannot become liable for a sin-offering are not included.* [Freedman: Stretching out one's hand with an article from private to public domain or vice versa may involve a sin-offering, if one deposits the article in the other domain; but acceptance can never lead to this.]

**III.1 A.** [If the beggar stuck his hand inside, and the householder took [something] from it, or if the householder put something in it and he [the beggar] removed it — both of them are exempt. If the householder put his hand outside and the beggar took something from it, or if the beggar put something into it and the householder brought it back inside,] both of them are exempt:

- B. *But lo, between the two, a complete act of labor has been carried out!*
- C. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- D. Rabbi says, “And if anyone of the common people sin unwittingly in doing any of the things...’ (Lev. 4:27) — he who does the entirety of an action, and not he who does only part of it [is liable]. A single individual who performs a forbidden action is liable; two people who carry it out are exempt.”

E. *So, too, it has been stated:*

F. Said R. Hiyya bar Gameda, “This has been set forth on the authority of the collegium, who has said, ‘A single individual who performs a forbidden action is liable; two people who carry it out are exempt.’”

- III.2** A. [Building on this distinction,] *Rab raised this question of Rabbi:* “If a third party loaded a person with food and drink, and he then carried them outside, what is the law? *Is the removal of one’s body considered equivalent to the removal of the object from its place, in which case he is liable? Or perhaps that is not the case?*”
- B. He said to him, “He is liable, and it is not parallel to the case of his hand [to which the Mishnah refers, where the article is placed in one’s hand and he withdraws it, and he is exempt, in line with this instance: **If on the Sabbath the beggar stands outside and the householder inside, and the beggar stuck his hand inside and put a beggar’s bowl into the hand of the householder, or if he took something from inside it and brought it out, the beggar is liable, the householder is exempt**]. *How come? His body is at rest, but his hand is not at rest.*” [Freedman: The body is at rest, so the article on his body is also at rest; he then effects its removal; his hand is not at rest on the ground, so he does not actually remove the article from its place (Freedman)].
- C. **[3B]** *Said R. Hiyya to Rab, “Son of aristocrats! Haven’t I told you that when Rabbi is concentrating on one tractate, don’t ask him questions concerning some other tractate, since it may not be in his mind? For if Rabbi weren’t an eminent authority, you would have embarrassed him, since he might have given you an answer that is no answer at all. But, in any event, he has given you a perfectly fine answer. For it has been taught on Tannaitic authority: If someone was carrying food and drink while it was still day, and he brought them outside once darkness had fallen, is liable, and it is not parallel to the case of his hand.”*

- III.3** A. *Said Abbaye, “It is perfectly obvious to me that a man’s hand is not classified as either private domain or public domain. It is not classified as public domain: As shown by the rules governing the poor man’s hand [if the beggar stuck his hand inside, and the householder took something from it, or if [the householder] put something in it and he [the beggar] removed it — both of them are exempt]. It is not classified as private domain is shown by the*

*case of the hand of the householder [if the householder stuck his hand outside and put something into the hand of the beggar, or if he took something from it and brought it inside, the householder is liable].”*

- B. *Abbaye raised this question: “As to the hand of a human being, what is the rule as to treating it as equivalent to a neglected part of public domain” [Karmelit: part of public domain that is not much used, therefore regarded as neither public nor private; rabbinical law prohibits carrying from a neglected part of public domain to either public or private domain (Freedman)]. [Freedman: When one stretches out his hand into another domain, it does not enjoy the status of his body; does it occupy the intermediate status of a neglected part of public domain; since it holds an object, its owner should be forbidden to withdraw the hand until the end of the Sabbath, or is that not the case?] Did rabbis impose the penalty on him, that he not draw the hand back to himself, or did they not do so?”*
- C. *Come and take note: If one’s hand was full of fruit and he stretched it out — one Tannaite formulation: It is forbidden to bring it back inside [until after the Sabbath]; the other Tannaite formulation: It is permitted to bring it back in. Now isn’t this what is at stake in the conflict: The one authority maintains that the hand is equivalent to a neglected part of the public domain, the other that it is not?*
- D. *Not at all. All parties concur that it is equivalent to a neglected part of the public domain, but there is no problem, for the one refers to a case in which the hand is below ten handbreadths above the ground, the other, where it is above that height [below: It is in public domain, and the hand has to be left there; above: It is in an area in which no liability is incurred, so he can bring it back in (Freedman)]. And if you prefer, I shall say: Both statements pertain to a case in which the hand is less than ten handbreadths off the ground; the hand, moreover, is not equivalent to a neglected part of the public domain; but there still is no problem. The one speaks of a case in which it is still day, the other, a case in which darkness has fallen. If it is still day, rabbis have not penalized the man, if darkness has fallen, they have.*
- E. *To the contrary, it is more reasonable to state matters contrariwise: If it is still day, so that if he had thrown the article away, he would not have become liable to a sin-offering, rabbis may very well impose a penalty; if it is after nightfall, in which case if he throws the fruit away, he will incur liability to a sin-offering, rabbis oughtn’t to penalize him.*

**III.4** A. *But since this is not the way we respond to the proposal, we may solve the problem raised by R. Bibi bar Abbayye. For R. Bibi bar Abbayye raised this question: “If one stuck a loaf of bread into an oven, have rabbis permitted him to remove it before he incurs a liability to a sin-offering, or have they not done so?” [Freedman: If it remains in the oven until baked, he will incur a sin-offering for having baked on the Sabbath; but rabbis forbid removing bread from the oven on the Sabbath.] On the strength of the silence before us, you may settle the question that they have not permitted him to do so! [Since that is not the case, we reject the contrary reading of matters just now proposed.]*

B. *No, that’s no problem: Go ahead and resolve matters just as you propose!*

C. *Or, if you prefer, so you can’t resolve the question, but there still is no problem, and this is the resolution of the conflict between the two Tannaite formulations: The one speaks of a case in which the action is done inadvertently, the other, deliberately. Where the action is done inadvertently, the rabbis did not penalize the man for what he has done; if the action is deliberate, they did.*

D. *Or, if you prefer, both formulations deal with a case in which the action was done inadvertently, but here what is subject to conflict is whether an action that is done inadvertently is penalized because of the penalty imposed on an action done deliberately. The one authority takes the view that an action that is done inadvertently is penalized because of the penalty imposed on an action done deliberately. The other authority maintains that an action that is done inadvertently is not penalized because of the penalty imposed on an action done deliberately.*

E. *Or, if you prefer, I shall say that an action that is done inadvertently is not penalized because of the penalty imposed on an action done deliberately. But there still is no contradiction: The one speaks of movement in and out of that same courtyard, [4A] the other, movement in and out of a different courtyard.*

F. *That is in line with the question that Raba presented to R. Nahman: “If one’s hand was full of produce and he stuck it outside, what is the law as to his bringing it back into that same courtyard?”*

G. He said to him, "It is permitted to do so."

H. "...Into another courtyard, what is the law?"

I. He said to him, "It is forbidden to do so."

J. *"What's the difference?"*

K. *"After you've measured some salt for it [I'll tell you the difference]! In the one case, his initial intention has not been accomplished, but here, his initial intention has been accomplished."*

[Freedman: If he stretches out his hand into the street, he wants to remove the produce from the courtyard, so he may bring the hand back into the courtyard, if his intention is unfulfilled, but as to a neighboring courtyard, his intention would be carried out, so we don't permit him to accomplish it.]

### **III.5** A. *Reverting to the body of the foregoing:*

B. R. Bibi bar Abbayye raised this question: "If one stuck a loaf of bread into an oven, have rabbis permitted him to remove it before he incurs a liability to a sin-offering, or have they not done so?"

C. Said R. Aha bar Abbayye to Rabina, "Now how can we imagine the case at hand? If he did it inadvertently and did not realize [before the bread was completely baked that it was the Sabbath, or if he didn't recall that baking on the Sabbath is forbidden (Freedman)], then whom are rabbis supposed to permit [since the man won't ever know to ask]? But if it is a case in which he afterwards did become aware of what had happened, then would he be liable at all? And haven't we learned in the Mishnah: **All those who may be liable to sin-offerings in fact are not liable unless at the beginning and the end, their [sin] is done inadvertently. [But] if the beginning of their [sin] is inadvertent and the end is deliberate, [or] the beginning deliberate and the end inadvertent, they are exempt — unless at the beginning and at the end their [sin] is inadvertent [M. 11:6J-K].** And, on the other hand, if it is a case of deliberate action, then he should have formulated the question in terms of before he incurs a liability to being stoned to death!"



D. Said R. Shila, “In point of fact the reference is to a case of inadvertent action. And as to the question, whom are rabbis supposed to permit [since the man won’t ever know to ask]?, it is, third parties.”

E. Objected R. Sheshet, “So do they say to someone, ‘Sin, so that your fellow will gain an advantage?’” [Will someone be told to violate the rule against removing bread from an oven so as to save a third party from the greater violation involved in baking on the Sabbath? (Freedman)]

F. Rather, said R. Ashi, “In point of fact, it is a case of deliberate action. And formulate it as follows: Before he violates a prohibition by which he would incur a liability to being stoned to death!”

G. R. Aha b. Raba repeated the matter in a Tannaite formulation in some many words: “R. Bibi bar Abbaye raised this question, ‘If one stuck a loaf of bread into an oven, rabbis have permitted him to remove it before he should come into a situation in which he would violate a prohibition that is penalized by stoning.’”

- IV.1 A.** [If on the Sabbath the beggar stands outside and the householder inside, and] the beggar stuck his hand inside [and put a beggar’s bowl] into the hand of the householder, or if he took something from inside it and brought it out, the beggar is liable, the householder is exempt]:
- B. *But why should he be liable, for lo, we require that the removing of the object and the depositing of the object must involve a space four by four handbreadths square, and that condition has not been met here?*
- C. *Said Rabbah, “But who is the authority behind this rule? It must be R. Aqiba, who maintains that we do not require that the removing of the object and the depositing of the object must involve a space four by four handbreadths square, for we have learned in the Mishnah: **He who throws [an object] from private domain to public domain, [or] from public domain to private domain, is liable. [He who throws an object] from private domain to private domain, and public domain intervenes — R. Aqiba declares [him] liable [to a sin-offering]. And sages exempt [him] [M. 11:1]. R. Aqiba maintains the theory that an object that is intercepted by the air***

*through which it passes is as though it has come to rest there [so when it crosses the public domain, it is as though it had come to rest there, and liability is incurred], and sages take the view that an object that is intercepted by the air through which it passes is not as though it has come to rest there.”*

**IV.2** *A. But is that to say that it is self-evident to Rabbah that an object that is intercepted by the air through which it passes is as though it has come to rest there? [4B] And that is so when it is within ten handbreadths of the ground? [Freedman: The space above ten handbreadths is not classified as public domain.] But surely Rabbah raised a question on that very matter! For Rabbah raised the question: “If the object passes through the space below ten handbreadths of the ground, do they really disagree? It is in this matter that they disagree: R. Aqiba maintains that in that area, an object that is intercepted by the air through which it passes is as though it has come to rest there [so when it crosses the public domain, it is as though it had come to rest there, and liability is incurred], and sages take the view that an object that is intercepted by the air through which it passes is not as though it has come to rest there. But as to the space above ten handbreadths, all concur that he is not liable. They hold in common — so this theory goes — that we do not treat as comparable the act of throwing and the act of reaching an object across a space. [Freedman: If one reaches over an object from private domain to private domain across public domain, even if it is above ten handbreadths, he is liable.] Or perhaps they differ as to the space above ten handbreadths, and what is at issue is this: R. Aqiba maintains that we do treat as comparable the act of throwing and the act of reaching an object across a space. Sages, by contrast, take the view that we do not treat as comparable the act of throwing and the act of reaching an object across a space. But as to the situation prevailing for the space lower than ten handbreadths, all would concur that he is liable. How come? We concur in the principle that an object that is intercepted is treated as though it has come to rest. [Since Rabbah has phrased the question in that way, it is not so clear that Rabbah treats as self-evident the proposition that an object that is intercepted by the air through which it passes is as though it has come to rest there.]”*

B. No, that's not a serious problem: After raising the question, he resolved it: R. Aqiba indeed does maintain that an object that is intercepted by the air through which it passes is as though it has come to rest there.

**IV.3** A. But maybe — responding to Rabbah's theory that R. Aqiba maintains that we do not require that the removing of the object and the depositing of the object must involve a space four by four handbreadths square — while [Aqiba] doesn't require the deposition of the object in a space four handbreadths square [for liability to be incurred,] he does require removal from such a confined space?

B. Rather, said R. Joseph, "Who is the authority behind the cited passage? It is Rabbi."

C. So which ruling of Rabbi is supposed to be invoked here? Should we say it is the following ruling of Rabbi: If one tossed an object and it came to rest on a projection, if it is a small projection, Rabbi declares him liable, and sages declare him exempt? But surely in that case — as we shall point it in context — it is in accord with what Abbaye said, for said Abbaye, "Here, with what situation do we deal? It is a tree that stands in private domain, with its foliage extending into public domain, and one tossed the object, and it landed in the foliage. In that case, Rabbi takes the view that we do invoke the conception, we assign the foliage to the status of the trunk of the tree, and rabbis hold the position that we don't invoke the conception of assigning the foliage to the status of the stock of the tree." [So it cannot be that case at all.] Rather, it has to be the following ruling of Rabbi, which has been taught on Tannaite authority: If one tossed an object from public domain to public domain, with private domain intervening — Rabbi declares the act liable. And sages declare it exempt. [In that context] said R. Judah said Samuel, "Rabbi would impose liability on two counts, one on the count of removing the object from the one domain, the other on the count of bringing it in to the other domain." Therefore, it follows, a place four by four is not required either for removal of the object nor for the deposit of the object.

D. But lo, in that same matter, it has been said: Both Rab and Samuel say, [5A] "Rabbi imposed liability only in the case of a private domain

that was roofed over, *in which instance we invoke the principle, the house is as though it were full of objects [and so had no air space at all, thus as soon as the object enters the space, it is as though it has come to rest]*. But that rule would not apply to a space that is not roofed over.” *And should you say, here, too, it is a case in which it is roofed over, then that poses no problem in the case of private domain that is roofed over, but in the case of public domain that is roofed over, does one incur liability in that same way? And hasn’t R. Samuel bar Judah said R. Abba said R. Huna said Rab said, “If someone transfers an object through four cubits of public domain that is roofed over, he is exempt for liability, since that area is not comparable to the case of the flags of the wilderness.”* [Freedman: The definition of what constitutes forbidden work on the Sabbath depends on the work that was done in connection with the tabernacle in the wilderness; carrying was necessary, so carrying an object four cubits is work. But there it was done under the open sky, hence Rab’s statement; the same applies here. By ‘flags of the wilderness’ is meant the whole disposition and encampment of the Israelites; they didn’t have any cover in public ground.]

E. *Rather, said R. Zira, “Lo, who is the authority behind our rule? It is ‘others.’ For it has been taught on Tannaite authority: Others say, ‘If someone stood still in place and caught a tossed object, the one who threw the object is liable; if he moved from his place to catch the tossed object, the one who threw it is exempt.’* [If the catcher didn’t move, the one who threw is liable, being regarded as having both removed the object and also deposited it; but if the catcher moved and caught the object, the thrower didn’t deposit the object, since it doesn’t come to rest where it would have solely on the strength of his having tossed the object.] *If someone stood still in place and caught a tossed object, the one who threw the object is liable: Lo, we require that the object come to rest in a space of four cubits, and that condition has not been met. So it must follow that we do not require that the object come to rest in a space of four cubits.”*

F. *But maybe it is coming to rest in such a space that we don’t require, but removal from a space of four cubits we do require [for liability to be incurred on the part of the one who tossed the object]? And even in regard to depositing the object, maybe the sense is that*

*he spread out his cloak and caught the object, in which case, the depositing also has taken place in a space of four cubits?*

*G. Said R. Abba, "Our Mishnah paragraph likewise means that he removes the object from one basket and puts it into another basket, so that there is depositing in a place four cubits square."*

*H. But the language that is used in our Mishnah paragraph is **his hand!***

*I. Repeat it as: A basket in his hand.*

**IV.4** *A. Well, o.k., forget about a basket in private domain, but a basket located in public domain is classified itself as private domain [so why should one be liable in regard to carrying the basket out of private domain]?*

*B. Then don't we have to say that the Mishnah paragraph is not in accord with the view of R. Yosé b. R. Judah? For it has been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Yosé b. R. Judah says, "If one stuck a reed in public domain, with a basket on the top of it, and one tossed an object, which landed on it, he is liable [for the object is regarded as private domain]. But if the passage concurred with R. Yosé b. R. Judah, how could the rule be that he is liable [if] the householder stuck his hand outside and put [something] into the hand of the beggar [the householder is liable]? What he is doing is moving an object from private domain to private domain!"*

*C. You may even take the view that the passage accords even with R. Yosé b. R. Judah, for in that case, the basket is above ten handbreadths, here it is lower than that [and so is classified as public domain].*

**IV.5** *A. This presented a problem to R. Abbahu: Is the language that is used in our Mishnah paragraph a basket in his hand? The language that is used is, **his hand!***

*B. Rather, said R. Abbahu, "It is a case in which he lowered his hand to within three handbreadths of the ground and received the object" [Freedman: everything within three handbreadths of the ground is regarded as part of the ground itself, so the hand becomes a place four cubits square].*

*C. But the language that is persistently used in the Mishnah is **standing!***

D. *It refers to his bending over; or, if you prefer, he is standing, but in a pit; or, if you prefer, it is a very short person.*

E. *Said Raba, "Oh come on, is a Tannaite authority going to go to the trouble of telling us about all these weird cases?"*

F. Rather, said Raba, "A person's hand is reckoned as though it were a space of four by four cubits."

G. *And so when Rabin came, he said R. Yohanan [said], "A person's hand is reckoned as though it were a space of four by four cubits."*

**IV.6** A. Said R. Abin said R. Ilai said R. Yohanan, "If someone threw an object and it landed in the hand of a second party, he is liable."

B. *Well, then, what is he telling us? That a person's hand is reckoned as though it were a space of four by four cubits? Lo, R. Yohanan said that once!*

C. *What might you otherwise have maintained? That is the case where the man himself reckons his hand in such a way, but where he doesn't reckon his hand in such a way, I might say that is not so; thus we are informed that that is not the case.*

**IV.7** A. Said R. Abin said R. Ilai said R. Yohanan, "If someone stood in place and caught an object, he is liable. If he moved from his place and caught it, he is exempt."

B. *So, too, it has been taught on Tannaite authority: Others say, "If someone stood still in place and caught a tossed object, the one who threw the object is liable; if he moved from his place to catch the tossed object, the one who threw it is exempt." [If the catcher didn't move, the one who threw is liable, being regarded as having both removed the object and also deposited it; but if the catcher moved and caught the object, the thrower didn't deposit the object, since it doesn't come to rest where it would have solely on the strength of his having tossed the object.]*

- IV.8** A. *R. Yohanan raised this question: “If he himself tossed the objected and moved from the spot and then came back and caught it on the same spot, what is the law?”*
- B. *So what’s he asking?*
- C. *Said R. Adda bar Ahbah, “What he’s asking about is the effect of two acts of force exerted by one and the same man. Are two acts of force in one and the same man reckoned as the action of one man, in which case he is liable for both sides of the transaction, or perhaps they are reckoned as the actions of two separate persons, in which case he is exempt.”*
- D. *The question stands.*

- IV.9** A. *Said R. Abin said R. Yohanan, “If one poked his hand into a courtyard of another party and received rain water and took it out, he is liable.”*
- B. *Objected R. Zira, “So what difference does it make to me whether another person loaded him up or Heaven loaded him up? The man himself in any event is not the one who has done the uprooting [of the object from its place]?”*
- C. *Don’t use the language, “received” but rather “caught” it with an action that is affirmative.*
- D. *Still, we require that the taking up of the object be from a place four cubits square, and that condition has not been met!*
- E. *Said R. Hiyya b. R. Huna, “It would be a case in which he caught the rain as it rebounded from the well.”*
- F. *But even if it is on the wall, lo, it has not come to rest there!*
- G. *It is in line with what Raba said, “It is a sloping wall,” and here, too, it is a sloping wall.*

**IV.10** A. *Now where was that statement of Raba made?*

B. *It was in the context of that which we have learned in the Mishnah:*

C. **[5B] [If] he was reading in a scroll on the threshold, [and] it rolled out of his hand, he may roll it back to himself. [If] he was reading on the top of the roof, and the scroll rolled out of his hand, before it falls to within ten handbreadths [of the ground], he may roll it back to himself. Once it has fallen to within ten handbreadths [of the ground], he turns it over onto the written side [to protect it]. [R. Judah says, “Even if it is distant from the ground by only so much as a hair’s breadth, he may roll it back to himself.” R. Simeon says, “Even if it has touched the ground**

itself, he may roll it back to himself. For nothing which is prohibited by reason of Sabbath rest stands against the honor due to the Sacred Scriptures”] [M. **Erub. 10:3**], in which context [he turns it over onto the written side] we reflected: How come he may turn it over onto the written side? Surely it has not come to rest [so he should be able to roll it back], and Raba responded, “It refers to a sloping wall.”

D. *Well, I might well say that Raba made such a statement with reference to a scroll, which can very well come to rest, but does water naturally come to rest by nature?*

E. Rather, said Raba, “[Yohanan addressed a case in which] he got the rain from the top of a water hole.”

F. *Well, if it was in a hole, that’s pretty obvious! [Who ever doubted it had come to rest?]*

G. *What might you otherwise have supposed? Water that falls on water is not regarded as having come to rest? He thus informs us that that conception is not entertained.*

**IV.11** A. *Raba is consistent with opinions expressed elsewhere, for* said Raba, “Water that is lying on water — lo, that is a situation in which it has come to rest. A nut that is lying upon water — lo, that is not a situation in which it has come to rest.”

B. *Raba raised this question: “A nut that is lying in a utensil, and a utensil is floating on water — do we invoke the criterion of the situation of the nut, in which case it has come to rest, or do we go by the criterion of the utensil, which, being unstable, has not come to rest?”*

C. *The question stands.*

**IV.12** A. As to oil floating on wine there is a dispute between R. Yohanan b. Nuri and rabbis, *for we have learned in the Mishnah: Oil which is floating on the surface of wine, and a one who has immersed on that day and awaits sunset for the completion of his rite of purification [a tebul yom] touched the oil — he has rendered unfit only the oil.* R. Yohanan b. Nuri



says, “Both of them are deemed connected to one another” [M. T. Y. 2:5H-K].

#### IV.13

- A. Said R. Abin said R. Ilai said R. Yohanan, “If someone [on the Sabbath day] was carrying food and drink, going in and coming out all day long [from one domain to the other] — he is liable only when he stands still.” [Freedman: He was laden in the first place to carry the stuff from one part of private domain to another, and if he goes out instead, it is not removal, since when the food was moved at first there was no intention of carrying from private to public domain.]
- B. Said Abbaye, “And that is the case if he stood still to catch his breath.” [Freedman: But if he stops merely to rearrange the burden, it is all part of his walking.]
- C. *On what basis is such a qualification introduced?*
- D. Because a master has said, “If within four cubits one stops to rest, he is exempt; if it is to shoulder the burden, he is liable; beyond four cubits of the starting point, if he stopped to catch his breath, he is liable; if it was to shoulder the burden, he is exempt.” [Freedman: One is liable for carrying an object four cubits over public ground — if he himself removed it from the first spot and put it down in the other, in an intentional, single action. Stopping to rest constitutes an act of deposit; when he restarts, there is a new removal; so if he stops to rest within four cubits of the starting point, he is not liable, since he hasn’t carried the object four cubits. But stopping to rearrange the burden doesn’t constitute an act of deposit; hence when he does eventually stop after four cubits, he has effected removal and depositing in a single action, and is liable; so in Abin’s case, he would not be liable when stopping to rest the first time, for the food he carried in and out was not carried in a single act of removal and deposit; but he would be liable if he went in and out after his rest.]
- E. *So what does R. Yohanan tell us? Merely that the original act of removing the stuff was not for this purpose? Lo, hasn’t R. Yohanan already said that once, for* said R. Safra said R. Ammi said R. Yohanan, “One who is transferring goods from one corner to another and changed his mind in regard to them and takes them out [from private to public domain] is exempt [from liability for violating the Sabbath] because to begin with lifting them up was not for that purpose”?

- F. *It is a duplication of Amoraic formulations; one has it in the one version, the other, in the other version.*

**IV.14** A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. He who carries articles from a shop into the open space via a colonnade [the shop is private domain, the open space public, the colonnade is classified as a neglected portion of public domain, not equivalent to public or private domain] is liable.
- C. And Ben Azzai declares him exempt.

D. *Well, there is no problem understanding Ben Azzai's position, since he takes the view that walking along is equivalent to standing [so when the man walked through the colonnade, it is as though he merely stood there; we have then two distinct actions, carrying the object from private domain to the neglected part of the public domain, then carrying the object from that to public domain; neither act by itself imposes liability (Freedman)]. But from the viewpoint of rabbis, granting that they take the view that walking is not equivalent to standing, then under circumstances such as these, how in the world would we find a case in which someone would be liable?*

E. *Said R. Safra said R. Ammi said R. Yohanan, [6A] "It is comparable to carrying an object in the public domain. In that case, even though, so long as he is going along holding the object, he is exempt, when he puts it down he is going to be liable. Here, too, there is no difference."*

F. *But how are the cases parallel? In that case, wherever the man puts the object down, the location itself is one that is subject to liability; but in this case, if he puts the object down in the colonnade, it is a place that is not subject to liability.*

G. *Rather, the correct analogy is to someone who is carrying an object in public domain for precisely four cubits. In such a case, even though he is exempt if he puts it down within the four cubits, if he puts it down at the end of the four cubits, he is liable; here, too, the case is no different.*

H. *But how comparable are the cases? In that case the place is exempt for liability only relative to this man, but for all others it is a place that is subject to liability. Here, by contrast, it is a place that is exempt from liability for all persons.*

I. *Rather, the correct analogy is to one who carries an object from private to public domain through the neglected sides of the public domain: When he puts the object down in public domain, he is liable; here the case runs parallel.*

J. *Objected R. Pappa, "Well, that proposed analogy poses no problems to rabbis, who have said, 'The sides of the public domain are not classified as public domain,' but from the perspective of R. Eliezer, who maintains, 'The sides of the public domain are classified as public domain,' what is to be said?"*

K. *Said to him R. Aha b. R. Iqa, "Well, while I can well concede that you have heard that in a case in which there is no fencing, R. Eliezer said, 'The sides of the public domain are classified as public domain,' do you have evidence that he takes the same position where there is fencing [as with the colonnade]? Therefore there is a valid analogy for the case at hand."*

**IV.15** A. Said R. Yohanan, "But Ben Azzai concedes in the case of one who throws [an object from a shop to public domain through a colonnade, that he is liable]."

B. *So, too, it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

C. He who carries articles from a shop into the open space via a colonnade is liable. That is so whether he carries the object out or carries it in, reaches it across, or throws it.

D. Ben Azzai says, "He who carries it out or brings it in is exempt; he who reaches it across or throws it is liable.

**IV.16** A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. **There are four distinct domains for purposes of carrying objects on the Sabbath: Private domain, public domain, neglected parts of public domain, and a place totally exempt from all liability.**
- C. **What is the definition of private domain?**
- D. **The space of a trench ten handbreadths deep and four broad, and so, too, of a fence ten handbreadths high and four broad — that is private domain without qualification.**

- E. **What is the definition of public domain? A main road, a large piazza, and alleys open at both ends — that is public domain without qualification.**
- F. **People are not to carry objects from private domain of that character to public domain of that character, and they are not to bring objects from public domain of that character to private domain of that character.**
- G. **And if someone took out or brought in an object under such conditions, he is liable for a sin-offering if the act was done inadvertently, and to the penalty if extirpation if the act was done deliberately, or he may even be stoned to death [if there was a formal admonition not to do so on pain of death and a consequent act of rebellion].**
- H. **The sea, a plain, colonnade, or neglected area of public domain, is classified as neither public domain nor private domain. People are not to carry or hand around objects in that area, but if one does so in such an area, he is exempt from penalty. And they are not to carry objects out from domain of that classification to public domain, or from public domain to domain of that interstitial character, nor are they to carry in objects from private domain to domain of that character, or from that domain to private domain, but if one brought out or brought in objects in such wise, he is exempt.**
- I. **As to courtyards that are publicly owned or blind alleys, if one prepared a symbolic meal of joining for them, they are permitted as to carrying objects about, but if one did not prepare such a symbolic meal of fusion, they are forbidden.**
- J. **Someone standing on a threshold [less than four handbreadths square, which is a place in which no liability is incurred, not constituting a distinct domain at all but joined to either public or private domain, as the case may be (Abraham)] may take something from the householder or give it to him, may take something from a poor man or give it to him, on condition that he does not take something from the householder and give it to the poor man or take something from the poor man and give it to the householder [so appearing to carry directly from domain to domain], but if one did so in just that way, all three of them are exempt.**
- K. **Others say, “The threshold serves both domains. When the door is open, it is classified as part of the inside of the house; when the door is locked, it is classified along with the outside of the house.**

- L. “But if the threshold itself was ten handbreadths high and four broad, lo, it constitutes a domain unto itself” [T. **Shab. 1:1-6**].

**IV.17** A. The master has said, [what is the definition of private domain? The space of a trench ten handbreadths deep and four broad, and so, too, of a fence ten handbreadths high and four broad] — that is private domain without qualification: *Excluding what [by the emphatic definition, that is...]*?

B. *It is meant to exclude what R. Judah said in that which has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

C. Still further did R. Judah state, “He who owns two houses on two sides of public domain may put **[6B]** a board on this side and a board on that side, or a beam on this side and a beam on that side, and carry things around in the middle.

D. They said to him, “A symbolic fusion of space in the public domain may not be undertaken in such a way.”

**IV.18** A. *And why do they call this, private domain without qualification?*

B. *What might you otherwise have supposed? That where rabbis differ from R. Judah, it is to maintain that so far as carrying alone this is not private domain, but as to throwing objects from side to side, they might concur with R. Judah that it is private domain. So we are informed to the contrary.*

**IV.19** A. The master has said, What is the definition of public domain? A main road, a large piazza, and alleys open at both ends — that is public domain without qualification: *Excluding what [by the emphatic definition, that is...]*?

B. *It is meant to exclude what R. Judah said in addition, for we have learned in the Mishnah:*

C. R. Judah says, “If a public path went through them [the boards], one should divert it to the side.”

D. And sages say, “It is not necessary [to do so]” [M. **Erub. 2:4A-B**].

**IV.20** A. *And what is the meaning of without qualification?*

B. *Since the opening Tannaite formulation has used the language, without qualification, the complementary one also uses the language, without qualification.*

**IV.21** A. *But why not also take account of the wilderness? For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:* What is the definition of public domain? A main road, a large piazza, and alleys open at both ends and the wilderness?

B. *Said Abbayye, “No problem, the one speaks of a situation in which the Israelites were ensconced in the wilderness, the other speaks of our own time [when the wilderness is just empty space].”*

**IV.22** A. The master has said, **And if someone took out or brought in an object under such conditions, he is liable for a sin-offering if the act was done inadvertently, and to the penalty if extirpation if the act was done deliberately, or he may even be stoned to death:**

B. **He is liable for a sin-offering if the act was done inadvertently — so what else is new!**

C. *The whole composition, including this needless detail, was required by the Tannaite framer with reference to the other matters, namely: **And to the penalty if extirpation if the act was done deliberately, or he may even be stoned to death.***

D. *Big deal — so what else is new!*

E. *In framing matters in this way, we are informed of Rab’s view, for said Rab, “I found a suppressed scroll of the household of R. Hiyya in which was written: ‘Issi b. Judah says, “The generative classifications of labor are forty less one, but one bears liability on only a single count [in any one action].”’”*

F. *But is that so? And haven’t we learned in the Mishnah: **The generative categories of acts of labor prohibited on the Sabbath are forty less one [M. Shab. 7:2A]**, in connection with which we reflected: What need do we have for the specific number associated with that statement? And said R. Yohanan, “So that if someone did all of these actions in a single spell of inadvertence, he is liable for each classification of labor”?*

G. *Rather, say it this way: He is liable on only a single count, in which case we are now informed that such an act of carrying is one of the actions about which there is no doubt whatsoever.*

**IV.23** A. The master has said, **The sea, a plain, colonnade, or neglected area of public domain, is classified as neither public domain nor private domain:**

B. *Is it the fact that a plain...is classified as neither public domain nor private domain? And lo, we have learned in the Mishnah: A plain: In the dry season is private domain in respect to the Sabbath, and public domain in respect to uncleanness. And in the rainy season it is private domain for both [M. Toh. 6:7]!*

C. *Said Ulla, "In point of fact it is classified as neglected public domain. So why is it classified as private domain? Because it is not public domain."*

D. *R. Ashi said, [7A] "For instance, when it has partitions."*

E. *That is in line with what Ulla said R. Yohanan said, "An enclosure that covers an area more than two seahs which is not enclosed for living purposes, even if it is a kor or two in area — if one throws something from public domain into such an area, he is liable. How come? Because there is a partition, even though the area lacks inhabitants" [so it is classified as private domain].*

F. *Well, there is no problem with R. Ashi's statement; he doesn't explain that the Mishnah passage at hand is neglected public domain, since he prefers to invoke Ulla's other statement. But how come Ulla did not explain the passage at hand in accord with that other statement of his?*

G. *He can say to you, "If there are partitions, is it called 'a plain' at all? Surely what it is is simply an enclosed area."*

H. *And R. Ashi?*

I. *The language that is used in the Tannaite formulation is simply private domain!*

**IV.24** A. **Neglected area of public domain [is classified as neither public domain nor private domain]:**

B. *So aren't all these other classifications of space also simply in the category of a neglected area of public domain?*

C. *When R. Dimi came, he said R. Yohanan [said], "This was required only to cover the case of a corner located near the public domain. Even though on occasion masses of people crowd and overflow in*

*that area, still, it is not all that convenient for everyday use, so it is treated as equivalent to neglected public domain."*

**IV.25** A. *When R. Dimi came, he said R. Yohanan [said], "The space between the pillars of a colonnade is classified as neglected public space. How come? Even though sometimes the general public walks there, since they can't just stride along there, it's classified as neglected public space."*

B. *Said R. Zira said R. Judah, "The balcony in front of the pillars of a colonnade is classified as neglected public space."*

*C. He who holds that the ground between the pillars is so classified will all the more so take that view of the balcony. But he who holds that that is so of the balcony may take that view only of the balcony, because it is not accessible for ordinary use, but not of the ground between the pillars, which is entirely accessible for ordinary use.*

*D. Another version: But as to the space between the pillars, through which on occasion people amble, that is classified as public domain.*

- IV.26** A. *Said Rabbah bar Shila said R. Hisda, "With a brick standing upright in the public domain, if one threw an object and it stuck to its side, he is liable; if it landed on top, he is exempt." [Freedman: When an article lies in the street, less than ten handbreadths high and four square, it is a place to which liability does not pertain; but that is in respect to what can be put to a well-defined, natural use, for example, the top of a low wall or of a brick, on which articles may be placed; but as to the side of a wall or a brick, that can only give accidental service, and in that case, everything less than ten handbreadths in height is as the street itself, so when one throws an article, and, after it has gone four cubits, it cleaves to the side of the brick, it is as though it fell in the street, and he is liable.]*
- B. *Both Abbayye and Raba say, "But that is the case with one that is three handbreadths high, in which case people won't walk on it; but as to thorns or shrubs, even if they are not three handbreadths high" [these rank as a distinct domain, because people won't step on them (Freedman)].*
- C. *But Hiyya bar Rab said, "Even in the case of thorns and shrubs [that is the rule]. But that is not the rule for horse shit" [on which people will avoid stepping].*



D. And R. Ashi said, "Even horseshit."

#### IV.27

A. *Said Rabbah of the household of R. Shila, "When R. Dimi came, he said R. Yohanan [said], 'The dimensions of neglected public space cannot be less than four cubits square.'"*

B. And said R. Sheshet, "And it affects an area up to ten cubits square."

C. *What can possibly be the meaning of the language, And it affects an area up to ten cubits square? Should I say that it means, if there is a partition ten handbreadths high, then it is classified as neglected public domain, and if not, it is not classified as neglected public domain? But isn't it, then? And didn't R. Giddal say R. Hiyya bar Joseph said Rab [said], "In the instance of a house the inner space of which is not ten handbreadths high, but the covering of which brings it up to ten handbreadths high, it is permitted to carry on the roof over the entire area, but within the house, one may carry only in a space of four cubits"?* [Freedman: Since it is unfit for a dwelling, its walls are disregarded and it ranks not as private domain but as neglected public domain, and that is the reverse of our hypothesis.] *So what can possibly be the meaning of the language, And it affects an area up to ten cubits square?*

D. *It means, only up to ten handbreadths is the space classified as neglected public domain, but no higher than that [so that if the top is more than ten handbreadths above the ground, it is not classified as neglected public domain].*

E. *That is in line with what Samuel said to R. Judah, "Sharp wit! In matters that pertain to the Sabbath don't take account of any space above ten handbreadths." Now for what legal purpose is that statement made? Should we propose that the meaning is, private domain does not extend beyond ten handbreadths above the ground? But didn't R. Hisda say, "If someone stuck into private domain a pole, on top of which was a basket, and he threw up something into the basket and it came to rest on it, even if it is a hundred cubits high, he is liable, since private domain extends upwards without limit"?*

F. **[7B]** *But if the meaning is, public domain does not extend above ten handbreadths from ground level, well, that is in point of fact our Mishnah paragraph's statement, for we have learned in the Mishnah: He who throws [something from a distance of] four cubits toward*

a wall — [if he throws it] above ten handbreadths, it is as if he throws it into the air [which is public domain]. [If it is] less than ten handbreadths, it is as if he throws an object onto the ground [which is private domain] [M. **Shab. 11:3A-C**]. *So the statement must speak of neglected public domain, bearing the message that the category of neglected public domain does not exist above the height of ten handbreadths. [Then Dimi and Sheshet bear the message that] rabbis accorded to it the leniencies of private and public domain, namely: As to the leniencies of private domain, only if it measures four handbreadths square is the area classified as neglected public domain; otherwise it is classified as a place to which liability simply does not attach. And as to the leniencies of public domain, only up to ten cubits is it classified as neglected public domain; above that height, it is not classified as neglected public domain at all.*

**IV.28** A. *Reverting to the body of the text at hand:* R. Giddal say R. Hiyya bar Joseph said Rab [said], “In the instance of a house the inner space of which is not ten handbreadths high, but the covering of which brings it up to ten handbreadths high, it is permitted to carry on the roof over the entire area, but within the house, one may carry only in a space of four cubits” —  
B. Said Abbaye, “But if someone dug out a space four by four cubits and that makes up the measure of the inside of the house to ten cubits, then carrying over the entire space is permitted. *How come? The rest of the area would be classified as holes in private domain, and holes in private domain are classified as private domain. For it has been stated:* Holes in private domain are classified as private domain.”

**IV.29** A. As to holes in public domain —

B. Abbaye says, “They are classified as public domain.”

C. Raba says, “They are not classified as public domain.”

D. *Said Raba to Abbaye, “From your perspective, in maintaining holes in public domain are classified as public domain, how does this differ from what R. Dimi, when he came, said R. Yohanan said, ‘This was*

*required only to cover the case of a corner located near the public domain. [Even though on occasion masses of people crowd and overflow in that area, still, it is not all that convenient for everyday use, so it is treated as equivalent to neglected public domain.]’ But why not classify that space [by your reasoning] as holes in the public domain?”*

*E. There, it is not convenient to use that space, here, it is convenient to use that space.*

*F. We have learned in the Mishnah: **He who throws [something from a distance of] four cubits toward a wall — [if he throws it] above ten handbreadths, it is as if he throws it into the air [which is public domain]. [If it is] less than ten handbreadths, it is as if he throws an object onto the ground [which is private domain] [M. Shab. 11:3A-C].** Now, when we reflected on this statement, we asked: Why is it merely it is as if he throws an object onto the ground [which is private domain]? Surely it doesn’t come to rest there [but bounces]! And said R. Yohanan, “This rule was repeated in regard to a cake of juicy figs [which stick].” Now, if you take the position that the holes in public domain are equivalent to public domain, why invoke the image of a cake of juicy figs? You can invoke the case of a splinter or anything else, but suppose it is a case in which it landed in a hole!*

*G. Well, as a matter of fact, sometimes this was taught in the language, “the case of a splinter or other object is different, because they come back,” and sometimes he used the language, it refers to a wall that doesn’t have a hole. And how do you know it? Because the first clause uses the language, **[if he throws it] above ten handbreadths, it is as if he throws it into the air [which is public domain].** But if you suppose that it is a wall that has a hole, then why is it as though he threw it into the ear? Lo, it comes to rest in the hole. And if you should say, the Mishnah statement pertains*

*to a hole that is not four cubits square, didn't R. Judah say R. Hiyya said, "If one threw an object above ten handbreadths and it went and came to rest in a hole of any size at all, that brings us to the dispute of R. Meir and rabbis, for R. Meir takes the view that in our imagination we hollow the hole to complete it to the requisite dimensions, so liability is incurred, and rabbis take the view that we do not do so." So it follows that the reference is to a wall without a hole.*

*H. That proves the point.*

**IV.30** *A. Reverting to the body of the foregoing: "If someone stuck into private domain a pole, on top of which was a basket, and he threw up something into the basket and it came to rest on it, even if it is a hundred cubits high, he is liable, since private domain extends upwards without limit" —*

*B. May we say that R. Hisda does not accord with Rabbi, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority: If one tossed an object and it came to rest on a projection, if it is a small projection, Rabbi declares him liable, and sages declare him exempt?*

*C. [8A] Said Abbaye, "In the case of private domain, all parties concur with R. Hisda. But here, with what situation do we deal? It is a tree that stands in private domain, with its foliage extending into public domain, and one tossed the object, and it landed in the foliage. In that case, Rabbi takes the view that we do invoke the conception, we assign the foliage to the status of the trunk of the tree, and rabbis hold the position that we don't invoke the conception of assigning the foliage to the status of the stock of the tree."*

- IV.31** A. Said Abbayye, “If one threw a hive into the public domain, ten handbreadths high but not six broad, he is liable; if it is six broad, he is exempt.” [A round object with a diameter of six contains enough space for a square of four to be inscribed; since an object four square is a distinct domain, no liability is incurred for throwing one domain into another (Freedman).]
- B. Raba said, “Even if it is not six broad, he is exempt. How come? It is not possible for a piece of cane not to project ten handbreadths above the earth.” [In order to incur liability, the whole of the article thrown must rest in public domain. Since it is ten handbreadths high, it is not possible that the top and bottom canes of the circumference shall be absolutely even and straight, so something must project above ten from ground level, which is a place of non-liability, not public domain.]
- C. If he overturned the mouth [where the hive was not six handbreadths broad] [and threw the hive], then, if it is a bit more than seven in height, he is liable; if it is seven and a half high, he is exempt. [Freedman: The walls of an object are regarded as extending beyond its opening down to the ground itself as soon as the opening comes within a shade less than three handbreadths from the ground; when this overturned hive, which is a shade more than seven in height, enters within just under three handbreadths from the ground and is regarded as already resting on the ground, the whole is within ten from the ground and therefore he is liable; but if it is slightly taller than this, it is partly above ten, hence there is no liability.]
- D. R. Ashi said, “Even if it is seven and a half, he is liable. How come? The partitions are made for the contents [to make it a receptacle, not to form an imaginary extension].”

- IV.32** A. Said Ulla, “A column nine handbreadths high located in the public domain, on which the public rearrange their burdens, and someone threw an object and it came to rest on it — he is liable. *How come? If such a column were less than three handbreadths high, the public would step on it [so it's public domain pure and simple]; if it is from three to nine high, they don't step on it but they also don't rearrange their burdens on it [since it's too low]; if it is nine high, they certainly do rearrange their burdens on it.*” [Abraham: It's put to public use and is part of public domain.]

**IV.33** A. Said Abbayye to R. Joseph, “And what about a pit nine cubits deep?”

B. He said to him, “So, too, is the rule with a pit.”

C. Raba said, *“But that is not the rule with a pit. How come? What can be used only with unusual effort is not classified as a public utility.”*

D. R. Adda bar Mattena objected to Raba, *“If someone’s basket was lying in public domain, and it was ten cubits high and four cubits broad, then people may not move objects from inside it to public domain, or from public domain to the space inside it. If it is less than this, they may do so. And so with a hole. Now doesn’t this refer to the second clause [one nine handbreadths high or deep]?”*

E. *No, it refers to the first clause.*

F. *An objection was raised: [8B] If someone intended to take up his abode for the purpose of the Sabbath in public domain, and he placed his symbolic fusion meal in a pit above ten handbreadths, it is an effective fusion meal; if it was below ten handbreadths, it is not a valid fusion meal. Now what is the situation to which reference is made here? Should I say that he put it in a pit ten handbreadths deep, so that “above” means that he raised the bottom a bit and put the fusion meal there, and “below” means he lowered it and put it there, then what’s the difference between above and below? He’s in one place, his fusion meal is in another, distinct place. [Abraham: The whole of the pit is ten deep, so it’s private domain, and no object in it, even if raised to the edge, may be taken out into public domain; so the meal is inaccessible and invalid; thus he is in one place, public domain, the meal in another, private domain.] So isn’t it a hole that is not ten handbreadths deep? And it is stated explicitly, it is an effective fusion meal! So that proves that what can be used only with unusual effort is classified as a public utility.*

G. *On some occasions he replied to them, “But both he and his fusion meal are located in neglected public domain, and why is it called public domain at all? Because it’s not private domain.” And on some occasions he replied to them in this way: “He is in public domain, and his fusion meal is in neglected public domain, and the formulation is that of Rabbi, who has said, ‘Whatever is forbidden by reason of Sabbath rest is not subject to a prohibition at twilight’ [so he had access to the food at twilight, which is just the moment at which the fusion meals serves to effect acquisition for the man of that spot as his resting place for the Sabbath (Abraham)]. And don’t dare say that*

*I'm merely putting you off, but I am making a precise and exact statement to you, in line with what we have learned in the Mishnah: If it was shallow water and a public path passed through it, he who throws [an object for a distance of] four cubits is liable. And what is the measure of shallow water? Less than ten handbreadths in depth. [If there was] shallow water, and a public path goes through it, he who throws into it to a distance of four cubits is liable [M. Shab. 11:4B-E]. Now there is no problem explaining why there are two references to this shallow water: One refers to summer, the other, winter, and it was required to do so for both seasons. For if we knew the rule only about the summer, we might have supposed that it is then customary for people to cool themselves in the pool [which is then public domain], but I might have thought that that is not so in winter. And if we had the rule for winter, I might have thought that he used the water because he was stained with mud so he would go into it, but in summer I might suppose that that is not the rule; so both references are necessary. But why in the world refer twice to the fact that “a public path passed through it”? It must then follow that passage through an area only with difficulty is classified as a valid passage, but utilization only with difficulty is not classified as utilization.”*

*H. A done deal.*

**IV.34** A. Said R. Judah, “In the case of a bundle of canes, if one threw it down and raised it up [so moving it, but didn’t lift it entirely from the ground] and repeatedly did so, he is not liable — until he actually lifted it up.”

**IV.35** A. The master has said: **Someone standing on a threshold may take something from the householder or give it to him, may take something from a poor man or give it to him:**

B. *As to this threshold, how is it to be defined? Should I say, it is a threshold leading out of the public domain [into an alley]? Then how can the language serve, may take something from the householder? Lo, it is a question of carrying the object out from public to private domain. But then, how can the language serve, may take something from a poor man, when he is carrying it from private to public domain? And if it is a threshold of neglected public domain, then how can you use the language, may take something from the householder or give it to him? That bears the implication, even to begin*



*with! But, after all, there is an operating prohibition in play [that forbids carrying between neglected public domain and public or private domain, even though, if one does so, the act is not penalized]!*

- C. *So it must mean, a threshold that serves a place that to begin with is not subject to liability, for instance, an area not four handbreadths square. And that is in accord with what, when he came, R. Dimi said R. Yohanan [said], “An area that is not four cubits by four cubits — it is permitted for those located in private domain and those located in public domain to put down and shoulder their goods therein, on condition that they not exchange [items from persons in the framework of the one to those in the framework of the other].”*

#### IV.36

- A. **The master has said: [Someone standing on a threshold may take something from the householder or give it to him, may take something from a poor man or give it to him,] on condition that he does not take something from the householder and give it to the poor man or take something from the poor man and give it to the householder [so appearing to carry directly from domain to domain], but if one did so in just that way, all three of them are exempt:**
- B. *May we then say that this refutes the position of Raba? For said Raba, “He who moves an object from the beginning to the end of four full cubits in public domain, even though he [9A] carries it over himself [through space that is more than ten handbreadths above the ground (Abraham)] is liable”?*
- C. *Not at all, for in that case, the object has not come to rest, while here, it has come to rest. [In the position posited by Raba, we disregard the method of its passage and take account of carrying an object for four cubits in the street, that alone (Abraham).]*

#### IV.37

- A. **Others say, “The threshold serves both domains. When the door is open, it is classified as part of the inside of the house; when the door is locked, it is classified along with the outside of the house [lying at the opening of a blind alley between the alley and the public domain (Abraham)]:**
- B. *Is that the case even though it has no stake? [Abraham: A stake is put at the side of the opening, which is treated as though it formed a complete partition stretching right across; the threshold is excluded from the partitioning influence of a stake, which was fixed at the inner side of the threshold.] And didn’t R. Hama bar Guria say Rab said, “That which lies within the opening of the gate has to have another stake to render the area permitted”? And if you say it is a case in which there is not an area of four by four cubits, hasn’t R. Hama bar*



Guria said Rab said, “What lies within the opening, even though it is not an area of four by four cubits, has to have another stake in order to render carrying in the area permitted”?

- C. *Said R. Judah said Rab, “Here we deal with a threshold of an alley, half of the threshold being covered, half uncovered, with the covering being on the inner side; so **when the door is open, it is classified as part of the inside of the house; when the door is locked, it is classified along with the outside of the house.**”*
- D. *R. Ashi said, “In point of fact we are dealing with a threshold of a house, it is one that is covered over with two beams, neither of them four handbreadths in width, with less than three handbreadths between them, with the door in the middle. **When the door is open, it is classified as part of the inside of the house; when the door is locked, it is classified along with the outside of the house.**”*

**IV.38 A. But if the threshold itself was ten handbreadths high and four broad, lo, it constitutes a domain unto itself:**

- B. *That sustains the position of R. Isaac bar Abdimi, for said R. Isaac bar Abdimi, “R. Meir would say, ‘In any situation in which you find two domains, which form a single domain, for instance, a pillar in private domain that is ten handbreadths high and four broad, it is forbidden to adjust one’s load on it, as a precautionary decree on account of the possibility of one’s doing so on a hill of those dimensions that is located in public domain.” [That is private domain, so one may not move an article from it into public domain; when such a comparable locus is in private domain, it is forbidden too, lest people draw the conclusion from the one case that it is permitted to do the same in the other.]*

**1:2**

- A. [9B] **A man should not sit down before the barber close to the afternoon [prayer],**
- B. **unless he has already prayed.**
- C. **Nor [at that time] should a man go into a bathhouse or into a tannery,**
- D. **nor to eat, nor to enter into judgment.**
- E. **But if they began, they do not break off [what they were doing].**
- F. **They do break off [what they were doing] to pronounce the recitation of the Shema.**
- G. **But they do not break off [what they were doing] to say the Prayer.**

**I.1** A. *What is the meaning of **close to the afternoon [prayer]**? Should we say that it is near the principal afternoon prayer? But why not, since there will be ample time left in the day? But if it means, near the minor afternoon prayer, then what is the meaning of, **But if they began, they do not break off [what they were doing]**? [Abraham: There were two times for the afternoon, the principal time, or first one, at 12:30 P.M., and the minor time, which was from 3:30 to sunset] Shall we then have to say that this is a refutation of the position of R. Joshua b. Levi? For said R. Joshua b. Levi, “Once the time has come for reciting the afternoon prayer, it is forbidden for someone to taste a thing prior to saying the Prayer of the afternoon worship”?*

B. No, in point of fact, the meaning is, but it refers to near the principal afternoon prayer, but at issue is a fancy haircut, such as Ben Elasa would get [which took a long time, and might finish even before the principal afternoon prayer].

**II.1** A. **Nor [at that time] should a man go into a bathhouse:**

B. *That is, for the entire schvitz, beginning to end.*

**III.1** A. **Or into a tannery:**

B. That means, tanning on a large scale.

**IV.1** A. **Nor to eat:**

B. That means, a long meal.

**V.1** A. **Nor to enter into judgment:**

B. That means, the beginning of a trial.

**V.2** A. *R. Aha bar Jacob said, “In point of fact, it refers to a perfectly normal haircut, and why shouldn’t one sit down for such a haircut to begin with? It is a precautionary decree, lest the scissors break. Likewise, the rule **nor [at that time] should a man go into a bathhouse** is, merely to sweat, and to begin why not? Lest he faint. So, too, the rule **or into a tannery** means, to begin with to inspect it, and why not? Lest he see his goods being ruined, and that will upset him [and he’ll forget about the worship]. So, too, **nor to eat** means, even a short meal, and to begin with why not? It may end up lasting longer than expected. And along these same lines **nor to enter into judgment** means, even to the giving of the verdict, and to begin with why not? There may be further argument and the original judgment may be upset.*

**V.3** A. At what point is the beginning of the haircut [after which one doesn’t have to break off for the prayer]?

B. Said R. Abin, "Once the barber puts his sheet on the customer's lap."

**V.4** A. At what point is the beginning of the bathing process [after which one doesn't have to break off for the prayer]?

B. Said R. Abin, "Once one takes off his coat."

**V.5** A. At what point is the beginning of the tanning process [after which one doesn't have to break off for the prayer]?

B. Said R. Abin, "Once one ties an apron around his shoulders."

**V.6** A. At what point is the beginning of the eating [after which one doesn't have to break off for the prayer]?

B. Said Rab, "When one has washed his hands."

C. And R. Hanina said, "When he has loosened his belt."

D. *But there is no conflict, the one refers to us, the other to them [in the Land of Israel]. [The former wore a tight belt, the latter didn't.]*

**V.7** A. *Said Abbaye, "As to our colleagues in Babylonia, from the perspective of him who has said, 'the recitation of the Evening Prayer is optional,' once they have loosened their belt, we don't bother them again [to stop the meal prior to saying the prayer]; from the perspective of him who has said that it is obligatory, do we trouble them to do so? Lo, the recitation of the Afternoon Prayer in the opinion of all parties is obligatory, and yet we have learned, **But if they began, they do not break off [what they were doing],** in connection with which said R. Hanina, 'That is after he has loosened his belt.'"*

B. **[10A]** *At that time, drunkenness is uncommon, but here, at the evening meal, it is common [so one must refrain from the meal, even if he has loosened his belt, until prayers are said, if these prayers are deemed obligatory]. Or also, in the case of the afternoon prayer, since a set time is assigned to it, one will be concerned and not come to transgress; but as to the evening prayer, since no set time is assigned to it but it can be recited all night long, he will not be preoccupied about it and may end up transgressing.*

C. *Objected R. Sheshet, "So is it such a big deal to loosen one's belt? Anyhow, let him get up as is and say the prayer?"*

D. It is on the count of, "Prepare to meet your God, O Israel" (Amo. 4:12).

**V.8** A. *Rabbah bar R. Huna put on stockings and said his prayer, citing the verse, "Prepare to meet your God, O Israel" (Amo. 4:12).*

B. *Raba took off his cloak, clasped his hands, and said his prayer, saying, "I am like a slave before his master."*

C. *Said R. Ashi, "I saw R. Kahana, when there was anguish in the world, removing his cloak, clasping his hands, and saying his prayers, with the words, 'I am like a slave before his master.' But when there was tranquillity in the world, he would put on and wrap himself in his cloak and pray, saying the verse, 'Prepare to meet your God, O Israel' (Amo. 4:12)."*

**V.9** A. *Raba saw R. Hamnuna prolonging his prayer. He said, "They relinquish an everlasting life in order to occupy themselves with immediate gratification."*

B. *For he maintained the theory that the time of prayer and the time of Torah study are separate from one another.*

**V.10** A. *R. Jeremiah was in session before R. Zira, and they were engaged in the study of a tradition. The time came for praying, so R. Jeremiah hastened to adjourn. R. Zira cited in this regard the verse, "He who turns away from hearing the Torah — even his prayer is an abomination" (Pro. 28: 9).*

**V.11** A. At what point is the beginning of a lawsuit?

B. R. Jeremiah and R. Jonah —

C. One said, "From the moment that the judges cloak themselves."

D. And the other said, "From the time that the litigants commence laying out their cases."

E. *But they don't really differ. The one speaks of a situation in which they have already entered upon the judgment of the case, the other in which they have not already entered upon the judgment of the case.*

**V.12** A. *Between the pillars, R. Ammi and R. Assi were in session and studying. Every few minutes they knocked at the side of the door and announced, "If anybody has a suit, let him come on in."*

**V.13** A. *R. Hisda and Rabbah bar R. Huna were in session in court all day long. They felt weak. R. Hiyya bar Rab of Difti repeated for them the following Tannaite statement: "'And the people stood about Moses from the morning unto the evening' (Exo. 18:13) — now can it enter your mind that Moses was sitting and judging cases all day long?*

When would his study of Torah be carried out? But it is to tell you: Any judge who judges a case in truth and fidelity even for a single moment is regarded by Scripture as though he were turned into a partner of the Holy One, blessed be He, in the works of creation. *For here it is written, 'And the people stood about Moses from the morning unto the evening' (Exo. 18:13), and elsewhere, 'And there was evening, and there was morning, one day.'*

**V.14** A. How long are judges to sit in judgment?

B. Said R. Sheshet, "To mealtime."

C. *Said R. Hama, "What verse of Scripture makes that point? 'Woe is you, land, when your king is a child and your princes eat in the morning! Happy are you, land, when your king is the son of aristocrats and your princes eat at the right time, for strength and not to get drunk' (Qoh. 10:16-17) — for the strength of the Torah, and not for drunk with wine."*

**V.15** A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

B. The first hour is the mealtime for gladiators; the second, for robbers; the third, for heirs; the fourth, for laborers; the fifth, for everybody else.

C. Now is that so? And didn't R. Pappa say, "The fourth hour is the time for the main meal of everybody"?

D. Rather: The fourth is the time for everyone, the fifth the mealtime for workers, the sixth the mealtime for disciples of sages. From that point onward in the day, it is like throwing a stone into a barrel [and no benefit will come of the meal].

E. *Said Abbaye, "But we have made that statement only of one who has tasted nothing in the morning, but if someone has eaten something in the morning, there is no problem."*

**V.16** A. Said R. Adda bar Ahbah, "One may recite the Prayer in the bathhouse."

B. *An objection was raised: When one who enters a bathhouse — if it is a place where people stand dressed, he may recite Scripture or the Prayer there [T.: the Shema or say the prayer there], and he obviously may greet his fellows there; he may don his phylacteries and obviously he need not remove them if he came in wearing them. If it is a place where people stand naked, he may not greet his fellows there, and obviously he may not recite Scripture or the Shema or the Prayer there, and he must remove*

his phylacteries, and obviously he may not put them on. If it is a place where people stand both naked and dressed, he may greet his fellows there, but he may not recite Scripture or the Shema or the Prayer there, and he need not remove his phylacteries, but he may not put them on there to begin with [T. **Ber. 2:20**]!

- C. *When R. Adda bar Ahbah made that statement, it concerned a bathhouse in which there was no one located at all.*
- D. *But lo, said R. Yosé bar Hanina, “The bathhouse of which they have spoken is even one in which there is no other person present; the toilet of which they have spoken is even one in which there is no shit.”*
- E. *Rather, when R. Adda bar Ahbah made that statement, it concerned a new one.*
- F. *But this is precisely what Rabina asked as a question: “What if a locale is designated for use as a toilet? What is the law? Does that designation apply or not?” And, we recall, he did not solve that problem. Now isn’t the same rule pertinent to the bathhouse?*
- G. *Not at all, perhaps [10B] a bathhouse is exceptional, because it stinks.*

**V.17 A. He may not greet his fellows there:**

B. *That supports what R. Hamnuna said in the name of Ulla: “It is forbidden for someone to greet his fellow in the bathhouse, on the strength of the verse, ‘And he called it, The Lord is peace’ (Judg. 6:24).”*

C. *Well, if that’s so, then it also should be forbidden to say, “by faith” in the toilet, since it’s written, “the faithful God” (Deu. 7: 9). And should you say, well, that’s so — didn’t Raba bar Mehasayya say R. Hama bar Guria said Rab said, “It is permitted to say, ‘by faith,’ in the toilet”?*

D. *In that case, the name itself is not stated, as we translate it, “God is faithful,” but here the name itself is designated “Peace,” as it is written, “and he called it, the Lord is peace.”*

**Composite of Sayings in the Attributive, And said Raba bar Mehasayya said R. Hama bar Guria said Rab**

**V.18** A. And said Raba bar Mehasayya said R. Hama bar Guria said Rab, “He who gives a gift to his fellow has to inform him:

‘That you may know that I the Lord sanctify you’ (Exo. 31:13).”

B. *So, too, it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

C. “That you may know that I the Lord sanctify you” (Exo. 31:13):

D. The Holy One, blessed be He, said to Moses, “Moses, I have a fine gift [for you] in my treasury, and it is called Sabbath, and I desire to present it to [the people of] Israel. Go and inform them.”

E. On this basis, said Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel, “One who gives bread to a child must inform its mother.”

F. *What does he do to him?*

G. *Said Abbaye, “He smears him with oil or puts eye-shadow on him.”*

H. *But these days, when we are afraid of witchcraft, [what should the individual who gives the child bread do]?*

I. Said R. Pappa, “He smears on him some of the same thing [that was on the bread he gave him to eat].”

J. Is that so? But didn’t R. Hama bar Hanina say, “He who gives a gift to his fellow doesn’t have to inform him, as it is said, ‘And Moses didn’t know that the skin of his face shone by reason of his speaking with him’ (Exo. 34:29)”?

K. *No problem, the one refers to something that is apt to come out, the other, to something that is not apt to come out.*

L. *Well, the Sabbath is surely something that was apt to come out [yet God made sure Israel knew about the gift]?*

M. *The reward for it was not apt to come out [and Moses was told to inform the people about it].*

**V.19** A. *[Himself a priest,] R. Hisda was holding in hand two gifts of oxen [assigned to the priesthood]. He said, "To whoever will come and tell me a new tradition in Rab's name shall I give these!"*

B. *Said to him Raba bar Mehasayya, "This is what Rab said, 'He who gives a gift to his fellow has to inform him, as it is said, "that you may know that I the Lord sanctify you" (Exo. 31:13).'"*

C. *He gave them to him.*

D. *[The other] said to him, "Do you so prize the traditions of Rab?"*

E. *He said to him, "Yes I do."*

F. *He said to him, "This is what Rab said: 'A piece of clothing is valued by the one who wears it.' [As Rab's disciple, you value what he said.]"*

G. *He said to him, "Did Rab really say that?! Well, I value the second higher than the first, and if I had another ox, I'd hand it over to you for that one."*

**V.20** A. And said Raba bar Mehasayya say R. Hama bar Guria said Rab, "One should never single out one of his children from the others, since for the sake of two selas' weight of silver that Jacob gave to Joseph more than to the other children, his brothers were jealous of him, and matters unfolded so that our ancestors had to descend to Egypt."

**V.21** A. And said Raba bar Mehasayya say R. Hama bar Guria said Rab, "One should always try to take up residence in a town that was only recently settled, for, since it was only recently settled, its sins are few: 'Behold, now, this city is recently near to flee to, and it is little' (Gen. 19:20). *What can be the meaning of 'near'? Should we say that it really was near and small? But obviously they could see that*



*on their own. Rather, it must mean, since it was only recently settled, its sins are few.”*

*B. Said R. Abin, “What verse of Scripture sustains that reading? ‘Oh, please let me escape thither’ (Gen. 19:20), and the numerical value of the word for ‘pleas’ is fifty-one. But Sodom had been in existence for fifty-two years, while its prosperity lasted for [11A] twenty-six, ‘Twelve years they served Chedorlaomer and thirteen years they rebelled, and in the fourteenth year’ (Gen. 14: 4).” [That leaves twenty six years not at peace, plus twenty-six of peace prior to the destruction.]*

**V.22** *A. And said Raba bar Mehasayya said R. Hama bar Guria said Rab, “Any town the roofs of which are higher than that of the synagogue in the end will be destroyed: ‘To exalt the house of our God and to repair the ruins thereof’ (Ezra 9: 9).”*

*B. Now that judgment pertains only to the houses, but as to towers or turrets, there is no problem.*

*C. Said R. Ashi, “I made sure that Mata Mehasayya would not be destroyed.”*

*D. Yeah, sure — but it was destroyed.*

*E. But it wasn’t destroyed because of that particular sin.*

**V.23** *A. And said Raba bar Mehasayya said R. Hama bar Guria said Rab, “[Let me live] under Ishmael but not under a Roman; under a Roman but not under a Magus; under a Magus but not a disciple of a sage; under a disciple of a sage but never under a widow and orphan.”*

**V.24** A. And said Raba bar Mehasayya say R. Hama bar Guria said Rab, “Any illness but a bellyache, any pain but a heartache, any torment but not migraine, any evil but not a bad wife.”

**V.25** A. And said Raba bar Mehasayya said R. Hama bar Guria said Rab, “If all the seas were ink and all the reeds pens and all the heavens parchment and all men scribes, they would not suffice to write down all the intricacies of dominion.”

B. *What is the pertinent verse of Scripture that makes that point?*

C. Said R. Mesharshayya, “‘The heaven for height, the earth for depth, and the heart of kings is unsearchable’ (Pro. 25: 3).”

**V.26** A. And said Raba bar Mehasayya said R. Hama bar Guria said Rab, “Fasting is as good for dreams as fire for tow.”

B. Said R. Hisda, “But that is for that very day.”

C. And said R. Joseph, “Even on the Sabbath.”

**V.27** A. *R. Joshua b. R. Idi visited the household of R. Ashi. They prepared for him a third-grown calf and said to him, “Will the master taste something?”*

B. *He said to them, “I am observing a fast.”*

C. *They said to him, “But doesn’t the master concur with what R. Judah said, for said R. Judah, ‘A person may borrow against his fast and pay it back’?”*

D. He said to him, "It is a fast on account of a dream, and said Raba bar Mehasayya said R. Hama bar Guria said Rab, 'Fasting is as good for dreams as fire for tow.' And said R. Hisda, 'But that is for that very day.' And said R. Joseph, 'Even on the Sabbath.'"

**VI.1** A. **But if they began, they do not break off [what they were doing]. They do break off [what they were doing] to pronounce the recitation of the Shema. But they do not break off [what they were doing] to say the Prayer:**

B. *But the opening clause is explicit: They do not break off [what they were doing]!*

C. *The latter reference pertains to study of Torah, as has been taught on Tannaite authority: Colleagues who were engaged in the Torah interrupt their studies for the recitation of the Shema but they don't do so for the Prayer.*

**VI.2** A. Said R. Yohanan, "That was said only of such as R. Simeon b. Yohai and his colleagues, whose Torah study was their profession, but such as we must break off for both reciting the Shema and saying the Prayer."

B. *But hasn't it been taught on Tannaite authority: Just as they do not interrupt for the Prayer, so they don't interrupt for the recitation of the Shema?*

C. *When that Tannaite statement was set forth, it had to do with intercalating the year. For said R. Adda bar Ahbah, and so, too, the elders of Hagronayya repeated, "Said R. Eleazar bar Sadoq, 'When in Yavneh we were engaged in the intercalation of the year, we would not interrupt our work either to recite the Shema or to say the Prayer.'"*

### 1:3

A. **A tailor should not go out carrying his needle near nightfall,**

B. **lest he forget and cross [a boundary];**

C. **nor a scribe with his pen.**

D. **And [on the Sabbath] one should not search his clothes [for fleas], or read by the light of a lamp.**

- E. Nonetheless they state:
- F. [On the Sabbath] a teacher sees [by the light of a lamp] where the children are reading, but he does not read.
- G. Similarly:
- H. A male Zab should not eat a meal with a female Zab, because it leads to transgression.

- I.1** A. *There was have learned in the Mishnah: A man should not stand in private domain and drink in public domain, in public domain and drink in private domain, unless he has poked his head and the greater part of his body into the same domain as that in which he drinks. [11B] And so in the case of a winepress. A man scoops up water out of a gutter less than ten handbreadths from the ground. And from a waterspout in any manner he may drink [M. Er. 10:6].*
- B. *The question was raised: What is the rule in regard to neglected public domain?*
- C. *Said Abbaye, "It is the same."*
- D. *Raba said, "[The prohibition of moving an object between neglected public domain and public domain or private domain] itself is only a precautionary decree, so should we now go and issue a precautionary decree tacked on to another such decree?"*

E. *Said Abbaye, "On what basis do I make my statement? Because it is said in the Mishnah, **And so in the case of a winepress.** Now what is this winepress? If it is private domain, that is covered in the Mishnah, and if it is public domain, that, too, is covered in the Mishnah, so isn't it neglected public domain?"*

F. *And Raba said, "**And so in the case of a winepress** refers to tithes."*

G. *And so, too, said R. Sheshet, "**And so in the case of a winepress** refers to tithes."*

H. *For we have learned in the Mishnah: "**One drinks [wine] at the press — whether [it is mixed] with hot water or cold water — he is exempt [from removing the tithes]**" — the words of R. Meir. R. Eleazar bar Sadoq declares [him] liable [to removing the tithes]. But sages say, "**Concerning [the wine mixed with] hot water, he is liable [to removing the tithes], but concerning [the wine mixed***

**with] cold water, he is exempt [from removing the tithes]" [M. Ma. 4:4].** That is because he puts back the rest. [Abraham: The vat is the utensil into which the juice of the grapes runs; it descends into the pit underneath. Once it is in the pit its processing as wine is complete and it is liable to tithes; before they are given, nothing may be drunk. While it is yet in the vat its processing is not complete, so a little wine may be drunk even before the tithes are designated. That is so only if it is drunk directly over the vat. If it is taken out, that action itself confers upon it the status of finished wine, and the tithes are then owing. When it is taught, "and the same applies to a wine vat," it means, if one drinks wine from the vat, he is regarded as taking it away, unless he has his head and greater part of his body in the vat, and must render the tithes before he drinks. Wine was not drunk neat but diluted with water; if with cold, the rest can be poured back into the vat; if with hot, it can't; the hot mixture will ruin the rest. Meir holds that in both cases, since he doesn't take the wine away from the vat, he can drink a little without tithing; Eleazar differs; sages agree with Meir if cold water is used for diluting.]

- I. *We have learned in the Mishnah: **A tailor should not go out carrying his needle near nightfall, lest he forget and cross [a boundary].** Now surely this must mean that it is stuck in his garment!* [Abraham: Then even carrying it out on the Sabbath is only rabbinically forbidden as a precautionary measure, lest he carry it in some more ordinary way, and yet he must also not go out before the Sabbath as a preventive measure lest he do so on the Sabbath; we therefore have a preventive measure made to safeguard another such measure.]
- J. *Not at all, he can't doing so holding it in the ordinary way, in his hand.*
- K. *Come and take note: A tailor should not go out carrying his needle stuck in his garment. Doesn't this mean, on the eve of the Sabbath?*
- L. *Not at all. That was taught with respect to the Sabbath itself.*
- M. *But hasn't it been taught on Tannaite authority: On the eve of the Sabbath toward dark a tailor should not go out carrying his needle stuck in his garment?*
- N. *Lo, who is the authority behind that formulation? It is R. Judah, who has said, "A craftsman is liable for carrying out an object as he ordinarily would in his trade." For it has been taught on Tannaite authority: **A tailor must not go out carrying his needle stuck in his garment, nor a carpenter with the***

beam on his shoulder, nor a weaver with the button in his ear, nor a dyer with the color sample around his neck, nor a money changer with a denar in his ear, but if he does do so, he is not liable, though the act is forbidden,” the words of R. Meir. R. Judah says, “A craftsman is liable for carrying out an object as he ordinarily would in his trade, but everyone else is exempt from liability to punishment” [T. [Shab. 1:8B-H](#)]?

- I.2** A. *One Tannaite formulation states:* A person afflicted with flux should not go out with his pus bag, but if he goes out, he is not liable, though the act is forbidden. *Another Tannaite formulation states:* A person afflicted with flux should not go out with his pus bag, but if he goes out, he is liable to a sin-offering.
- B. *Said R. Joseph, “No problem, the one represents the position of R. Meir, the other of R. Judah.”*
- C. *Said to him Abbaye, “Well, I can concede that you have heard from R. Meir that that is the rule for something that is not ordinarily carried in such a way, but have you heard him take that position in connection with something that has to be carried in such a way? And if you don’t concede my point, then what about the following: In the case of an unskilled person who hollowed out a measure from a log on the Sabbath, would he be exempt on R. Meir’s view?”* [Abraham: Surely not, for if so, only a skilled worker will be liable for carrying out something of his own trade; it must be that a person is liable for doing any labor in the manner that would be routine for that person; the same is so for the person afflicted with flux and his pus bag.]
- D. *Rather, said R. Hamnuna, “No problem, the one refers to a person afflicted with flux who has produced two attested flows of pus, the other, one afflicted with flux who has produced three.”* [After three, he owes a sacrifice, so he needs the pouch to know whether or not he produces a third; since he needs it, it is in the ordinary way that he carries it so he must be liable (Abraham).]
- E. *And what’s the difference in respect to one who has suffered two such appearances, so that he should be liable? It is because he needs it for an examination? Then one who has suffered three appearances also needs it for counting!*
- F. *But is it needed for that very day* [he doesn’t need the pouch on the Sabbath, since he would not be liable should the third attack come on the Sabbath; he commences counting only on the next day (Abraham)].
- G. *But it’s needed to protect his clothing from the pus.*

- H. *Said R. Zira, “The Tannaite authority at hand takes the view that anything done only to keep things clean is not taken into account. [Abraham: When something is done not for its own sake but to prevent something from getting dirty, it is not regarded as a positive act and involves no liability.] For we have learned in the Mishnah: He who puts a dish on end against the wall so that it will rinse off, lo, this is under the law, If water be put. If [he did so] [12A] so that it [rain] should not harm the wall, it [the water] is not under the law, If water be put [M. Makh. 4:3].”* [The latter action is simply to keep the wall clean and is not taken into account in assessing whether dealing with the water flow involves utilizing the water in a purposeful manner, in which case the water has the power to impart susceptibility to uncleanness to dry produce that comes into contact with it.]
- I. *But are the cases truly parallel? In that case he doesn’t want the flow at all, but here he really needs the pus pouch to catch the pus. The valid comparison is only with the latter clause of the same composite: A trough into which the rain dripping from the roof flowed — the drops [of water] that splashed out and those that overflowed are not under the law, If water be put. But the water that is in it falls under the rubric “and if water be put” [since that water is wanted] [M. Makh. 4:5A-B].* [Abraham: This shows that when a man’s intentions are fulfilled, the action is taken into account; here, too, he carries the pouch with a definite intention, which is fulfilled, so he should be liable.]
- J. *Rather, both Abbayye and Raba say, “No problem, the one represents the view of R. Judah, the other, R. Simeon.”* [Judah holds one is culpable for an act even if the cause of the act is unwanted; Simeon denies liability; here the cause of carrying the pouch is the pus, which isn’t wanted (Abraham).]
- I.3** A. *A Tannaite statement of the household of R. Ishmael: “A man may go out on the eve of the Sabbath at dusk wearing his phylacteries.”*
- B. *How come?*
- C. *Since Rabbah bar R. Huna said, “A man is liable to touch his phylacteries occasionally, a view based on an argument a fortiori from the head-plate of the high priest: If the head-plate, which contains only one reference to the Divine Name, is subject to the statement of the Torah, ‘And it shall always be on his forehead’ (Exo. 28:38), so that he will not neglect it, phylacteries, which contain numerous mentions of the Divine Name, all the more so,” therefore he will keep them in mind that way.*

- I.4** A. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*  
 B. Hanania says, "A person is obligated to examine his clothing on the eve of the Sabbath at dusk."  
 C. *Said R. Joseph, "That is one of the great laws concerning the Sabbath."*
- II.1** A. **And [on the Sabbath] one should not search his clothes [for fleas]:**  
 B. *The question was raised: "Does this mean that on the Sabbath day **one should not search his clothes [for fleas]**? Then it would stand for the position of R. Eliezer, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority: Said R. Eliezer, 'He who kills a louse on the Sabbath is as though he killed a camel.' And then the phrase **or read by the light of a lamp** would refer to the consideration that one may end up tilting the lamp? Or perhaps both actions are forbidden lest he tilt the lamp?"*  
 C. *Come and take note:* They may not search garments nor read by the light of a lamp.  
 D. *But is that formulation any more formidable than that of our Mishnah [for the same question arises in that case as much as in ours]!*  
 E. *Come and take note:* They may not search garments by the light of a lamp, nor read by the light of a lamp. These represent some of the laws that they stated in the upper room of Hananiah b. Hezekiah b. Garon. *That proves that both actions are prohibited lest he tilt the light of the lamp.*  
 F. *Sure does.*
- II.2** A. Said R. Judah said Samuel, "It is forbidden even to distinguish by lamp light between one's own clothing and one's wife's."  
     B. *Said Raba, "We have made that statement only in connection with townsfolk, but as to country people, the clothing is readily distinguished. And even in the case of townsfolk, that statement concerns the clothing only of old ladies, but as to those of young women, they are easy to tell apart."*
- II.3** A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*  
 B. In the public domain they do not search garments for lice, because of considerations of self-respect.  
 C. Along these same lines said R. Judah, and there are those who say it in the name of R. Nehemiah, "In the public domain they try to vomit, because of considerations of self-respect."



- II.4** A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*  
B. He who examines his clothing on the Sabbath may crush the louse and toss it away, so long as he doesn't actually kill it.  
C. Abba Saul says, "He may take it and toss it away, so long as he doesn't squeeze it."

D. Said R. Huna, "The decided law is: He may press it and throw it away, and that is fitting, even on a weekday."

- II.5** A. *Rabbah would kill them; R. Sheshet would kill them.*  
B. *Raba tossed them into a pan of water.*  
C. *R. Nahman said to his daughters, "Kill them and let me hear the sound of those despicable things."*

- II.6** A. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*  
B. R. Simeon b. Eleazar says, "'They don't kill vermin on the Sabbath,' the words of the House of Shammai. And the House of Hillel permit."  
C. And so did R. Simeon b. Eleazar say in the name of Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel, "'On the Sabbath they don't negotiate terms for a daughter's betrothal, nor for teaching reading to a child, nor for teaching him a trade, nor do they comfort mourners, nor do they visit the sick,' the words of the House of Shammai. And the House of Hillel permit."

- II.7** A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*  
B. He who on the Sabbath comes to visit a sick person says, "Today it's the Sabbath, so one can't cry out, but recovery will come soon."  
C. And R. Meir says, "One may say, 'May [the Sabbath] show compassion.'"  
D. **[12B]** R. Judah says, "'May the Omnipresent have compassion on you and on all Israelite sick.'"  
E. R. Yosé says, "'May the Omnipresent have compassion on you in the midst of all Israelite sick.'"  
F. Shebna of Jerusalem, when he would come in, would say, "Peace," and when he would leave, he would say, "Today it's the Sabbath, so one can't cry out, but recovery will come soon. And his compassion is abundant, so enjoy the Sabbath rest in peace."

G. *And with which authority does the following statement of R. Hanina concur: "He who has a sick person in his house has to include him in a blessing for all of the sick of Israel"?*

H. *In accord with whom? It is in accord with R. Yosé.*

**II.8** A. And said R. Hanina, “It was with difficulty that sages permitted comforting the mourners and visiting the sick on the Sabbath.”

**II.9** A. *Said Rabbah bar bar Hannah, “When we would go after R. Eleazar to pay a call on a sick person, [we heard that] sometimes he would say to him, ‘The Omnipresent remember you in peace,’ and sometimes he would say, ‘The Omnipresent remember you in peace.’”*

B. *But how could he have acted in such a way? Didn’t R. Judah say, “A person should always ask what he needs in the Aramaic language”? [How could he use Hebrew or Aramaic, without distinction?] And R. Yohanan said, “Whoever asks for what he needs in Aramaic — the ministering angels don’t accede to him, for the ministering angels don’t understand Aramaic”!*

C. *A sick person is an exceptional situation, for the Presence of God is with him. For said R. Anan said Rab, “How on the basis of Scripture do we know that the Holy One, blessed be He, nourishes the sick? ‘The Lord will strengthen him upon the bed of languishing’ (Psa. 41: 4).”*

D. *So, too, it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

E. He who goes in to visit the sick should not sit on the bed or on the stool or chair but must cloak himself and sit on the ground, for the Presence of God hovers above the bed of the sick, as it is said, “The Lord sets himself upon the bed of languishing” (Psa. 41: 4).

F. Further said Rabin said Rab, “How on the basis of Scripture do we know that the Presence of God hovers above the bed of the sick? ‘The Lord sets himself upon the bed of languishing’ (Psa. 41: 4).”

**III.1** A. **...Or read by the light of a lamp:**

B. Said Raba, “That is the rule even if the lamp is located at a height twice a man’s stature or two ox goads up, even ten rooms on top of one another.”

**III.2** A. *The rule pertains to one who should not read by himself, but it’s o.k. for two to do so.*

B. *But hasn’t it been taught on Tannaite authority: Neither one nor two?*

- C. *Said R. Eleazar, “No problem, the former refers to two person’s together studying a single subject, the other, two.”*
- D. *Said R. Huna, “But if it is by the light of a bonfire, even ten people are forbidden to do so” [each sitting far from another, anyone of them may forget and stir up the flame (Abraham)].*

**III.3** A. *Said Raba, “But if it is an eminent authority, it is permitted.”*

- B. *An objection was raised: A man should not read by the light of a lamp, lest he tilt it. Said R. Ishmael b. Elisha, “I shall read by lamp light, I won’t tilt it.” Once he was studying and he wanted to tilt the lamp. He said, “How great are the teachings of sages, who have said, ‘A man should not read by the light of a lamp, lest he tilt it.’” R. Nathan says, “He studied and he did tilt it, but he wrote in his notebook, ‘I Ishmael b. Elisha studied on the Sabbath and tilted the lamp. When the house of the sanctuary is rebuilt, I shall bring a mighty fat sin-offering’” [T. Shab. 1:13].*
- C. *Said R. Abba, “R. Ishmael b. Elisha is an exception, since so far as teachings of the Torah were concerned, he treated himself as a common person.” [But he didn’t have to do so.]*

**III.4** A. *One Tannaite statement: On the Sabbath a waiter may examine cups and plates by the light of a lamp, and another Tannaite statement: On the Sabbath a waiter may not examine cups and plates by the light of a lamp.*

- B. *No problem — the one speaks of a permanent waiter, the other a temporary. Or, if you prefer, I shall say, both refer to a permanent waiter, but there still is no problem, the one speaks of a lamp that burns oil, the other, one that burns naphtha [which has a bad smell, so one won’t tilt it].*

**III.5** A. *The question was raised: As to a temporary waiter and a lamp fed with oil, what is the rule?*

- B. *Said Rab, “There is a law [permitting it], but they do not give public instructions along those lines.”*
- C. *But R. Jeremiah bar Abba said, “There is a law [permitting it], and they do give public instructions along those lines.”*

**III.6** A. *R. Jeremiah bar Abba visited the household of R. Assi. The waiter got up and examined the dishes by the light of a candle. R. Assi’s wife said to him, “But you don’t do it that way.”*

B. *He said to her, "Let him be. He concurs with the theory of his master."*

- IV.1** A. **Nonetheless they state: [On the Sabbath] a teacher sees [by the light of a lamp] where the children are reading, but he does not read:**
- B. *But didn't you say in the first clause, a teacher sees? Isn't that so as to read? [What can the phrase, but he does not read, possibly mean?]*
- C. No, it is to supervise the beginnings of the sections.
- D. And so said Rabbah bar Samuel, "But he may arrange the beginnings of the sections."
- E. But may he not arrange the entirety of the section? **[13A]** *Then it has been objected: Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel says, "School children would arrange the sections and would recite them by the light of a lamp" [T. Shab. 1:12]!*
- F. *If you wish, I shall say, this refers to the heads of the sections, and if you wish, I shall say, children are in an exceptional situation, because, with the fear of the master upon them, they won't end up tilting the lamp.*

- V.1** A. **Similarly: A male Zab should not eat a meal with a female Zab, because it leads to transgression.**
- B. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. **R. Simeon b. Eleazar says, "Come and see the extent to which observance of purity has spread through Israel. For we have not learned in the Mishnah: One who is clean should not eat with an unclean woman, but only: A male afflicted with flux should not eat with a female afflicted with flux, because of the possibility of its leading to transgression.**
- D. **"Along these same lines, a person afflicted with flux uncleanness who keeps the cultic cleanness rules at home should not eat with a similar person who does not, lest he lead the latter to associate with him" [T. Shab. 1:14].**

- V.2** A. *So if he does associate with him, what difference does it make? But rather, read it as follows: Lest he feed him unclean things.*
- B. *So can't a person afflicted with flux who observes cultic cleanness eat unclean food?*
- C. Said Abbaye, "It is a precautionary decree, lest he give him food that is not properly tithed."

- D. Raba said, “Most common folk do give tithes, but it is a precautionary decree, lest he visit him regularly and feed him unclean things when he is in a state of cleanness.”

### V.3

- A. *The question was raised:* What is the law concerning a menstruating woman’s sleeping with her husband, she in her garment, he in his?
- B. Said R. Joseph, “*Come and take note: ‘Fowl may be served up on the table together with cheese, but it may not be eaten with it,’ according to the House of Shammai. And the House of Hillel say, ‘It may neither be served up with it nor eaten with it’* [M. **Ed. 5:2B-C**].” [The answer here, too, is no.]
- C. *But that case is exceptional, since there is no counter-indication of what to do, but here, the couple will restrain another. And it stands to reason that a case in which there is contrary opinion is exceptional, for there is the further clause of the same: Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel says, “Two guests eat on one table, this one meat, and that one cheese, and they do not scruple”* [M. **Hul. 8:2C**].
- D. *Now hasn’t it been said in that connection:* Said R. Hanin bar Ammi said Samuel, “That rule has been repeated only in a case in which they don’t know one another, but if they know one another, they are forbidden to do so.” *Here, too, it is a case in which they know one another.*
- E. *But how are the cases comparable? There we may have separate viewpoints but no distinguishing object on the table to keep them from sharing one another’s food, but here there are both distinct viewpoints but also a distinguishing feature [the requirement that they not touch one another].*
- F. *There are those who say, Come and take note: Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel says, “Two guests eat on one table, this one meat, and that one cheese, and they do not scruple”* [M. **Hul. 8:2C**]. *And it has been said in that connection:* Said R. Hanin bar Ammi said Samuel, “That rule has been repeated only in a case in which they don’t know one another, but if they know one another, they are forbidden to do so.” *Here, too, it is a case in which they know one another.*
- G. *There we may have separate viewpoints but no distinguishing object on the table to keep them from sharing one another’s food, but here there are both distinct viewpoints but also a distinguishing feature [the requirement that they not touch one another].*

- H. *Come and take note: Similarly: A male Zab should not eat a meal with a female Zab, because it leads to transgression.*
- I. *Here, too, there may be separate viewpoints but no distinguishing object on the table to keep them from sharing one another's food.*
- J. *Come and take note: "And has not eaten upon the mountains, neither has lifted up his eyes to the idols of the house of Israel, neither has defiled his neighbor's wife, neither has come near to a woman who is menstruating" (Eze. 18: 6) — the verse thus treats as comparable one's wife who is menstruating and the wife of his neighbor. Just as in the case of the wife of his neighbor, even if he is wearing his garment and she hers, it is forbidden to sleep together, so in the case of his wife when she is menstruating, even if he is wearing his garment and she hers, it is forbidden to sleep together.*
- K. *That's decisive proof.*

**V.4** A. *Now this differs from what R. Pedat said, for said R. Pedat, "The Torah has declared forbidden close approach only in the case of incest: 'None of you shall approach to any that is near of kin to him to uncover their nakedness' (Lev. 18: 6)."*

**V.5** A. *When Ulla would come home from the household of the master, he would kiss his sisters on their hand.*

B. *Some say, "On their breast."*

C. *He then contradicts what he himself has said, for said Ulla, "Even merely coming near is forbidden, as we say to the Nazirite, 'Go, go around about, but do not even come near the vineyard.'"*

**V.6** A. *It was set forth as a Tannaite statement by the household of Elijah:*

B. **There is the case of a man who studied much Scripture, repeated much Mishnah, extensively served as a disciple of sages, but died when his years were only half done, and his wife took his tefillin and made the circuit of synagogues and schoolhouses, crying and weeping, saying to them, "My lords, it is written in the Torah, "For it is your life and the length of your days" (Deu. 30:20).**

C. **"On what account did my husband, who studied much Scripture, repeated much Mishnah, [13B] extensively served as a disciple of sages, die when his years were only half done?"**

D. No one knew what to answer her. But one time Elijah, of blessed memory, was appointed to deal with her, saying to her, “My daughter, on what account are you crying and weeping?”

E. She said to him, “My lord, my husband studied much Scripture, repeated much Mishnah, extensively served as a disciple of sages, but died when his years were only half done.”

F. He said to her, “When you were in your period, on the first three days of your period, what was your practice?”

G. She said to him, “My lord, God forbid, he never touched me, even with his little finger. But this is what he said to me, ‘Do not touch a thing, perhaps you may come into doubt about something.’”

H. “As to the last days of your period, what was your practice?”

I. She said to him, “My lord, I ate with him, drank with him, and in my clothing slept with him in the same bed, and, while his flesh touched mine, he never had the intention of any inappropriate action [such as sexual relations before the period had fully ended].”

J. He said to her, “Blessed be the Omnipresent, who killed him. For so is it written in the Torah: ‘To a woman during the unclean time of her menstrual period you shall not draw near’ (Lev. 18:17)” [The Fathers According to R. Nathan II:I.2].

K. *When R. Dimi came*, he said, “It was a wide bed.”

L. In the West they said, “Said R. Isaac bar Joseph, ‘There was an apron interposed between them.’”

### 1:4

- A. These are some of the laws which they stated in the upper room of Hananiah b. Hezekiah b. Gurion when they went up to visit him.
- B. They took a vote, and the House of Shammai outnumbered the House of Hillel.
- C. And eighteen rules did they decree on that very day.

- I.1** A. *Said Abbayye to R. Joseph, “Is the language of our Mishnah paragraph **these are**, or **and these are**? Is the sense, **and these are**, that is, inclusive of the foregoing, or is it, **these are**, solely with reference to what is to come?”*

- B. *Come and take note of the reading, And [on the Sabbath] one should not search his clothes [for fleas], or read by the light of a lamp, and these are some of the laws which they stated in the upper room of Hananiah b. Hezekiah b. Gurion when they went up to visit him.*
- C. *That proves that the correct reading of the Mishnah paragraph is, and these are.*
- D. *Sure does.*

**I.2** A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. Who wrote the Scroll That Lists Days on Which It Is Forbidden to Fast? It was Hananiah b. Hezekiah and his colleagues, who valued the days on which they were released from troubles.

**I.3** A. Said Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel, “We, too, value the days on which they were released from troubles. But what can we do? For if we were to come to write them down, we couldn’t do it” [since every day marks the release from some trouble (Abraham)].

- B. Another consideration: Nothing bothers a fool.
- C. Another consideration: A corpse doesn’t feel the scalpel.
- D. Is that so? But didn’t R. Isaac say, “The worm causes pain for the corpse as much as does a needle in the flesh of a living person, as it is said, ‘But his flesh grieves for him and his soul mourns over him’ (Job. 14:22)”?
- E. *Say:* The dead flesh of a living person doesn’t feel the scalpel.

**I.4** A. Said R. Judah [said Rab], “That man is to be remembered for good, by name of Hanina b. Hezekiah, for if it were not for his efforts, the book of Ezekiel would have been hidden away, for what he says contradicts the teachings of the Torah.

- B. “What did he do to save the situation? He took up three hundred barrels of oil with him to an upper room and stayed there until he had ironed out all the problems.”

**II.1** A. **And eighteen rules did they decree on that very day:**

- B. *What are the eighteen rules?*
- C. *It is in line with what we have learned in the Mishnah: These render heave-offering unfit: He who eats food unclean in the first remove; and he who eats food unclean in the second remove; and he who drinks unclean liquid; he whose head and the greater part of whose body enters drawn*



water; and one who was clean on whose head and the greater part of whose body three logs of drawn water fall; and a scroll, and hands, and a person who has completed his rites of purification and awaits sunset to be completely clean [a tebul yom]; and food and utensils which have been made unclean by [unclean] liquids [M. **Zab. 5:12**].

**II.2** A. *Who is the Tannaite authority who stands behind the rule: He who eats food unclean in the first remove; and he who eats food unclean in the second remove renders the heave-offering unfit [14A] but doesn't impart to it uncleanness?*

B. Said Rabbah bar bar Hannah, "It is R. Joshua, *for we have learned in the Mishnah: R. Eliezer says, '(1) He who eats food unclean in the first remove is unclean in the first remove; (2) [he who eats] food unclean in the second remove is unclean in the second remove; (3) [he who eats] food unclean in the third remove is unclean in the third remove.'* R. Joshua says, '(1) He who eats food unclean in the first remove and food unclean in the second remove is unclean in the second remove; (2) [he who eats food] unclean in the third remove is unclean in the second remove so far as Holy Things are concerned; (3) and is not unclean in the second remove so far as heave-offering is concerned — in the case of unconsecrated food which is prepared in conditions of cleanness appropriate to heave-offering' [M. **Toh. 2:2**]."

**II.3** A. *As to one who eats food in the first or second remove from uncleanness, how come rabbis decreed uncleanness in that case? Because sometimes one may eat unclean unconsecrated food, but then take a drink of liquid in the status of heave-offering and put it in his mouth and so render the liquid unfit.*

B. *As to one who drinks unclean liquids, how come rabbis have decreed uncleanness in that case? Because sometimes one may be drinking unclean liquid and may take food in the status of heave-offering and put it in his mouth, and so invalidate the other.*

C. *Big deal — that's the same thing as before!*

D. *What might you otherwise have supposed? The one is common, the other not [so rabbis would not make a decree for*

*the second matter]? So we are informed that that is not the case.*

**II.4 A. He whose head and the greater part of whose body enters drawn water:** *How come rabbis decreed uncleanness in that case?*

B. Said R. Bibi said R. Assi, “For to begin with they would immerse in cave water that was collected together and [while valid for purification purposes,] fetid, and they would then pour over themselves drawn water. But when they began to treat this as a fixed requirement, rabbis made a decree that such water is unclean.”

**II.5 A. What is the meaning of a fixed requirement?**

B. Said Abbaye, “It is that they would say, ‘These are not what effect purification, but these and those together effect purification.’”

C. Said to him Raba, “So what difference does it make? One way or the other they were immersing in valid water!”

D. Rather, said Raba, “They would say, ‘These are not what effect purification, but only those waters are what effect purification.’”

**II.6 A. And one who was clean on whose head and the greater part of whose body three logs of drawn water fall:** *How come rabbis decreed uncleanness in that case?*

B. *If it weren't for this, the other decree wouldn't stand up.*

**II.7 A. And the holy scroll:** *How come rabbis decreed uncleanness in that case?*

B. Said R. Mesharshayya, “Because to begin with they would put away food in the status of heave-offering along with a scroll of the Torah, saying, ‘This is holy and that's holy.’ But when they saw that it brought about a waste of food, rabbis decreed uncleanness for the scrolls.”

**II.8 A. And hands:** [Supply: *How come rabbis decreed uncleanness in that case?*]

B. Because hands fidget [Abraham: they are apt to touch things; hence unless the owner takes care that they not touch an unclean object after he washed them, they are treated as unclean].

C. *A Tannaite statement*: Also hands that have touched a holy scroll invalidate heave-offering, *in line with what R. Parnakh said*. For said R. Parnakh said R. Yohanan, “He who when naked holds a scroll of the Torah will be buried naked, too.”

D. Naked?! *Do you imagine, naked?!*

E. Rather, said R. Zira, “Naked, meaning, without religious duties to his credit.”

F. *Do you imagine*, without religious duties to his credit!?

G. *Rather, say*, “Naked: Without credit for that particular religious duty.”

**II.9** A. *Which of them did rabbis decree to begin with? Should I say that it was that one [that hands are unclean in general] that they decreed first of all? [14B] Then once they enacted that one, why did they need the other one too?*

B. *So it must have been the latter that was decreed to begin with, then the other was decreed in regard to the hands as well.*

**II.10 A. And the tebul yom:**

B. *But the uncleanness of the one who has immersed on the selfsame day derives from the Torah, for it is written, “And when the sun is down, he shall be clean, and afterwards he shall eat Holy Things” (Lev. 22: 7)!*

C. *Remove from the list: And the tebul yom.*

**II.11 A. And food which have been made unclean by [unclean] liquids:**

B. *What kind of unclean liquid? Should we say it was liquid made unclean by a dead creeping thing? Then the law derives from the Torah and not from rabbinical decree, since it is written, “And all drink that may be drunk in every such utensil shall be unclean” (Lev. 11:34).*

C. Rather, it is through water that is made unclean by reason of the hands, and it is a decree on account of liquid that derives from uncleanness by reason of a dead creeping thing.

**II.12 A. And utensils which have been made unclean by [unclean] liquids:**

B. *What kind of unclean liquid? Should we say it was liquid deriving from a person afflicted by flux? But that derives from the Torah, as it is written, “And if the person unclean with flux spit upon a clean person, he shall wash his clothes and bathe himself in water” (Lev. 15: 8) — what is in the hand of a clean person I have declared unclean for you.*

C. *Rather, it refers to liquid that is unclean by reason of contact with a dead creeping thing, and it is a decree on account of the liquid that exudes from a person afflicted with flux.*

**II.13 A. And hands:**

B. *Well, then, did the disciples of Shammai and Hillel make that decree? Shammai and Hillel themselves made that decree, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority: Yosé b. Yoezer of Seridah and Yosé b. Yohanan of Jerusalem decreed uncleanness on the land of the gentiles and on glassware. Simeon b. Shatah ordained the requirement of a marriage settlement for a wife and made a decree concerning uncleanness for metal utensils. Shammai and Hillel decreed uncleanness on the hands. And should you say that the meaning is, Shammai and his party and Hillel and his party, didn't R. Judah say Samuel said, “Eighteen matters did they issue as decrees, and concerning eighteen matters they differed,” but Hillel and Shammai differed in only three passages. For said R. Huna, “In three passages they differed, and no more.” And should you propose, on account of their rule, they made a decree to suspend the status of things touched by the hands, and on account of the decree of their disciples, they made the decree to burn such food, hasn't Ilfa said, “To begin with, the decree involving hands meant that food touched by them was to be burned”?*

C. *Rather, Hillel and Shammai came along and made the decree, but people didn't accept it from them, and then their disciples came along and made the decree, and people accepted it from them.*

D. *Still, in point of fact, it was Solomon who made that decree, for said R. Judah said Samuel, “At the moment that Solomon issued the decree concerning the making of the symbolic fusion meal and the*

washing of the hands, an echo came forth and said, “My son, if your heart be wise, my heart shall be glad, even mine” (Pro. 23:15), and “My son, be wise and make my heart glad, that I may answer him who reproaches me” (Pro. 27:11).”

E. *Solomon came along [15A] and made the decree in regard to Holy Things, and they [Hillel and Shammai] came along and made the decree also in respect to heave-offering.*

**II.14** A. *Reverting to the body of the text:* R. Judah said Samuel said, “Eighteen matters did they issue as decrees, and concerning eighteen matters they differed” —

B. *But hasn't it been taught on Tannaite authority:* They came to an agreement?

C. That day they differed, the next day came to an agreement.

**II.15** A. *Reverting to the body of the text:* Said R. Huna, “In three passages they differed” —

B. Shammai says, “[Dough which is made] from a qab [of flour is liable] to a dough-offering [Num. 15:20].” And Hillel says, “[Dough made] from two qabs.” And sages say, “It is not in accord with the opinion of this party nor in accord with the opinion of that party, but: [Dough made] from a qab and a half of flour is liable to the dough-offering.” After the measures were expanded in size [so six Jerusalem logs were now deemed five new logs], they ruled: Dough made from five fourths of a qab is liable. R. Yosé says, “[If it is made from exactly] five, it is exempt. [If it is made from] five and a bit more, it is liable” [M. Ed. 1:2]

C. *And further?*

D. Hillel says, “A full hin [three qabs] of drawn water [poured into a pool lacking forty seahs of suitable water] invalidates an immersion pool” (but a person is liable to say a teaching in the language of his master) and Shammai says, “Nine qabs.” And sages say, “It is not in accord with the opinion of this party or in accord with the opinion of that party.” But: Two weavers came from the dung gate in Jerusalem and gave testimony in the name of Shemaiah

and Abtalion: “Three logs [= 36 qabs] of drawn water invalidate an immersion pool.” And sages confirmed their report [M. Ed. 1:3].

E. *And further?*

F. Shammai says, “For all women it is sufficient [to be regarded as unclean by reason of menstruation] from the time [of their first having a flow].” Hillel says, “[It is retroactive] from the examination [at which the blood was found] to the examination [last made, before the blood was found], and even for a number of days.” And sages say, “[The rule is] not in accord with the opinion of this party nor in accord with the opinion of that party, but [a woman is regarded as having been unclean only] during the preceding twenty-four hours [when] this lessens the period from the present examination to the last examination, [and she is held to have been unclean only] during the period from examination to examination [when] this lessens the period of twenty-four hours” [M. Ed. 1:1].

G. *And aren't there any more? Lo, there is this one:*

H. Shammai says not to lay on hands. Hillel says to lay on hands [M. Hag. 2:2G].

I. *When R. Huna made his statement, it was with reference to a case in which there is no dispute on the part of their masters over and above theirs [but here they are part of a chain of disputes].*

J. *Well, there's this one:* He who gleanes grapes for the wine press — Shammai says, “The grapes have been rendered susceptible to uncleanness.” Hillel says, “The grapes have not been rendered susceptible to uncleanness.” But Hillel concurred with Shammai.

K. *That's an exception, because there Hillel was shut up by Shammai.*

**II.16** A. [Supply: *Reverting to the body of the text:* ] Yosé b. Yoezer of Seridah and Yosé b. Yohanan of Jerusalem decreed uncleanness on the land of the gentiles and on glassware —

B. *Lo, it was the rabbis of “the eighty years” who made that decree. For said R. Kahana, “When R. Ishmael b. R. Yosé fell ill, Rabbi sent word to him, ‘Tell us two or three of the things that you said to us in your father’s name.’*

C. *“He said word to them, ‘This is what father said: “One hundred and eighty years before the house of the Temple was destroyed, the wicked kingdom took over the dominion over Israel; eighty years prior to the destruction of the Temple the decree was made that the lands of the peoples around the Land of Israel and utensils made out of glass were subject to uncleanness, forty years prior to the destruction of the Temple the sanhedrin went out into exile from the Temple and held its sessions in a stall [on the Temple mount].”””*

D. *For what practical law does such information serve?*

E. Said R. Isaac bar Abdimi, *“It is to indicate that they did not judge cases involving extrajudicial penalties.”*

F. *Extrajudicial penalties do you say?* But did not R. Judah say in the name of Rab, *“Now may that man be remembered for good, and R. Judah b. Baba was his name, for if it were not for him the laws involving extrajudicial penalties would have been forgotten in Israel”?*

G. *Now should you say that [the two Yosés] also lived during those eighty years, hasn’t it been taught on Tannaite authority: Hillel, Simeon [his son], Gamaliel and Simeon [his son] ruled as patriarchs for one hundred years prior to the Temple’s destruction? And Yosé b. Yoezer of Seridah and Yosé b. Yosé of Jerusalem were many years prior to them!*

H. **[15B]** *Rather, they came and made the decree in regard to a clod of earth of gentile lands, that heave-offering that had touched it was to be burned as unclean without doubt, but they made no decree at all in regard to the contained air space of that territory, while the rabbis of the eighty years came and decreed that the status of heave-offering affected by the*

*contained air space of gentile territory was to be kept in suspense.*

*I. Does that bear the implication that the original decree concerned burning [the heave-offering so affected]? But didn't Ilfa say, "To begin with, the decree involving hands meant that food touched by them was to be burned"? So it follows that the original decree made reference to burning only by reason of the uncleanness of hands, but it made no reference to burning heave-offering on account of contamination on any other count!*

*J. Rather, they came along and made a decree to suspend the status of what had been in touch with a clod of dirt of gentile land, and they decreed nothing at all in regards the contained air space of gentile land; then the rabbis of the eighty years came along and decreed that what was affected by the clod of dirt should be burned, and the status of heave-offering affected by the contained air space was to be kept in suspense.*

*K. Nonetheless, as a matter of simple fact, that was decreed in Usha [centuries later], for we have learned in the Mishnah:*

**On account of six matters of doubt do they burn heave-offering: Concerning a doubt in regard to a grave area; and concerning a doubt in regard to dirt which comes from abroad; because of a doubt concerning the clothing of an am ha'ares [who does not observe cultic cleanness in eating everyday food]; and because of a doubt concerning utensils which were found; because of a doubt concerning drops of spit which were found; because of a doubt concerning human urine that was nearby the urine of a beast — because of certainly touching them, which is a matter of doubt in respect to their [imparting] uncleanness, they burn the heave-offering. R. Yosé says, "Even because of a doubt about having touched them in the private domain." And sages say, "[Because of a doubt about having touched them] in the private domain, they leave it in suspense. And [if the matter of doubt took place] in the public domain, it is clean" [M. [Toh. 4:5](#)]. And said**



Ulla, “The disposition of these six matters of doubt was ordained in Usha.”

*L. Rather: They came along and made a decree to suspend the status of heave-offering affected by a clod of gentile dirt, but made no decree at all as regards that which has been affected by the contained air space of gentile land, and the rabbis of the eighty years came and decreed that in both instances the status of the produce was to be held in suspense; then they came along at Usha and made a decree to burn what was affected by a clod of earth, but, as to what was affected by the air space, they left the matter as is.*

**II.17** A. *As to glassware, how come rabbis made a decree that glassware is subject to uncleanness?*

B. Said R. Yohanan said R. Simeon b. Laqish, “Since the beginning of the process of making them is with sand, rabbis assigned it to the status of earthenware.”

C. *But by that reasoning, like earthenware, they should not be subject to the purification process of an immersion pool, but then how come we have learned in the Mishnah: These interpose in utensils: (1) pitch, (2) and the gum of myrrh. On glass utensils — whether inside or outside [M. Miq. 9:5A-C]? [It follows that a purification process in an immersion pool takes effect for glass utensils.]*

D. *Here with what case do we deal?* It was a glass utensil that had a hole, filled by molten lead, *in line with the theory of R. Meir, who maintained*, “The status of an object entirely depends upon what holds it together” [and so the status of the glass utensil in this case is the same as that of a metal one, which is purified in an immersion pool]. *For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:* As to the status of glassware that was perforated and mended with molten lead — said Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel, “R. Meir declares it susceptible to uncleanness, and sages declare it insusceptible.”

E. *Well, then, by the same reasoning [that they are classified as earthenware utensils] [16A] they should not be subject to uncleanness through what touches their outer parts, but, in that case, how come we have learned in the Mishnah: Vessels of wood, and vessels of leather, and vessels of bone, and vessels of glass: When they are*

flat, they are clean, and when they form receptacles, they are [susceptible of becoming] unclean. [If] they are broken, they are clean. [If] one went and made [new] vessels, they receive uncleanness from now and henceforth. [As to] vessels of clay and vessels of alum crystal, their [capacity to receive] uncleanness is alike. (1) They [both] become unclean and convey uncleanness by [their] contained air space, and they impart uncleanness from their outer sides. (2) But they do not contract uncleanness from their outer parts. And breaking them is purifying them [M. Kel. 2:1]? *So it is only earthenware utensils and alum utensils that are alike in respect to how they contract uncleanness, but nothing else [but glassware should share the same trait, if Simeon b. Laqish is correct]!*

F. *Say:* Since, if they are broken, they can be repaired, *rabbis treated them in the category of metal utensils.*

G. *Well, then, if they are comparable to metal utensils, when repaired they should revert to the original uncleanness as do metal utensils, for we have learned in the Mishnah: Metal utensils: Their flat [parts] and their receptacles are unclean. [If] they have been broken, they have been purified. [If] one went and made of them [new] vessels, they have returned to their former uncleanness. Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel says, “[They return] not to every uncleanness but [only] to the uncleanness of the soul [corpse uncleanness]” [M. Kel. 11:1]!* *By contrast, in respect to glassware, we have learned in the Mishnah: Vessels of wood, and vessels of leather, and vessels of bone, and vessels of glass: When they are flat, they are clean, and when they form receptacles, they are [susceptible of becoming] unclean. [If] they are broken, they are clean. [If] one went and made [new] vessels, they receive uncleanness from now and henceforth [M. Kel. 2:1]! That is to say, from now and henceforth, but retroactively, not at all.*

H. *The uncleanness affecting glassware derives from the decree of rabbis, and the reversion to a prior uncleanness likewise derives from the ruling of rabbis. In respect to uncleanness deriving from the authority of the Torah, rabbis were prepared to impose retrospective uncleanness upon an existing, Torah based, uncleanness, but as regards an uncleanness that to begin with is defined only on*

*rabbinical authority, rabbis were not prepared to impose retrospective uncleanness.*

I. *Well, one way or the other, in flat form, glassware should be unclean, since flat metal utensils are declared by the law of the Torah to be susceptible to uncleanness!*

J. *Rabbis made a distinction in that case, so as not to burn on account of such utensils heave-offering and Holy Things. [Such things should be burned when made by an uncleanness defined by rabbis only in the six cases of doubt listed above (Freedman).]*

K. [16B] *R. Ashi said, "In point of fact they are in the same category as earthenware utensils, and as to your challenge, that, in that case, they should not be affected by uncleanness that touches their outer parts, since in this case the inside is visible as the outside, [that leniency does not apply]."*

**II.18** A. *"Simeon b. Shatah ordained the requirement of a marriage settlement for a wife and made a decree concerning uncleanness for metal utensils":*

B. *But the fact that metal utensils are subject to uncleanness derives from the Torah, for it is written, "Howbeit the gold and silver — anything that can stand in fire — you shall pass through fire and it shall be clean..." (Num. 31:22). It was necessary to make such a decree with respect to the prior uncleanness [indicating that when repaired they revert to that prior status], for said R. Judah said Rab, "There was the incident involving Shalsion, the Queen, who made a banquet for her son, but all her utensils were made unclean, so she had them broken and gave them to the goldsmith; he melted them down and made new utensils of them. Then sages said, 'They revert to their prior status of uncleanness.'" How come? They wanted to establish a protective fence to make sure that the rite of purification through the water of separation [the purification rite for corpse uncleanness described in Num. 19] would not fall into desuetude.*

C. *Well, that poses no problem from the perspective of him who has said that sages ruled in this regard not for all forms of uncleanness but only for the uncleanness that comes from corpse contamination, [only corpse uncleanness would be revived, since the cited verse speaks of uncleanness deriving from the dead]. But from the*

*perspective of him who has said that uncleanness reverts when the metal utensil is repaired, no matter its source, what is to be said in explanation of the ruling?*

D. Said Abbayye, “It was a precautionary decree, lest the hole that damages the utensil and so removes it from uncleanness might not be so large as to meet the standard that renders the object useless and therefore no longer susceptible to uncleanness.”

E. Raba said, “It was a precautionary decree, lest people say that immersion on that very day will serve to purify the object” [while immersion serves only to ready the object for cleanness, which takes place only when the sun sets, making a hole and repairing the object would permit reuse immediately; people might then see such a process and suppose that it had been immersed, and so immersion would purify the object on the selfsame day and not only after sunset completed the process].

*F. What’s at issue between them?*

*G. At issue between them is a case in which the smith recast the object [Abbayye’s consideration applies; maybe a small hole would have been enough; Raba’s reason is not pertinent, since it is obvious that the object is a new one (Freedman)].*

**II.19** A. *Any more enactments [among the eighteen]?*

- B. *The following, which we have learned in the Mishnah: **He who leaves utensils under the waterspout — all the same are large utensils and small utensils — and even utensils made of dung, of stone, and of dirt — it [the water] renders the immersion pool unfit. All the same is the one who leaves and the one who forgets, in accord with the words of the House of Shammai. And the House of Hillel declare clean in the case of the one who forgets. Said R. Meir, “They took a vote and the House of Shammai outnumbered the House of Hillel. And they [the Shammites] agree in the case of the one who forgets [not under the spout but] in the courtyard, that it is clean.” Said R. Yosé, “Still the dispute stands in its place” [M. **Miq. 4:1**].***
- C. *Said R. Mesharshayya, “Said a member of the household of a master, ‘All concur that if one left them there when it was clouding over — the utensils purified in the immersion pool are unclean; if he put them there when the clouds were dispersing, all concur that they are clean. Where there is a*

difference is a case in which he put them there when it was clouding over, but then the clouds dispersed, and then the clouds gathered again. One authority holds that the initial intentionality is nullified, the other, that it wasn't."

- D. *Now, from the perspective of R. Yosé, who has maintained, **Still the dispute stands in its place, there are fewer than eighteen.***
- E. Said R. Nahman bar Isaac, "Also on that day they made the rule that Samaritan women are classified as unclean with menstrual uncleanness from their cradles."

**II.20** A. *Any more enactments [among the eighteen]?*

- B. *The following, which we have learned in the Mishnah: **All movables bring the uncleanness [as tents] when they are as thick as an ox goad. Said R. Tarfon, [17A] "May I ruin my sons, that this is a ruined law, which the hearer heard and erred, that: The farmer passes [by the tomb] and the ox goad is on his shoulder, and one side of it overshadowed the tomb, and they declared him unclean, because [of the rule governing] utensils which overshadow the corpse."** Said R. Aqiba, "I shall repair it so that the words of sages may endure. Thus: **All movables bring the uncleanness on the man who carries them if they are thick as an ox goad, and on themselves if they are of any measure at all, and on another man and utensils if they are a square handbreadth**" [M. **Oh. 16:1**]. And said R. Yannai, "The goad of which they have spoken is a handbreadth not in thickness but in circumference, and they made this law as regards its circumference on account of its thickness." [Freedman: If its thickness is a handbreadth, it induces uncleanness of seven days by the law of the Torah; sages extended this to the former case to prevent confusion, and this is one of the eighteen enactments.]*
- C. *But from the perspective of R. Tarfon, who said, "**May I ruin my sons, that this is a ruined law, which the hearer heard and erred,**" there are less than eighteen enactments!*
- D. Said R. Nahman bar Isaac, "Also on that day they made the rule that Samaritan women are classified as unclean with menstrual uncleanness from their cradles." *And in the other question [putting utensils under a spout] he concurs with R. Meir.*

**II.21** A. *Any more enactments [among the eighteen]?*

- B. He who gleanes grapes for the wine press — Shammai says, "The grapes have been rendered susceptible to uncleanness." Hillel says, "The grapes have not

been rendered susceptible to uncleanness.” But Hillel concurred with Shammai.

- C. Said Hillel to Shammai, “How come grapes have to be vintaged in a state of cultic cleanness but olives don’t have to be gathered in a state of cultic cleanness?”
- D. He said to him, “So if you get me really mad, I’ll make a decree of uncleanness also in the matter of gathering olives, too.”
- E. They plunged a sword into the schoolhouse, saying, “Let anyone come in who wants, but no one is going to get out of here,” and on that day, Hillel sat humble before Shammai like just another disciple. **And that day was as hard for Israel as the day on which the golden calf was made [T. Shab. 1:16B].**
- F. *Well, Shammai and Hillel made this decree, but they wouldn’t take it from them, and then their disciples came along and made the same decree, and they took it from them [so it’s one of the eighteen decrees now].*

G. *Anyhow, what’s the operative consideration?*

H. Said Zeiri said R. Hanina, “It was a decree against the possibility of vintaging the grapes in unclean baskets.”

I. *Well, that poses no problem to him who holds that a unclean utensil brings the exuding liquid under consideration [and so renders it able to impart susceptibility to uncleanness]. But from the perspective of him who has said that an unclean utensil does not bring exuding liquid under consideration, [for the grape juice that exudes in the basket is not wanted, the owner would prefer it not go to waste, and if the owner doesn’t want a fluid, the fluid does not impart susceptibility to uncleanness], what is to be said?*

J. Rather, said Zeiri said R. Hanina, “It is a precautionary decree, lest he vintage the grapes in baskets lined with pitch [which prevents loss of the fluid, so the owner doesn’t care about its exuding, and consequently, it is wanted, and therefore imparts susceptibility to uncleanness].”

K. Raba said, “It is a decree on account of the clusters that cleave tightly” [Freedman: these have to be separated by force, causing juice to spurt out; the farmer does that himself, so the juice makes the grapes susceptible to uncleanness; there is then a preventing measure, extending this consideration to all exuding juice].

L. For said R. Nahman said Rabbah bar Abbuha, “Sometimes someone goes to his vineyard to find out whether the grapes are ready for vintaging, and he takes a bunch of grapes to squeeze it, and sprinkles juice on the grapes, and at the time of vintaging the grapes, the moisture is still dripping on them.”

**II.22** A. *Any more enactments [among the eighteen]?*

- B. Said [17B] Tabi the hunter said Samuel, “Also that the produce of food in the status of heave-offering is itself in the status of heave-offering was enacted on that day, too.”
- C. *How come?*
- D. Said R. Hanina, “It is a precautionary decree, on account of clean heave-offering in the possession of an Israelite” [so that he won’t hold on to produce in that status but will hand it over to a priest, since it can produce nothing he can keep anyhow].
- E. *Said Raba, “If people are suspect on that account, then to begin with they won’t designate heave-offering anyhow; he can assign a single grain of wheat to serve as heave-offering for the whole, in Samuel’s view, and since he doesn’t do it in such a niggardly way, he is certainly regarded as reliable.”*
- F. Rather, said Raba, “It is a precautionary decree on account of unclean heave-offering in the priest’s domain, to make sure he doesn’t hold on to it and be led to sin.”

**II.23** A. *Any more enactments [among the eighteen]?*

- B. *Said R. Hiyya bar Abba in the name of Ulla, “Also: The rule, **He who was overtaken by darkness on the road gives his purse to a gentile** [M. Shab. 24:1A], was enacted on that day as well.”*

**II.24** A. *Any more enactments [among the eighteen]?*

- B. Said Bali said Abimi of Sanvatah, “The decrees against gentile bread, oil, wine, and women all are among the eighteen decrees.”

**II.25** A. *That poses no problem from the perspective of R. Meir, but from the view of R. Yosé, there are only seventeen.*

B. *There is the one of R. Aha bar Adda, for said R. Aha bar Adda said R. Isaac, “They made the decree concerning their bread because of their oil, their oil because of their wine.”*

C. *What’s the sense of the statement, concerning their bread because of their oil? How is the prohibition of oil weightier than the*

*prohibition of their bread? [Was there reason to prohibit their oil more than to prohibit their bread?]*

D. *Say:* They made the decree concerning their bread and their oil, their oil because of their wine, and against their wine on account of their daughters, and against their daughters on account of something else, and they decreed against something else on account of the other thing.

E. *What's the something else?*

F. Said R. Nahman bar Isaac, "They decreed that a gentile child imparts uncleanness that is in the status of flux uncleanness, so that Israelite children won't get into the habit of playing with him by reason of sodomy."

G. *If so, from R. Meir's perspective, now there are nineteen!*

H. *Food and drink made unclean by liquid he treats as a single item.*

### 1:5

- A. The House of Shammai say, "They do not [on Friday afternoon] soak ink, dyestuffs, or vetches, unless there is sufficient time for them to be [fully] soaked while it is still day."
- B. And the House of Hillel permit.

### 1:6

- A. The House of Shammai say, "They do not put bundles of [wet] flax into the oven, unless there is time for them to steam off while it is still day."
- B. "And [they do not put] wool into the cauldron, unless there is sufficient time for it to absorb the color [while it is still day]."
- C. And the House of Hillel permit.
- D. The House of Shammai say, "They do not spread out nets for wild beasts, fowl, or fish, unless there is sufficient time for them to be caught while it is still day."
- E. And the House of Hillel permit.

### 1:7

- A. The House of Shammai say, "They do not sell [anything] to a gentile or bear a burden with him,
- B. "and they do not lift up a burden onto his back,



- C. “unless there is sufficient time for him to reach a nearby place [while it is still day].”
- D. And the House of Hillel permit.

1:8

- A. The House of Shammai say, “They do not give hides to a [gentile] tanner,
- B. “or clothing to a gentile laundryman,
- C. “unless there is sufficient time for them to be done while it is still day.”
- D. And in the case of all of them,
- E. the House of Hillel permit, while [18A] the sun is still shining.

1:9

- A. Said Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel, “The household of father had the habit of giving white clothes to a gentile laundryman three days before the Sabbath.”
- B. And these and those concur that they lay down olive press beams and wine press rollers.

- I.1**
- A. [The House of Shammai say, “They do not [on Friday afternoon] soak ink, dyestuffs, or vetches, unless there is sufficient time for them to be [fully] soaked while it is still day.” And the House of Hillel permit:] *What Tannaite authority holds that* putting water into ink is regarded as steeping it? [Freedman: The passage does not speak about kneading the ingredients, so merely pouring must be regarded as a labor forbidden on the Sabbath, otherwise there would be no controversy in respect to Friday.]
  - B. Said R. Joseph, “It is Rabbi, *for it has been taught on Tannaite authority*: ‘If one party puts in the flour and a second party puts in the water, the second party [having completed the process] is liable for having violated the Sabbath,’ the words of Rabbi. R. Yosé says, ‘He is liable only when he kneads the mixture.’”
  - C. *Said to him Abbaye, “But maybe R. Yosé takes the position that he does only in the case of flour, which requires kneading, but as to ink, which doesn’t require kneading, I might say that he should be liable forthwith.”*
  - D. “Don’t let the thought enter your mind, for it has been stated on Tannaite authority, ‘If one party puts in the ashes and another the water, the second is liable,’ the words of Rabbi. R. Yosé says, ‘He is liable only when he kneads the mixture.’”

- E. *But maybe the meaning of ashes is dirt, which does require kneading?*
- F. *But the word ashes has been taught on Tannaite authority, and the word dirt has been taught on Tannaite authority!*
- G. *But were they taught on Tannaite authority together in the same formulation? [Not at all, so they may bear the same meaning.]*

## I.2

- A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- B. **They open the irrigation channel for a vegetable patch on the eve of the Sabbath at dusk, and the patch may continue to absorb water through the Sabbath day. They put a perfume brazier under clothing, which continues to absorb the perfume all day long. They put sulphur under silver dishes on the eve of the Sabbath at dusk, and they continue to be sulphured on the Sabbath. They put eye salve on the eye or a poultice on a sore on the eve of the Sabbath at dusk, and these continue to provide healing throughout the entire Sabbath day.**
- C. **But they don't put wheat into the water driven wheels unless there is sufficient time for the wheat to be ground into flour while it is still day [T. Shab. 1:23].**

## I.3

- A. *How come?*
- B. Said Rabbah, "Because it makes an uproar."
- C. *Said to him R. Joseph, "Won't the master give as a reason, on account of the consideration of Sabbath rest for utensils? For it has been taught on Tannaite authority: 'And in all things that I have said to you, take heed' (Exo. 23:13) — this includes rest on the Sabbath for utensils."*
- D. Rather, said R. Joseph, "It is on account of the consideration of Sabbath rest for utensils."
- E. *Well, now that you have taken the view that on the basis of the Torah the House of Hillel take account of the Sabbath rest of utensils, how come they have permitted use on the Sabbath of sulphur and a perfume brazier?*
- F. *Because the utensil in which these are placed itself doesn't do any work.*
- G. *And how come they have permitted wet bundles of flax [the House of Hillel permit putting bundles of [wet] flax into the oven]?*

H. *Because there is no act of labor that is carried out, and the oven is motionless.*

I. *Well, what about the use of traps for wild beast, fowl, and fish, in which the trap actually carries out an action?*

J. *There, too, it means, with a fish hook, or a trap made with little joists [so Freedman], so that here, too, there is no concrete action.*

**I.4** A. *But now that R. Oshayya has said R. Assi said, “Who is the Tannaite authority who holds that according Sabbath rest to utensils derives from the law of the Torah? It is the House of Shammai and not the House of Hillel,” then from the viewpoint of the House of Shammai, whether or not the utensil performs an act of labor or doesn’t perform an act of labor, it is forbidden to use such an object, while, from the viewpoint of the House of Hillel, even if it performs an act of labor, it is forbidden; and now that you have maintained that from the viewpoint of the House of Shammai, even though the utensil doesn’t perform an act of labor, it is forbidden to use it on the Sabbath — then, if so [18B] why is it permitted by the House of Shammai to use a perfume brazier and a sulphur smoker?*

B. *In that case, it is lying on the ground [not in a utensil at all].*

C. *How come the House of Shammai permit use of a tank for brewing beer, a lamp, a pot, or a spit?*

D. *The owner declares them ownerless.*

**I.5** A. *Who is the Tannaite authority behind that which our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: **A woman should not fill a pot with peas and pulse and put it into the oven on the eve of the Sabbath at dusk. And if she put them in, at the end of the Sabbath they are forbidden for so long a span of time as they take to prepare. So, too, a baker must not fill a jug with water and put it into the oven on the eve of the***

**Sabbath at dusk. If he put it in, at the end of the Sabbath it is prohibited for as long as it takes to heat up on its own after the Sabbath and not from the heat derived on the Sabbath itself [T. Shab. 3:1A-C, 2A-C]?**

B. *Shall we say that this accords only with the House of Shammai and not with the House of Hillel [who make no provision for Sabbath rest for utensils]?*

C. *You may even maintain that it represents the position of the House of Hillel. For them it would be a precautionary decree, lest he stir the coals.*

D. *If so, then with reference to a perfume brazier and sulphur, there, too, let us make a precautionary decree, lest he stir the coals?*

E. *There he won't stir the coals, because if he does, the smoke will enter and do harm.*

F. *How about a precautionary decree in regard to wet bundles of flax?*

G. *There, since a draft is bad for them, he won't uncover the kettle.*

H. *How about a precautionary decree in regard to wool in the dye kettle?*

I. Said Samuel, "It's a kettle that is removed from the fire."

J. *But why not take account of the possibility that he may stir with it?*

K. *It's a kettle removed from the fire and sealed [so to stir would take an action, and someone by that point would remember that it is the Sabbath].*

**I.6** A. *Now that the master has said, "it would be a precautionary decree, lest he stir the coals," it should be permitted to put a pot containing raw food in an oven on the eve of the Sabbath before dusk. How come? It won't be fit for use*

*in the evening; so he'll ignore it and won't come and rake the coals.*

*B. Well, that poses no problem if it is well boiled [since the coals won't need raking]; if it is partly boiled, it would be forbidden. If a raw bone is thrown into it, it would be permitted [since obviously no one is going to eat the mixture until the next day].*

## **I.7**

*A. Now that the master has said that in any situation in which a draft will do damage, one won't uncover the pot, then, in the case of a kid's meat, where the oven is sealed down, there is no problem; with the meat of a buck, where the oven is not sealed well, it would be forbidden; but what about the case of the meat of a kid where the oven isn't well sealed or the meat of a buck where it is?*

*B. R. Ashi permits it, R. Jeremiah of Difti forbids it.*

*C. And from the viewpoint of R. Ashi, who permits it, what about this Tannaite statement: **They do not roast meat, onions, and eggs, unless there is time for them to be roasted while it is still day [M. 1:10A]**?*

*D. That rule pertains to a buck's meat, and an oven that is not sealed well.*

*E. Others say, "With the meat of a kid, whether the oven is well sealed or not, there is no problem; as to a buck's meat, if the oven is well sealed, there is no problem; they differ in regard to the meat of a buck if the oven is not well sealed. R. Ashi permits it, R. Jeremiah of Difti forbids it.*

F. *“And from the viewpoint of R. Ashi, who permits it, what about this Tannaite statement: **They do not roast meat, onions, and eggs, unless there is time for them to be roasted while it is still day** [M. 1:10A]?”*

G. *“That speaks of meat on the coals.”*

H. *Said Rabina, “As to raw gourd, there is no problem; since a draft is bad for it, it is in the category of the meat of a kid.”*

**II.1** A. **The House of Shammai say, “They do not sell [anything] to a gentile or bear a burden with him, and they do not lift up a burden onto his back, unless there is sufficient time for him to reach a nearby place [while it is still day].” And the House of Hillel permit:**

B. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

C. The House of Shammai say, “On the eve of the Sabbath someone should not sell an article to a gentile nor lend it to him nor lend him money nor give him a gift unless there is sufficient time for him to reach home while it is still day.”

D. And the House of Hillel say, “Sufficient time for him to reach the house nearest the city wall.”

E. R. Aqiba says, “Sufficient time for him to leave the door of the Israelite’s house before the Sabbath falls.”

F. Said R. Yosé b. R. Judah, “The statement of R. Aqiba is the same as the statement of the House of Hillel. R. Aqiba comes only to amplify the statement of the House of Hillel.”

**II.2** A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

B. The House of Shammai say, “A person should not sell his leaven to a gentile unless he knows that it will be used up prior to the Passover,” the words of the House of Shammai [sic].

C. And the House of Hillel say, “So long as it is permitted for an Israelite to eat it, it is permitted to sell it to a gentile.”

D. R. Judah says, [19A] “It is forbidden for thirty days prior to Passover to sell Babylonian preserve or any other kind of preserve.”

**II.3** A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. They put out food in the courtyard for the dog. If he took the food and went out of the courtyard, people are not obligated in that regard [e.g., to keep the dog from carrying the food into public domain].
- C. Along these lines, they put food out for a gentile in the courtyard. If he took it and went out, people are not obligated in that regard [e.g., to keep him from carrying the food into public domain].

**II.4** A. *So what do I need more than one case for? This is the same as that!*

B. *What might you have supposed? In the one case, the matter is incumbent upon a person, in the other not [for example, one is responsible for his dog, but not for a stranger]. So we are informed that that is not the case.*

**II.5** A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. A person should not rent out utensils to a gentile on the eve of the Sabbath, but he may do so on Wednesday or Thursday.
- C. Along these same lines, they do not send letters with a gentile on Friday, but on Wednesday or on Thursday it is permitted to do so.
- D. They say concerning R. Yosé the Priest, and some say, R. Yosé the Pious, that his handwriting was never found in the possession of a gentile.

**II.6** A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. They do not send letters with a gentile on Friday unless a fee is stipulated [in which case the gentile is working for himself, not for the Israelite].
- C. The House of Shammai say, "There must be sufficient time for the letter to get to the address's house prior to the Sabbath."
- D. The House of Hillel say, "Sufficient to reach the house nearest the wall of the town."

**II.7** A. But didn't he stipulate a fee?

B. *Said R. Sheshet, "This is the sense of the statement: But if a fee is not stipulated, the House of Shammai say, 'There must be sufficient time for the letter to get to the address's house prior to the Sabbath.' The House of Hillel say, 'Sufficient to reach the house nearest the wall of the town.'"*

**II.8** A. *So didn't you say to begin with, They do not send letters with a gentile?*

B. *No problem, the one involves a case in which a post office is permanently situated in the town, the other, a case in which a post office is not permanently situated there.*

**II.9** A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

B. They don't start a journey by ship less than three days prior to the Sabbath. Under what circumstances? For an optional trip. But as to a religious duty, that is acceptable.

C. "And one stipulates with the ship captain that this is on the stipulation that he will undertake Sabbath rest, even though he does not actually meet that stipulation," the words of Rabbi.

D. Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel says, "That is not necessary."

E. And from Tyre to Sidon, it is permitted to sail even on a Friday.

**II.10** A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

B. They do not undertake a siege of gentile cities less than three days prior to the Sabbath, but if they began a siege, they don't lift it.

C. And so did Shammai say, "'Until it fall' (Deu. 20:20) — even on the Sabbath."

**III.1** A. **Said Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel, "The household of father had the habit of giving white clothes to a gentile laundryman three days before the Sabbath":**

B. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

C. **Said R. Sadoq, "This was the custom of the household of Rabban Gamaliel: They would give white garments to the laundryman three days prior to the Sabbath, but colored ones even on Friday. And from their actions we have learned that it is harder to launder white ones than dyed ones" [T. *Shab. 1:22E-G*].**

**III.2** A. *Abbayye would give a colored garment to a laundry man and ask, "How much do you want for it?"*

B. *"The same as for a white one."*

C. *He said to him, "Our rabbis have already forestalled you. [This needs less work, so you get less.]"*

**III.3** A. *Said Abbayye, "When someone hands over a garment to a fuller, he should hand it over by measure and take it back by measure, for if it is more than the original measure, the fuller spoiled the garment by stretching it, and if less, by shrinking it."*



**IV.1** A. **And these and those concur that they lay down olive press beams and wine press rollers:**

- B. *What distinguishes all these other acts, in that the House of Shammai forbids them, and those pertaining to the beam of the olive press and the roller of the wine press, in which the House of Shammai don't decree against laying them down prior to the Sabbath and leaving them in place?*
- C. *In the case of those other acts, for which, if done on the Sabbath, one is liable to a sin-offering, the House of Shammai forbade doing them on Friday at dusk; but as to loading the beam of the oil press or the wine press rollers, if these are done on the Sabbath, there is no sin-offering, they did not forbid dealing with them on Sabbath eve prior to sunset.*

**IV.2** A. *Who is the Tannaite authority who holds that whatever happens entirely on its own [without human intervention] is unobjectionable [and may be allowed to proceed on the Sabbath]?*

- B. *Said R. Yosé b. R. Hanina, "It is R. Ishmael, for we have learned in the Mishnah: (1) Garlic, (2) unripe grapes, and (3) green ears of corn which one was pressing while it was still daylight [on the eve of the Sabbath] — R. Ishmael says, 'He may complete [the work] after it gets dark.' And R. Aqiba says, [19B] 'He may not complete [the work after it gets dark]' [M. Ed. 2:6B-C]."*
- C. *And R. Eleazar said, "It is R. Eleazar, for we have learned in the Mishnah: Honeycombs which one broke on the eve of the Sabbath and [their liquids] exuded on their own — they are prohibited. And R. Eleazar permits [use of the honey on the Sabbath] [M. Shab. 22:1J-K]."*

D. *Now as to the view of R. Yosé bar Hanina, how come he did not rule as does R. Eleazar?*

E. *He will say to you, "It is in that case in particular that he permits it, since to begin with it was food and now it's food. But here [with oil or wine] to begin with it was a solid food and now it's a liquid."*

F. *And R. Eleazar will say to you, But we have a tradition that even olives and grapes are permitted. For lo, when R. Hoshayya came from Nehardea, he came and brought in hand a Tannaite formulation as follows: Olives and grapes that one crushed on the eve of the Sabbath, and their juices exude on their own — they are forbidden [that is, it is forbidden to drink the juice on the Sabbath]. But R. Eleazar and R. Simeon permit.*

G. And R. Yosé b. R. Hanina?

H. *He hadn't heard that Tannaite statement.*

I. *And as to R. Eleazar, how come he did not rule as does R. Yosé bar Hanina?*

J. *He will say to you, "Wasn't it stated in that connection, 'Said Rabbah bar Hanina said R. Yohanan, "Where they lack crushing, there is no dispute; where there is a dispute, it is where they lack pounding"'; and these, too, are similar to those in that they lack crushing."*

K. R. Yosé bar Hanina gave public instruction in accord with R. Ishmael.

- IV.3** A. As to the [remnants of] oil that belongs to pressers and [oil gathered in the] mats of pressers [used for covering the olives that belonged to the workers who pressed the olives], *Rab forbade [handling it on the Sabbath], and Samuel permitted doing so.* [The issue is whether or not this is designated prior to the Sabbath for use on the Sabbath; if not, then it may not be handled on the Sabbath.]
- B. *As to coupled mattings, Rab forbids handling them, Samuel permits doing so.*
- C. *Said R. Nahman, "As to a goat kept for milk, a ewe for shearing, a fowl for eggs, oxen for ploughing, and dates for trading, Rab forbids handling them, Samuel permits doing so.*
- D. *They differ in what is subject to dispute between R. Simeon and R. Judah.* [Freedman: The owner has designated these for the stated purposes, not for eating; may he change his mind and slaughter them on festivals for food? This has to do mainly with festivals.]

**IV.4** A. *There was a disciple in Harta of Argiz who gave a practical decision in accord with R. Simeon. R. Hamnuna excommunicated him.*

B. *But don't we accept the reasoning of R. Simeon?*

C. *It was in the locale of Rab, and he should have acted appropriately.*

**IV.5** A. *Two disciples — one saved food in one utensil, the other in four or five [to prevent its being destroyed in a fire], and they differ along the same lines as Rabbah bar Zabeda and R. Huna.*

### 1:10

- A. They do not roast meat, onions, and eggs, unless there is time for them to be roasted while it is still day.
- B. They do not put bread into an oven at dusk,
- C. nor cakes on the coals,
- D. unless there is time for them to form a crust [even] on the top surface while it is still day.
- E. R. Eliezer says, “Sufficient time for its bottom surface [only] to form a crust.”

### 1:11

- A. They lower the Passover-offering into an oven at dusk [when the fourteenth of Nisan falls on a Friday].
- B. And they light the fire in the fireplace of the House of the Hearth [M. Tam. 1:12].
- C. [20A] But in the provinces, [they do so only if] there is sufficient time for the flame to catch over the larger part of [the wood].
- D. R. Judah says, “In the case of charcoal [one may light the fire if there is time for the fire to catch] any quantity [of charcoal] whatsoever.”

## I.1

- A. [Unless there is time for them to be roasted while it is still day:] So how much must the meat be roasted before the Sabbath?
- B. Said R. Eleazar said Rab, “So that it may be roasted prior to sunset as much as the sort of hen that Ben Derusai would eat [a third done].”
  - C. *So, too, it has been stated:*
  - D. R. Assi said R. Yohanan said, “Any food that is cooked to such an extent that it can have been eaten by Ben Derusai [if cooked further by a gentile] does not fall into the classification of that which has been cooked by a gentile.”
  - E. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
  - F. Hanania says, “Any food that is cooked to such an extent that it can have been eaten by Ben Derusai — it is permitted to keep it on the stove [on the Sabbath], even though it is not swept clear of cinders or sprinkled with ashes.”

## II.1

- A. They do not put bread into an oven at dusk, nor cakes on the coals, unless there is time for them to form a crust [even] on the top surface while it is

still day. R. Eliezer says, “Sufficient time for its bottom surface [only] to form a crust”:

- B. *The question was raised: Is the meaning of **bottom** the one by the oven, or perhaps **bottom** means, the one by the fire?*
- C. *Come and take note: R. Eliezer says, “Sufficient time for its bottom surface [only] to form a crust.”*

**III.1 A. They lower the Passover-offering into an oven at dusk [when the fourteenth of Nisan falls on a Friday]:**

- B. *How come?*
- C. *Because members of the association [signed up to share this offering for their Passover] are meticulous. [The members of the association are not going to rake the coals on the Sabbath, because if one forgets, another will remind him (Freedman).]*
- D. *Well, then, if it were not for that consideration, would that not be the rule? But didn't a master say, “With the meat of a kid, whether the oven was tightly sealed or not, there is no problem”?*
- E. *In that case, the premise is that it is cut up; here it is not cut up. [The Passover kid was roasted whole; a draft would not injure it; the only basis for permitting the procedure is as stated (Freedman).]*

**IV.1 A. And they light the fire in the fireplace of the House of the Hearth:**

- B. *What is the scriptural basis for this ruling?*
- C. *Said R. Huna, “‘You shall not kindle fire throughout your habitations’ (Exo. 35: 3) — throughout your habitations you shall kindle no fire, but you may kindle a fire in the fireplace of the House of the Hearth.”*
- D. *Objected R. Hisda to that proposition, “Then if so, even on the Sabbath the same rule ought to apply [and it should be permitted to do so].”*
- E. *Rather, said R. Hisda, “The purpose of the verse of Scripture is to permit burning the limbs and the fat [of animals sacrificed on Friday], and the priests are quite meticulous.” [The priests are not going to rake the coals on the Sabbath, because if one forgets, another will remind him (Freedman).]*

**V.1 A. But in the provinces, [they do so only if] there is sufficient time for the flame to catch over the larger part of [the wood]. R. Judah says, “In the case of charcoal [one may light the fire if there is time for the fire to catch] any quantity [of charcoal] whatsoever”:**

- B. *What is the definition of “the greater part”?*

- C. Said Rab, "The greater part of each log."
- D. And Samuel said, "It is so that people shouldn't have to say, 'Let's bring chips to put under them.'" [Freedman: It should be burning strongly enough not to require such assistance.]
  - E. *There is a Tannaite formulation of R. Hiyya in support of what Samuel has said: "It is so that the flame should rise on its own and not with the help of something else."*

- V.2**
- A. As to a single log —
  - B. Rab said, "The greater part of its thickness."
  - C. *There are those who say, "The greater part of its circumference."*
    - D. *Said R. Pappa, "Therefore our requisite measure is both the greater part of its thickness and the greater part of its circumference."*
    - E. *This follows along lines of Tannaite statements, as follows:*
    - F. R. Hiyya said, "So that the log may become useless for the work of an artisan" [the greater part of the thickness].
    - G. R. Judah b. Betera says, "So that the fire takes hold of both sides of the log, and even though there is no clear proof for that proposition in Scripture, there is still an allusion to it: 'The fire has devoured both the ends of it, and the midst of it is burned, is it profitable for any work?' (Eze. 15: 4)"

- V.3**
- A. "And there was a fire burning in the brazier before him" (Jer. 36:22):
  - B. *What is the meaning of a brazier?*
  - C. Said Rab, "A willow fire" [Freedman].
  - D. And Samuel said, "Wood kindled by willow branches."

**V.4** A. *There was someone who said to them, "Who wants brazier-bits," and it turned out he was selling willow branches.*

- V.5**
- A. Said R. Huna, "As to canes, they do not have to be burning over their greater part, but if they are bound together, then they do have to be burning over their greater part [prior to the Sabbath]. [Freedman: Air has no access, and the fire may otherwise require attention.] As to date pits, they do not have to be burning over their greater part, but if they are baled, then they do have to be burning over their greater part [prior to the Sabbath]."

- B. Objected R. Hisda, "To the contrary! The opposite is more reasonable. Canes may fall apart, but if they are bound up, they can't fall apart. Pits can fall apart, but if placed in bales, they can't fall apart." [If they fall apart, they won't catch fire from each other and will require attention (Freedman).]

C. *So, too, it has been stated:*

D. [20B] Said R. Kahana, "Canes that one tied together have to be burning over their greater part [prior to the Sabbath]; if they are not tied together, they don't have to be burning over their greater part. Pits have to be burning over their greater part; if baled, they don't."

- V.6 A. R. Joseph stated as a Tannaite formulation: "Four types of fire do not have to be burning over their greater part prior to the Sabbath to be allowed to burn: Fires of pitch, sulphur, cheese, and grease."

F. *In a Tannaite statement it was repeated:* Straw and rakings too.

G. Said R. Yohanan, "Babylonian lumber is not governed by the rule of 'the greater part.'"

H. R. Joseph objected to that proposal: "*To what does that rule pertain? Should I say, to chips? But if in regard to a wick Ulla has said, 'He who kindles must kindle the greater part of what protrudes of the wick,' then can there be any question as to what governs chips?*"

I. Rather, said R. Joseph, "*This statement refers to cedar bark.*"

J. R. Ammi bar Abba said, "*It refers to dry twigs.*"