

XV.

BAVLI SHABBAT CHAPTER FIFTEEN

FOLIOS 111B-115A

15:1

- A. On account of [tying] what sorts of knots [on the Sabbath] are [people] liable?
- B. (1) A camel driver's knot, and (2) a sailor's knot.
- C. And just as one is liable for tying them, so he is liable for untying them.
- D. R. Meir says, "Any knot which he can untie with one hand — they are not liable on its account [for tying it]."

I.1 A. *What is a camel driver's knot, and a sailor's knot?*

- B. *Should we say it is the knot tied through the nose ring of a camel and the knot tied through the ship's ring? But these are knots that are readily untied.*
- C. *Rather, it is the knot of the nose ring itself and of the ship's ring itself.*

II.1 A. **R. Meir says, "Any knot which he can untie with one hand — they are not liable on its account for tying it":**

- B. *R. Ahadeboy, brother of Mar Aha, raised this question: "From R. Meir's perspective, what about a slip knot [however strongly fastened (Freedman)]? Is his operative consideration that the knot can be untied with one hand, and that is the case here? Or perhaps his operative consideration is that it is not well-tied, but this one is?"*
- C. *The question stands.*

15:2A-C

- A. You have knots on account of which they are not liable, like a camel driver's knot and a sailor's knot.
- B. A woman ties (1) the slit of her shift, (2) the strings of her hair-net and of her belt, (3) the thongs of a shoe or sandal, (4) [leather] bottles of wine or oil, and (5) a cover over meat.
- C. R. Eliezer b. Jacob says, "They tie a knot before a domestic beast so that it will not go forth."

- I.1** A. *There is a contradiction in the very body of the statement before us. First you say, **You have knots on account of which they are not liable, like a camel driver's knot and a sailor's knot**, so while there is no liability, still, they are subject to the prohibition [of not being tied on the Sabbath]. But then the Tannaite formulation proceeds, **A woman ties the slit of her shift...**, with the result that even to begin with it is permitted to make such knots.*
- B. *This is the sense of the statement:*
- C. **You have knots on account of which they are not liable, like a camel driver's knot and a sailor's knot**, and what might they be? **[112A]** *The knot tied through the nose ring of a camel and the knot tied through the ship's ring. There is no liability, but it is forbidden to make such knots. And then, there are knots that to begin with are permitted. And what might these be? **A woman ties the slit of her shift....***

- II.1** A. **A woman ties the slit of her shift:**
- B. *That isn't very surprising.*
- C. *It is required to cover the case of one that has two pairs of bands [so if one is untied, it can be put on and taken off]. What might you have supposed? That one of them is null [since she can manage by undoing the other, so the former is a permanent knot; we don't know which it is, so both must be left untouched]? So we are informed that that is not the case.*

- III.1** A. **The strings of her hair-net and of her belt:**
- B. *That isn't very surprising.*
- C. *It is required to cover the case of of a hair net that is roomy. You might have thought, she can remove it as is [without untying anything]. So we are informed that that argument is null, and a woman, being meticulous about her hair, will untie it; [so it is an impermanent knot].*

IV.1 A. The thongs of a shoe or sandal:

- B. *It has been stated:*
- C. If one unties the laces of his shoes or sandals —
- D. *one Tannaite formulation:* he is liable for a sin-offering.
- E. *And it has further been taught on Tannaite authority:* He is exempt, although such a deed is forbidden.
- F. *And it has further been taught on Tannaite authority:* It is permitted to do so to begin with.
- G. *The rulings on shoes contradict one another, the rulings on sandals contradict one another.*
- H. *The rulings on shoes do not contradict one another: The one that states that one is liable to a sin-offering deals with a cobbler's knots [which are permanent]; the one that states he is not liable but it is forbidden to make such a knot speaks of a knot characteristic of rabbis [tied loosely]; the rule that states that it is, to begin with, permitted deals with knots tied by the Mahozan population [which always were untied and therefore impermanent].*
- I. *The rulings on sandals do not contradict one another: The one that states that one is liable to a sin-offering deals with travelers' sandals, tied by cobblers; the one that states he is not liable but it is forbidden to make such a knot speaks of knots tied by an unskilled person for his own use; the rule that states that it is, to begin with, permitted deals with sandals in which two or more persons may go out [so they were tied and untied every time, hence the knots are impermanent].*

J. *That is in line with the case of R. Judah, for R. Judah, brother of R. Sela the pious, had a pair of sandals, sometimes worn by himself, sometimes worn by his child. He went to Abbayye and asked him, "In such a case, what is the rule?"*

K. He said to him, "Such knots impose liability to a sin-offering."

L. *He said to him, "What I was wondering about was the rule that it may be exempt from an offering but nonetheless forbidden for use, and you are telling me that liability to a sin-offering is incurred?!"*

M. *"How come?"*

N. *He said to him, "Because on weekdays, too, sometimes I go out in the shoes, and sometimes the child does."*

O. *He said to him, "If so, it is indeed permitted to begin with."*

IV.2 A. *R. Jeremiah was walking along behind R. Abbahu in neglected public domain. The thong of his sandal broke. He said to him, "What do I do with it?"*

B. *He said to him, "Take a fresh reed, suitable for an animal to eat, and wind it around it."*

IV.3 A. *Abbaye was standing before R. Joseph, when the thong of his sandal broke. He said to him, "What do I do with it?"*

B. *He said to him, "Leave it be [since it may not be handled on the Sabbath]."*

C. *"So how is it different from the case of R. Jeremiah?"*

D. *"There it was not in a protected situation, here it is."*

E. *"But it's a utensil, since I could move it from the right foot to the left?"*

F. *He said to him, "Since R. Yohanan has spelled out the law in accord with the position of R. Judah, that proves that the law is in accord with R. Judah."*

G. *To what does he make reference here?*

H. *To that which has been taught on Tannaite authority: **A sandal the two straps of which were broken, the strappings of which were torn, or from which even one sole separated, is insusceptible to uncleanness. If one of its ears tore or one of its strappings or if the larger part of one sole was separated, it remains susceptible to uncleanness. R. Judah says, "If it is the inner one, it remains susceptible, if it is the outer one, it is insusceptible"** [T. **Kel. B.B. 4:5D-E**]. And said Ulla, and some say, Rabbah bar bar Hannah, said R. Yohanan, "As is the dispute with respect to uncleanness, so is the dispute with reference to the Sabbath, but not with reference to the rite of removing the shoe." And we reflected on this matter: As to R. Yohanan, to which of the two positions does he make reference? Should I say it is with reference to rabbis? But since, so far as uncleanness is concerned, it is*

deemed to remain a utensil, for the purposes of the Sabbath also, it must remain a utensil. So isn't it to the matter of removing the shoe, in which case it is not a suitable utensil? But haven't we learned in the Mishnah: [If] she performed the rite of removing the shoe...with the sandal for the left foot on the right foot, her performance of removing the shoe is valid [M. Yeb. 12:2A]? So R. Yohanan must have made his observation with respect to R. Judah's position, and since for the purposes of uncleanness it is not a utensil, for the purposes of the Sabbath it also is not a utensil, but that is not the case with respect to performing the rite of removing the shoe, for which purpose it is a valid utensil.

I. Well, I may well say that we would maintain the position, [If] she performed the rite of removing the shoe...with the sandal for the left foot on the right foot, her performance of removing the shoe is valid, in a case in which it is a utensil that serves its purpose [that is, it can serve the left foot], but here it is not a utensil for its own purpose, since, after all, R. Judah said, "...if it is the outer one, it is insusceptible." Therefore it is not a utensil at all.

J. In point of fact, he made his statement with respect to R. Judah, so say: And likewise [deleting: not] with reference to the rite of removing the shoe. And so he informs us: When we invoke the rule, [If] she performed the rite of removing the shoe...with the sandal for the left foot on the right foot, her performance of removing the shoe is valid, that is in a case in which [112B] it is a utensil in its own right, but here it is not a utensil in its own right.

K. But did R. Yohanan ever make any such statement? And lo, said R. Yohanan, "The decided law accords with the unattributed Mishnah statement," and we have learned in the Mishnah: A sandal, one of the straps of which was torn, and which was repaired, is subject to midras uncleanness. [If] the second was torn, and one repaired it, it is clean of midras uncleanness but subject to the uncleanness imparted by contact with midras uncleanness. [If]

one did not complete repairing the first before the second was torn, it [the sandal] is clean. [If] its heel was torn, [if] its toe piece was removed, or [if] it was divided into two, it [the sandal] is clean [M. Kel. 26:4A-D]! *Now doesn't this rule mean that there is no distinction between breaking the inner or the outer thong [contrary to the position of R. Judah]?*

L. *No, it makes reference in particular to the inner thong, but as to the outer thong, what is the rule? The sandal is then insusceptible.*

M. *If so, then instead of formulating matters as, [If] the second was torn, and one repaired it, it is clean of midras uncleanness but subject to the uncleanness imparted by contact with midras uncleanness, why not impose the distinction in context and formulate matters in this way: Under what circumstances? If the inner one breaks, but if the outer one breaks, it is clean?*

N. Said R. Isaac b. Joseph, "Let our Mishnah paragraph [at M. Kel. 26:4] refer to a sandal that has four ears and four straps, but let's not destroy the opinion of R. Yohanan."

IV.4 A. *When Rabin came, he said R. Hanan bar Abba said Rab [said], "The decided law accords with R. Judah. But R. Yohanan said, "The decided law is not in accord with R. Judah."*

B. *But did R. Yohanan say any such thing? Since R. Yohanan has spelled out the law in accord with the position of R. Judah, that proves that in his opinion the law is in accord with R. Judah.*

C. *What we have is a conflict of Amoraic opinion on the position of R. Yohanan.*

IV.5 A. *There we have learned in the Mishnah: All utensils of householders — their measure [indicating that they*

are so damaged as to be useless and therefore are insusceptible to uncleanness is] a hole that allows pomegranates to fall through [M. Kel. 17:1A].

B. *Hezekiah raised this question*: “If there was a hole big enough to let olives fall through, and the owner stopped it up, and then the utensil went and got a hole big enough to let olives fall through, and the owner stopped it up, and so on, until the hole got big enough for a pomegranate to fall through, [what is the law]?”

C. Said to him R. Yohanan, “My lord, you have repeated to us the following Mishnah teaching: **A sandal, one of the straps of which was torn, and which was repaired, is subject to midras uncleanness. [If] the second was torn, and one repaired it, it is clean of midras uncleanness but subject to the uncleanness imparted by contact with midras uncleanness. [If] one did not complete repairing the first before the second was torn, it [the sandal] is clean. [If] its heel was torn, [if] its toe piece was removed, or [if] it was divided into two, it [the sandal] is clean [M. Kel. 26:4A-D]!** *And we said to you, what marks the first case? Because the second still is sound? But then when the second is broken, the first has been fixed? And you said to us, ‘What we have now is a new entity.’ Well, here, too, What we have now is a new entity.*”

D. *He exclaimed of him, "This man is not mortal!"*

E. *Others say, "He exclaimed of him, 'This man is what it means to be mortal!'"*

F. Said R. Zira said Raba bar Zimona, "If the former generations were children of angels, we are children of mortals, and if they were children of mortals, we are children of asses — but not like the ass of R. Hanina b. Dosa or R. Phineas b. Yair, but like quite common asses."

V.1 A. [Leather] bottles of wine or oil:

B. *That isn't very surprising.*

C. *It is required to cover one that has two spouts. You might suppose that the owner may treat one as null. So we are informed that we do not take that possibility to heart.*

VI.1 A. A cover over meat:

B. *That isn't very surprising.*

C. *It is required to cover one that is screwed in. You might suppose that the owner may treat as null the cloth that he ties on top, unscrewing the stopper instead. So we are informed that we do not take that possibility to heart.*

VII.1 A. R. Eliezer b. Jacob says, "They tie a knot before a domestic beast so that it will not go forth":

B. *That isn't very surprising.*

C. *It is required to cover one that has two cords. You might suppose that [113A] the owner may ignore one of the two entirely. So we are informed that we do not take that possibility to heart.*

VII.2 A. Said R. Joseph said R. Judah said Samuel, "The decided law is in accord with R. Eliezer b. Jacob."

B. *Said to him Abbaye, "Since you say, 'the decided law...', that implies that there is a dispute?"*

C. *He said to him, "So what difference does it make to you?"*

- D. *[Abbayye] said to him, "Is the lesson to be recited in a sing-song, [without reasoning]?"*

15:2D-F

- D. **They tie a bucket with a belt but not with a rope.**
E. **R. Judah permits [tying with a rope].**
F. **A governing principle did R. Judah state, "On account of any sort of knot which does not last they are not liable."**

- I.1** A. **But not with a rope:** *What sort of rope? Should one say, a rope in general, then why say, R. Judah permits [tying with a rope]? This is a permanent knot [so how could he permit using it]? So it must refer to a weaver's rope.*

B. *That bears the implication, then, that rabbis take the view that we make a precautionary decree against using a weaver's rope on account of rope in general, and R. Judah maintains that we make no such decree. But then note the following contradictory evidence: If on the Sabbath the cord of a bucket broke, one should not fix it but merely make a slip knot. R. Judah says, "One may wind a follow belt or fascia around it, on condition that he not tie it with a slip knot." It follows therefore that there is a contradiction between one statement of R. Judah and another, and so, too, between one statement of rabbis and another!*

C. *There is no contradiction between one statement of rabbis and another: One rope can be confused with another, but looping cannot be confused with knotting.*

D. *And there is a contradiction between one statement of R. Judah and another: In that case it is not because looping may be mistaken for knotting, but because looping itself is knotting.*

- I.2** A. Said R. Hiyya bar Ashi said Rab, "One may bring a cord from his house and tie it onto a cow and its trough [and we are not concerned that it may become a permanent knot]."
B. *On the basis of a contradictory rule, which follows, an objection was raised by R. Aha Arika, who is the same as R. Aha bar Pappa, to R. Abba: "The rope attached to the trough may be tied to the cow, the one attached to the cow may be tied to the trough, on condition that he not bring a cord from the house and tie it to the cow and the trough."*
C. *In that case, it is a rope in general, here it is a weaver's rope.*

I.3 A. Said R. Judah said Samuel, “All implements of a weaver may be handled on the Sabbath [for some purpose legitimate to the Sabbath].”

B. *They addressed this question to R. Judah: “What is the law as to the upper beam and the lower beam?”*

C. *“Well, uh, yes, but, well, uh, heah, hum, no” — and he didn’t have in hand a solid reply!*

I.4 A. *It has been stated:*

B. Said R. Nahman said Samuel, “All implements of a weaver may be handled on the Sabbath [for some purpose legitimate to the Sabbath], including the upper beam and the lower beam, but not the vertical rollers.”

C. *Said Raba to R. Nahman, “What differentiates the two vertical rollers? Should I say, because this one makes holes? But the holes come about on their own [and therefore no one is culpable for them]. For we have learned in the Mishnah: **He who buries turnips or radishes under the vine — if some of its leaves were exposed, he does not fear, either because of [the laws of] diverse kinds, or because of [the laws of] the Seventh Year or because of [the laws of] tithes; and they are removed on the Sabbath [M. Kil. 1:9A-D].**”* [We don’t take account of the fact that by picking them out of the ground, he will make holes (Freedman).]

D. *In the field someone will not end up filling up the holes, but in the house, one is going to end up filling up the holes.*

I.5 A. *R. Yohanan addressed this question to R. Judah bar Livai: “As to the weaver’s tools, for instance, the upper beam and the lower beam, what is the law on handling them on the Sabbath?”*

B. He said to him, “They are not to be handled. How come? Because they cannot be moved about.”

15:3

A. **They fold up clothing even four or five times.**

B. **And they spread beds on the night of the Sabbath for use on the Sabbath,**

C. **but not on the Sabbath for use after the Sabbath.**

D. **R. Ishmael says, “They fold clothes and lay out beds on the Day of Atonement for the Sabbath.**

- E. “And the fat pieces of the Sabbath-offering are offered on the Day of Atonement.”
- F. R. Aqiba says, “Those of the Sabbath are not offered on the Day of Atonement, and those of the Day of Atonement are not offered on the Sabbath.”

- I.1 A. [They fold up clothing even four or five times:] Said the household of R. Yannai, “They have repeated that rule only in the case of an individual person, but when it comes to two persons, that is not the case. [Freedman: When two people do it, they will smooth the creases and that is an act of repair or improvement.] And with reference to a single individual’s doing so, too, we have made that statement only in connection with new garments, but as to old garments, it may not be done. And even as to new ones, we have made this statement only as to white ones, but not as to colored ones. And we made this statement only if he has no others for a change of clothing, but if he has others for a change, it is not the case.”
- B. *A Tannaite statement: Members of the household of Rabban Gamaliel didn’t fold up their white garments, because they had plenty of other clothing for changing* [T. **Shab. 12:17/O-P**].

- I.2 A. Said R. Huna, “If one had other clothing for a change of clothes, he may change, but if he has no other clothing for a change of clothes, he should lower his clothing [making them look longer, in the manner of wealthy people].”
- B. R. Safra objected to this statement: “Lo, that would appear to be ostentatious!”
- C. *Since this is not something he does every day, it doesn’t look ostentation.*”

- I.3 A. “And you shall honor it, not doing your own business [lit.: not doing your own ways]” (Isa. 58:13) —
- B. “And you shall honor it” — so your garments for the Sabbath shouldn’t be similar to your garments for the weekday.
 - C. *That is in line with how R. Yohanan would refer to his garments as “Those that do me honor.”*
 - D. “...not doing your own ways” — this means that your manner of walking on the Sabbath should not be like your manner of walking on weekdays.
 - E. “Nor finding your own affairs” — your affairs are forbidden, but the affairs of Heaven are permitted.

F. “Nor speaking your own words” — **[113B]** this means that your manner of speech on the Sabbath shouldn’t be like that on weekdays.

G. “Speaking” — speaking of weekday matters is forbidden, but thinking about them is permitted.

I.4 A. *Now as to all these other states, well and good, but as to the statement, this means that your manner of walking on the Sabbath should not be like your manner of walking on weekdays, what can that possibly mean?*

B. *It is in line with what R. Huna said Rab said, and some say, said R. Abba said R. Huna, “If one was walking along on the Sabbath and came to a water course, if he can put down his first foot before raising his second, it is permitted to cross it, but if not, it is forbidden.” [One may not jump across.]*

C. *Objected Raba, “So what’s he supposed to do? Go around? Then he increases the distance he has to walk. Should he just walk through it? He’ll soak his clothes in water and end up wringing them out. Rather, in such a situation, since there is no choice, he may jump across.”*

I.5 A. *[As to the statement, this means that your manner of walking on the Sabbath should not be like your manner of walking on weekdays, what can that possibly mean?] It is in line with what Rabbi asked R. Ishmael b. R. Yosé, “What is the law on taking giant steps on the Sabbath?”*

B. He said to him, “So is it permitted on a weekday? For I maintain, taking a giant step takes away one five-hundredth of a person’s vision, *but it is given back to him by the sanctification recited in the evening.*”

I.6 A. *Rabbi asked R. Ishmael b. R. Yosé, “What is the law on eating dirt on the Sabbath?”*

B. He said to him, “So is it permitted on a weekday? For I maintain, it makes you sick.”

I.7 A. Said R. Ammi, “Whoever eats the dirt of Babylonia is as though he ate the meat of his ancestors.”

B. Whoever eats the dirt of Babylonia is as though he ate the meat of his ancestors. And some say, “...is as

though he ate abominations and creeping things, as it is written, ‘And he dissolved every living thing’ (Gen. 7:23).”

I.8 A. And R. Simeon b. Laqish said, “Why is it called Shinar? For all the dead of the Flood were shaken out there [the word for shaken out there shares consonants with Shinar].”

B. And R. Yohanan said, “Why is Babylonia called mesulah? Because the dead of the Flood were dumped there [the word for dump shares consonants with the word mesulah.]”

I.9 A. And some say, “...is as though he ate abominations and creeping things, as it is written, ‘And he dissolved every living thing’ (Gen. 7:23)” —

B. *But surely they were dissolved! Rather, because they do injury, rabbis made a precautionary decree against eating them.*

C. *For there was a man who ate red clay and then cress, and the cress grew in his heart and he died.*

Composite on Ruth

Beginning with her Preparation of Proper Garments for the Sabbath

I.10 A. “Wash yourself therefore and anoint yourself and put your garment on you” (Rut. 3: 3):

B. Said R. Eleazar, “This refers to Sabbath garments.”

I.11 A. “Rebuke a wise man and he will become still wiser” (Pro. 9: 9) —

B. Said R. Eleazar, “This refers to Ruth the Moabite and Samuel the Ramatite.

C. “Ruth the Moabite: for while Naomi said to her, ‘Wash yourself therefore and anoint yourself and put your garment on you’ (Rut. 3: 3), yet: ‘And she went down to the threshing floor’ and only then ‘did according to all that her mother-in-law instructed her’ (Rut. 3: 6).

D. “Samuel: Eli said to him, ‘Lie down and it shall be, if he calls you, you shall say, speak, Lord, for your servant listens,’ (1Sa. 3: 9), but: ‘And the Lord came and stood and called as at other times, Samuel, Samuel, then Samuel said, Speak, for your servant listens’ (1Sa. 3:10), but not, ‘speak lord.’”

- I.12** A. “And she went and came and gleaned in the field” (Rut. 2: 3) —
 B. Said R. Eleazar, “She went back and forth until she found with whom to go.”
- I.13** A. “Then Boaz said to his servant who was in charge of the reapers, whose girl is this?” (Rut. 2: 4) —
 B. So did Boaz go around asking about girls?
 C. Said R. Eleazar, “He observed a matter of wisdom in her: Two ears of grain she gleaned, three she didn’t [and that is the law on gleaning].”
 D. *In a Tannaite statement it was repeated:* He observed conduct of surpassing modesty in her: The standing grain she gleaned standing, the fallen ones, sitting.
- I.14** A. “And stay here by my maidens” (Rut. 2: 8) —
 B. So was it Boaz’s way to stick around the girls?
 C. *Said R. Eleazar, “When he saw ‘Orpah kissed her mother-in-law but Ruth cleaved to her’ (Rut. 1:14), he said, ‘It’s permitted to stick by her.’”*
- I.15** A. “And at mealtime Boaz said to her, come here” (Rut. 2:14) —
 B. Said R. Eleazar, “He thereby give her a hint: ‘The kingdom of the house of David was destined to come forth from you.’ For it is written, ‘hither’ in that regard: ‘Then David the king went in and sat before the Lord, and he said, Who am I O Lord God and what is my house, that you have brought me hither’ (2Sa. 7:18).”
- I.16** A. “And dip your morsel in vinegar” (Rut. 2:14) —
 B. Said R. Eleazar, “On the basis of this statement it is the fact that vinegar is good in hot weather.”
 C. R. Samuel bar Nahmani said, “He gave her a hint: ‘A son is destined to come forth from you, whose actions will be as harsh as vinegar,’ and who was it? It was Manasseh.”
- I.17** A. “And she sat beside the reapers” (Rut. 2:14) —
 B. Said R. Eleazar, “At the side of the reapers, but not among them. He gave a hint to her that the kingdom of the house of David was destined to be split up.”
- I.18** A. “And he handed her parched grain and she ate and had enough and some left over” (Rut. 2:14) —
 B. Said R. Eleazar, “‘she ate’ — in the time of David; ‘and had enough’ — in the time of Solomon. ‘And some left over’ — in the time of Hezekiah.”

C. *There are those who say*, “‘she ate’ — in the time of David and Solomon; ‘and had enough’ — in the time of Hezekiah. ‘And some left over’ — in the time of Rabbi.”

D. *For a master said*, “*The house steward of Rabbi was richer than King Shapur.*”

E. *In a Tannaite statement it was repeated*: “‘she ate’ — in this world; ‘and had enough’ — in the days of the Messiah. ‘And some left over’ — in the age to come.”

I.19 A. “And beneath his glory shall he light a burning like the burning of a fire” (Isa. 10:16) —

B. Said R. Yohanan, “Under his glory, but not actually his glory.”

C. *That is in line with how R. Yohanan called his clothing*, “*Those who do me honor.*”

D. R. Eleazar says, “‘Under his glory’ literally.”

E. R. Samuel bar Nahmani said, “‘and beneath his glory’ as in the burning of the sons of Aaron. Just as is the burning of the sons of Aaron. [Just as in that case it was a burning of the soul while the body endured, so here there is a burning of the soul while the body remained intact.]”

Further on Proper Dress on the Sabbath

I.20 A. Said R. Aha bar Abba said R. Yohanan, [114A] “How do we know in the Torah that changing clothing [is an act of honor]? As it is said, ‘And he shall put off his garments and put on other garments’ (Lev. 6: 4).”

B. *And a Tannaite authority of the household of R. Ishmael [said]*, “The Torah has thereby taught you proper conduct. In the garments in which one has cooked for one’s master he should not mix the cup of wine for his master.”

I.21 A. Said R. Hiyya bar Abba said R. Yohanan, “It is a disgrace for a disciple to go out with patched sandals.”

B. *Is that the case? And lo, R. Hiyya bar Abba went out [in such a way].*

C. Said Mar Zutra, son of R. Nahman, “The rule applies to those that have patches on the patches.”

D. And said R. Hiyya bar Abba said R. Yohanan, “Any disciple of a sage on whose garment a grease stain turns up is worthy of death: ‘All they who hate me love death’ (Pro. 8:36) — read the letters of the word ‘hate me’ as though they were given vowels to yield ‘make me hated.’”

- E. Rabina said, “That concerns a thick patch.”
- F. *But they don’t differ; the one speaks of a coat, the other, a shirt.*

I.22 A. And said R. Hiyya bar Abba said R. Yohanan, “What is the meaning of the verse of Scripture, ‘Like as my servant Isaiah has walked naked and barefoot’ (Isa. 20: 3) — naked, in worn out garments; barefoot, in patched shoes.”

I.23 A. *We have learned in the Mishnah as follows: On the saddle of the householder it interposes, and on that of the water skin carriers, it does not interpose. On a packsaddle it interposes. Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel says, “[It interposes only if the spot is at least] as big as an Italian issar” [M. **Miq. 9:5I-K**]. On garments: On one side, it does not interpose. On both sides, it interposes. R. Judah says in the name of R. Ishmael, “Even if it is on one side only, [it interposes].” [R. Yosé says, “[It interposes on the clothes] of the construction workers if on one side only; but [in the clothes of] the farmer only if on both sides”] [M. **Miq. 9:6**].*

- B. *R. Simeon b. Laqish raised this question of R. Hanina, “In the case of a saddle, is it sufficient for the stain to interpose if it is on one side, or must it be on both sides?”*
- C. He said to him, “This I haven’t heard, but I have heard something parallel, namely: **R. Yosé says, “[It interposes on the clothes] of the construction workers if on one side only; but [in the clothes of] the farmer only if on both sides” [M. **Miq. 9:6**].** Now a saddle doesn’t stand higher than the clothing of a common person!”

I.24 A. *What is the definition of construction workers?*

B. Said R. Yohanan, “This refers to disciples of sages, for they are engaged in building the world.”

I.25 A. And said R. Yohanan, “And what is the definition of a disciple of a sage, to whom one returns a lost object just because he says he recognizes it? It is a disciple who is meticulous about turning his shirt [so the seams are on the inside].”

B. And said R. Yohanan, “And what is the definition of a disciple of a sage, who is appointed administrator of the community? It is one whom they may ask concerning a legal

matter in any passage, and he gives the correct answer, even in the tractate Kallah.”

C. And said R. Yohanan, “And what is the definition of a disciple of a sage, whose work fellow citizens are commanded to do? It is one who abandons his own interest and engages in the interests of Heaven.”

D. *But that is, in any event, only to make sure he has food.*

E. And said R. Yohanan, “And what is the definition of a disciple of a sage? It is any who may be asked a law on any matter and can give the answer.”

F. *What difference does it make? If it is to appoint him administrator over the community. If he is well informed about one tractate, he can be appointed where he lives; if on a whole of Tannaite statements, he may be appointed head of a session.*

I.26 A. [Reverting to the question, *What is the definition of the garments of construction workers?*] R. Simeon b. Laqish said, “This refers to court robes that come from overseas.”

B. *Does that imply that they are white? But didn't* R. Yannai say to his sons, “My sons, don't bury me in white garments or in black ones, not in white, lest I not have sufficient accumulated virtue and so appear like a groom among mourners, not in black, lest I have sufficient accumulated merit and appear like a mourner among grooms. Rather, they should be in court robes that come from overseas,” *which proves that they are colored.*

C. *No problem, the one speaks of robes, the other, shirts.*

II.1 A. **R. Ishmael says, “They fold clothes and lay out beds on the Day of Atonement for the Sabbath. And the fat pieces of the Sabbath-offering are offered on the Day of Atonement”:**

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

C. “‘The burnt-offering of the Sabbath on the Sabbath thereof’ (Num. 28:10) [Freedman: The burnt-offering of one Sabbath may be completed, with its fat burnt on the altar, on another Sabbath; the burnt-offering of one Sabbath must be completed on that same Sabbath.] —

- D. “this teaches that the fat of the offering of one Sabbath may be offered on the Day of Atonement.
- E. “Might one suppose that those of the Day of Atonement’s offerings may be burned on the Sabbath?
- F. “Scripture says, ‘on the Sabbath thereof,’” the words of R. Ishmael.
- G. R. Aqiba says, “‘The burnt-offering of the Sabbath on the Sabbath thereof’ (Num. 28:10) —
- H. “this teaches that the fat of an offering prepared on the Sabbath may be offered on a festival. Might one suppose that that is the case also with the Day of Atonement? Scripture says, ‘on the Sabbath thereof.’”

II.2 A. Now when you examine the matter, you recognize that in the opinion of R. Ishmael, the same is so for votive and freewill-offerings, which may be carried out on a festival, *and that explains why the verse is required to make the point concerning the Day of Atonement.* [Freedman: If even voluntary offerings, which can be brought on weekdays, may be sacrificed on a festival, then certainly fat left over from an obligatory public sacrifice of the Sabbath may be burned in the evening, even if it is a festival, and no verse is necessary to make that point; so the verse must refer to the Day of Atonement.]

B. From the perspective of R. Aqiba, the same is not so for votive and freewill-offerings, which may be carried out on a festival, *so where a verse of Scripture is needed, it is required for doing so on the festival.*

- II.3** A. *Said R Zira, [114B] “When I was in Babylonia, I stated that that which has been taught on Tannaite authority, if the Day of Atonement coincided with a Friday, the ram’s horn is not sounded, while if it coincided with the end of the Sabbath, the prayer of division between the Sabbath and ordinary days was not to be recited, represented a unanimous opinion. But when I came up there, I found Judah, son of R Simeon b. Pazzi, in session and stating, ‘This represents the view of R. Aqiba. But it can’t be R. Ishmael, for he has said, **And the fat pieces of the Sabbath-offering are offered on the Day of Atonement, let it be sounded so that it may be known that the fat pieces of the Sabbath-offering are offered on the Day of Atonement.** And I said to him, ‘But the priests are meticulous [and know the law].’”*
- B. *Said Mar Qashisha b. R. Hisda to R. Ashi, “But do we invoke the argument that, ‘But the priests are meticulous [and know the law]’? And haven’t we learned in the Mishnah: **[On an eve of the Sabbath which came during the***

festival there were forty-eight in all: three for the opening of the gates, three for the upper gate and three for the lower gate, three for the drawing of the water, three for the pouring of the water on the altar, nine for the offering of the daily whole-offering in the morning, nine for the offering of the daily whole-offering of the evening, nine for the additional offerings,] three to make the people stop work, and three to mark the border between the holy day and the ordinary day [M. Suk. 5:5G-I]? ”

- C. *“It is in accord with what Abbaye said, ‘That is for the rest of the people in Jerusalem;’ here, too, it is for the rest of the people in Jerusalem.”*

II.4 A. *Well, why not sound the shofar so that people will know that it is permitted to trim vegetables on the Day of Atonement from the time of the evening-offering onward?*

B. Said R. Joseph, “It is because one does not set aside what is prohibited by reason of Sabbath rest [for example, sounding the ram’s horn] in order to permit some other action.”

C. And R. Shisha b. R. Idi said, “What is prohibited by reason of Sabbath rest that is of importance for something fairly near at hand may be permitted; what is prohibited by reason of Sabbath rest that is of consequence only much later on is not permitted.” [Freedman: If it were of immediate importance, the deed prohibited by reason of Sabbath rest would have been permitted; but when the Day of Atonement falls on a Friday, even if the vegetables are trimmed, they cannot be cooked on the Sabbath, so the sounding of the ram’s horn would matter only for later Days of Atonement, and in such a case the prohibition by reason of Sabbath rest is not superseded.]

D. Well, anyhow, is it the fact that what is prohibited by reason of Sabbath rest that is of importance for something fairly near at hand may be permitted? And haven’t we learned in the Mishnah: **On a festival which coincided with Friday [the eve of the Sabbath] they sound the ram’s horn, and they do not say the prayer that marks the boundary between the sacred and the profane. And on [a festival which coincided with] Sunday [the day after the Sabbath] they say that prayer and they do not sound [the ram’s horn] [M. Hul. 1:7K-L]? But why should this be the rule? Sound the ram’s horn so that people should know that it is permitted to slaughter**

animals right away? So it is best to deal with the matter in line with what R. Joseph said.

- II.5** A. Said R. Zira said R. Huna, and some say, said R. Abba said R. Huna, “On a Day of Atonement that coincided with the Sabbath, it is forbidden to trim vegetables.”
- B. Said R. Mana, “*A Tannaite statement*: How on the basis of Scripture do we know that on a Day of Atonement that coincided with the Sabbath, it is forbidden to trim vegetables? Because it is said, ‘A Sabbath’ (Exo. 16:23) meaning, it is a matter of what is forbidden by reason of Sabbath rest. *Now for what purpose is this stated? Should we say, it has to do with ordinary work, it is stated in so many words, ‘You shall not do any work’ (Exo. 20: 9). So doesn’t this refer to such a thing as trimming vegetables?*”

C. *Sure does.*

- II.6** A. Said R. Hiyya bar Abba said R. Yohanan, “On a Day of Atonement that coincided with the Sabbath, it is permitted to trim vegetables.”
- B. *An objection was raised*: How on the basis of Scripture do we know that on a Day of Atonement that coincided with the Sabbath, it is forbidden to trim vegetables? Because it is said, “A Sabbath” (Exo. 16:23) meaning, it is a matter of what is forbidden by reason of Sabbath rest. *Now for what purpose is this stated? Should we say, it has to do with ordinary work, it is stated in so many words, “You shall not do any work” (Exo. 20: 9). So doesn’t this refer to such a thing as trimming vegetables?*
- C. No, in point of fact, it refers to ordinary work, but it is stated to indicate that in doing so one violates both a positive and a negative commandment.

II.7 A. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority in accord with the position of R. Yohanan*:

B. On a Day of Atonement that coincided with the Sabbath, it is permitted [115A] to trim vegetables, crack nuts, scrape pomegranates, from the evening-offering onwards, because of one’s anguish.

C. *The household of R. Judah trimmed cabbage.*

D. *The household of Rabbah scraped pumpkins. When he saw they did this too early, he said to them, “A letter has come from the west in the name of R. Yohanan, prohibiting that practice.”*