

II.

BAVLI SHABBAT CHAPTER TWO

FOLIOS 20B-36B

2:1

- A. With what do they kindle [the Sabbath light] and with what do they not kindle [it]?
- B. They do not kindle with (1) cedar fiber, (2) uncarded flax, (3) raw silk, (4) wick of bast, (5) wick of the desert, (6) or seaweed;
- C. or with (1) pitch, (2) wax, (3) castor oil, (4) oil [given to a priest as heave-offering which had become unclean and must therefore be] burned, (5) [grease from] the fat tail, or (6) tallow.
- D. Nahum the Mede says, “They kindle [the Sabbath lamp] with melted tallow.”
- E. And sages say, “All the same is that which is melted and that which is not melted: They do not kindle with it.”

I.1

- A. **Cedar fiber:**
- B. *This is cedar bark.*
- C. *But cedar bark is merely wood?*
- D. *It means, the bast inside it.*

II.1

- A. **Uncarded flax:**
- B. Said R. Joseph, “This is the hatched flax.”
- C. *Said to him Abbaye, “But it is written, ‘And the hatched flax shall serve as kindling’ (Isa. 1:31).”*

D. *Rather, said Abbayye, "It is flax that is crushed but not combed."*

III.1 A. Raw silk:

B. *Said Samuel, "I asked all the sailors, and they said that it's cissaros blossom"* [Freedman/Jastrow].

C. *R. Isaac bar Zeira said, "It's a cotton-like plant."*

D. *Rabin and Abbayye were in session before Rabana Nehemiah, the brother of the exilarch. They saw that he was wearing silk. Rabina said to Abbayye, "That's the raw silk of which we have learned in the Mishnah."*

E. *He said to him, "We call it peranda silk."*

F. *An objection was raised: Garments made of silk, raw silk, or floss silk are subject to the requirement of having show fringes. [So the kind of silk referred to here is not the same as common silk.]*

G. *That is a valid refutation.*

H. *If you prefer, I shall say, silk is one category, peranda silk is another.*

IV.1 A. Wick of bast:

B. *That is willow bast.*

IV.2 A. *Rabin and Abbayye were walking in the valley of Tamrurita. They saw some willows. Said Rabin to Abbayye, "That's the bast of which we have learned in the Mishnah."*

B. *He said to him, "But that's just wood."*

C. *So he peeled it and showed him the wool-like substance that was inside.*

V.1 A. Wick of the desert:

B. *That's mullein* [Freedman: a tall woolly weed].

VI.1 A. Or seaweed:

B. *What's seaweed? Should we say, it's the black moss of pits? But that crumbles* [and can't yield a wick (Freedman)]!

C. *Rather, said R. Pappa, "It's the black gunk of ships."*

VI.2 A. A Tannaite statement:

B. *They added to the list wicks made of wool or hair.*

- C. *And the Tannaite authority responsible for our formulation?*
- D. *Wool shrinks, hair merely smoulders.*

VII.1 A. With pitch:

- B. *Pitch is what it says.*

VIII.1 A. Wax:

- B. *Wax is what it says.*

VIII.2 A. A Tannaite statement:

- B. Up to this point are listed what is unacceptable for use as wicks, and from this point onwards is listed what is unacceptable for use as oils.
 - C. *Big deal! [That's obvious.]*
 - D. *That observation is necessary with reference to wax. What might you have supposed? It's also no good for wicks? So we are informed to the contrary.*

VIII.3 A. Said R. Ammi bar Abin, "Resin is the leavings of pitch; wax is the leavings of honey."

- B. **[21A]** *For what practical purpose do we need that information?*
- C. *It has to do with buying and selling [an order for resin or wax comes with the residue of pitch or honey, as the case may be].*

VIII.4 A. Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:

- B. **With respect to all of these items of which they have spoken, while the Sabbath lamp may not be lit of them on the Sabbath, nonetheless they may make a fire of them, both for warmth and for light, whether on the ground or in the stove; the prohibition concerns only the making of a wick out of them for the Sabbath lamp [T. **Shab. 2:1C**].**

IX.1 A. Castor oil:

- B. *What is castor oil?*
- C. *Said Samuel, "I asked all the sailors, and they told me that there's a certain bird in the towns by the sea called a castor bird" [a pelican].*

IX.2 A. R. Isaac b. R. Judah said, "It's cotton seed oil."

- B. *R. Simeon b. Laqish said, "It's oil from the gourd of the kind that Jonah planted."*
- C. *Said Rabbah bar bar Hannah, "I myself saw the type of gourd that Jonah planted; it's like a ricinus tree and grows in ditches. It is planted at the*

entrance of stores; from its pits they make oil; under its branches all the sick people in the West take a rest."

IX.3 A. Said Rabbah, "As to the wicks of which sages have said, 'They do not kindle the Sabbath light with them,' the reason is that the flame burns unevenly. As to the oils of which sages have said, 'They do not kindle the Sabbath light with them,' the reason is that they don't flow freely to the wick" [Freedman: so one may trim the wick or tilt the lamp on the Sabbath; so they are not to be used].

IX.4 A. *Abbayye raised this question of Rabbah, "As to the oils of which sages have said, 'They do not kindle the Sabbath light with them,' what is the rule about one's pouring a bit of good oil into them and lighting that? Do we make a precautionary decree, lest one turn out to light forbidden oil as it is, unmixed, or do we make no such decree?"*

- B. He said to him, "They are not to be kindled. *How come?* Because they may not kindle with that oil [as is, unmixed, hence, also, with mixtures]."
- C. *An objection was raised: If one wrapped something with which they kindle the Sabbath light around something with which they do not kindle the Sabbath light, they do not kindle the Sabbath light therewith. Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel said, "Members of the household of father would wrap flax around a nut and kindle the Sabbath light with it" [T. Shab. 2:4G-H]. So in any event the Tannaite formulation is clear that they do kindle in such a way [in Gamaliel's house]!*
- D. *He said to him, "Rather than refuting me on the basis of what Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel said, support my view by appeal to what the initial Tannaite authority has ruled!"*
- E. *No problem, a precedent outweighs a statement!*
- F. *One way or another there's a problem — weren't the wick and nut meant for a light [burning together for that purpose]?*
- G. *No, it was for floating [the nut was to keep the wrapping on the surface of the oil].*
- H. *So if it was for floating, what is the reason for the position of the initial authority?*
- I. *The whole of the passage stands for the view of Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel, but it is flawed, and this is how it should be spelled out: If one wrapped something with which they kindle the Sabbath light around something with which they do not kindle the Sabbath light, they do not kindle the*

Sabbath light therewith. Under what circumstances? If it is to kindle the lamp. But if it was to float the wick, it is permitted. For **Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel said, “Members of the household of father would wrap flax around a nut and kindle the Sabbath light with it.”**

- J. *Well is that so now? And didn't* R. Barona say Rab said, “In the case of melted tallow and the dissolved innards of fish, one may pour a little oil and light with that oil”? [That is so, even though tallow is forbidden, and that refutes Rabbah (Freedman).]
- K. *These kinds of oil flow along in their natural condition, while the ones listed in the Mishnah don't. Rabbis forbade melted tallow on account of unmelted tallow, and the dissolved innards of fish on account of the undissolved innards.*
- L. *Well, why not make a precautionary decree against* melted tallow and dissolved innards of fish when diluted with oil on account of those that are not mixed with oil?
- M. *That itself is merely a precautionary decree, and we're not likely to go and enact a precautionary decree to protect yet another precautionary decree.*

- IX.5** A. *R. Ammi bar Hama set forth as a Tannaite statement: “The wicks and oils of which sages have said, ‘They do not kindle the Sabbath light with them’ are also not used for kindling the lamp in the sanctuary, as it is said, ‘to cause a lamp to burn continually’ (Exo. 27:21).”*
- B. *He repeated that Tannaite statement, and he also made a further statement concerning it: “It is so that the flame will leap upward on its own and not so that it will leap upward through something else [requiring attention].”*
 - C. *We have learned in the Mishnah: **Out of the worn-out undergarments and girdles of the priests they made wicks, and with them they lit the candles [M. Suk. 5:3A-B].*** [These were woolen garments, which is supposed to be on the list of forbidden materials, thus refuting Ammi.]
 - D. *The celebration of the water drawing is an exception to the rule.*
 - E. *Come and take note of what Rabbah bar Mattenah taught as a Tannaite statement: Out of the worn-out undergarments of the priesthood they made wicks for the sanctuary. Now doesn't that mean the garments were made of composite materials [wool and linen]?*
 - F. No, they were the linen ones.

The Hanukkah Lamp. The Festival of Hanukkah

- IX.6** A. Said R. Huna, “The wicks and oils of which sages have said, ‘They do not kindle the Sabbath light with them’ are also not used for kindling the Hanukkah lamp, either on the Sabbath or on weekdays.”
- B. *Said Raba, “What is the consideration operative in R. Huna’s statement? He takes the view that if the Hanukkah lamp goes out, one is obligated to attend to it, and it is permitted to make use of its light for other purposes.”*
- C. R. Hisda said, “They may light the Hanukkah lamp using these substances on weekdays but not on the Sabbath.” *He takes the view that if the Hanukkah lamp goes out, [21B] one is not obligated to attend to it, and it is permitted to make use of its light for other purposes.*
- D. Said R. Zira said R. Mattenah, and some say, said R. Zira said Rab, “The wicks and oils of which sages have said, ‘They do not kindle the Sabbath light with them’ are used for kindling the Hanukkah lamp, either on the Sabbath or on weekdays.”

E. Said R. Jeremiah, “What’s the operative consideration in Rab’s statement? He takes the view that if the Hanukkah lamp goes out, one is not obligated to attend to it, and it is forbidden to make use of its light for other purposes.”

F. Rabbis made this statement before Abbaye in the name of R. Jeremiah, and he didn’t accept it. When Rabin came, rabbis stated the same before Abbaye in the name of R. Yohanan, and he accepted it. He said, “If I had sufficient merit, I would have learned this tradition to begin with.”

G. Well, so now he’s learned it!

H. It makes a difference in regard to what one has learned in his youth [which last].

IX.7 A. If the Hanukkah lamp goes out, one is not obligated to attend to it:

B. By way of objection: The religious duty in its regard pertains from when the sun sets until pedestrians have left the marketplace. Doesn’t this mean that if during that span of time it has to be relit?

C. So, what it means is that, if one has not yet lit the Hanukkah lamp, he does so, or, also, it covers the time

that it must burn [but if it does go out, it need not be relit].

IX.8 A. Until pedestrians have left the marketplace:

B. *How long is that?*

C. *Said Rabbah bar bar Hannah said R. Yohanan, "Until the Palmyreans have left the marketplace."*

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

- B. The religious duty in respect to Hanukkah: There is to be a lamp for each man and his household. But those who excel have a lamp for each member of the household. And the most zealous –
- C. The House of Shammai say, "On the first day one lights eight candles, and from that time onward, diminishes them from day to day."
- D. The House of Hillel say, "On the first day one lights one candle, and from that time onward, adds to them from day to day."

IX.10 A. *Said Ulla, "In the West two Amoraic authorities differ, namely, R. Yosé bar Abin and R. Yosé bar Zebida. One said, 'The operative consideration of the House of Shammai is that the lamp corresponds to the days that are coming, and of the House of Hillel, it corresponds to the days that have gone by.' The other said, 'The operative consideration of the House of Shammai is that the number of candles corresponds to the bullocks of the festival [of Tabernacles], and the operative consideration of the House of Hillel is that, in matters of sanctity, we go up, not down.'"*

IX.11 A. *Said Rabbah bar bar Hannah said R. Yohanan, "There were two elders in Sidon. One acted in accord with the House of Shammai, the other acted in accord with the House of Hillel. This one gave as the operative consideration for his position, the number of candles corresponds to the bullocks of the festival [of Tabernacles], and the other gave as the operative consideration for his position, in matters of sanctity, we go up, not down."*

IX.12 A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. As to the Hanukkah lamp, the religious duty is to leave it at the door of one's house on the outside. But if he lived in an upper room, he puts it on the window nearest the public domain. But in time of danger he leaves it on his table, and that's enough.

IX.13 A. Said Raba, “He has to have another lamp, to make use of the light of that other lamp for any secular purpose. *But if there is another fire, he doesn’t have to have it; and if he’s an eminent authority, even though there is another fire in the room, he still has to have it.*” [The fire is in honor of the eminent authority, so still another light is required for ordinary use.]

IX.14 A. *What’s the point of Hanukkah?*

- B. *It is in line with what our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. *On the twenty-fifth of Kislev the days of Hanukkah, which are eight, begin. On these days it is forbidden to lament the dead and to fast.*
- D. For when the Greeks entered the sanctuary, they made all of the oil that was in the sanctuary unclean. But when the rule of the Hasmonean house took hold and they conquered them, they searched but found only a single jar of oil, lying with the seal of the high priest. But that jar had enough oil only for a single day. But there was a miracle done with it, and they lit the lamp with it for eight days. The next year they assigned these days and made them festival days for the recitation of Hallel psalms [Psa. 113-118] and for thanksgiving.

IX.15 A. *There we have learned: A camel which was carrying flax and passed by in the public way, and the flax it was carrying got poked into a store and caught fire from the lamp of the storekeeper and set fire to the building — the owner of the camel is liable. [If] the storekeeper had left his lamp outside, the storekeeper is liable. R. Judah says, “In the case of a candle lit for Hanukkah, the shopkeeper is exempt under all circumstances” [M. B.Q. 6:6C-E].*

- B. *Said Rabina in the name of Raba, “Since R. Judah has said what he has, it must follow that the religious duty concerning the candle lit at Hanukkah is that it be placed within ten handbreadths of the ground, for if you take the view that it can be put even ten handbreadths above the ground, why did R. Judah say that, if the fire was caused by the Hanukkah candle, one would be exempt? Couldn’t the injured party plead, ‘You should have placed it well above the reach of the camel and its rider’? It must follow that the religious duty concerning the candle lit at Hanukkah is that it be placed within ten handbreadths of the ground.”*
- C. *Say: Not at all. I may say to you that it may be placed even above ten handbreadths. And, as to the plea, “You should have placed it well above the reach of the camel and its rider,” since the man was involved in doing a religious duty, sages did not want to impose so much bother on him.*

- D. Said R. Kahana, “R. Nathan bar Minyumi gave the following exposition in the name of R. Tanhum: [22A] ‘The Hanukkah candle that one set at a height above twenty cubits is invalid as would be a sukkah built with a roof that high or an alleyway with a crossbar that high.’”

IX.16 A. And said R. Kahana, “Expounded R. Nathan bar Minyumi in the name of R. Tanhum, “What is the meaning of the verse of Scripture: ‘And the pit was empty, there was no water in it’ (Gen. 37:24)?

B. “Since it is stated explicitly, ‘And the pit was empty,’ don’t I know that ‘there was no water in it’?”

C. “But the sense of ‘there was no water in it’ is, but there were plenty of snakes and scorpions.”

IX.17 A. Said Rabbah, “As to a Hanukkah lamp, the religious duty is to leave it within the handbreadth nearest the door [on the outside].”

B. *Where does one put it?*

C. R. Aha b. Raba said, “At the right hand side.”

D. R. Samuel of Difti said, “On the left.”

E. *And the decided law is, on the left, so that the Hanukkah lamp will be at the left and the mezuzah at the right.*

IX.18 A. Said R. Judah said R. Assi, “It is forbidden to count money by the Hanukkah lamp. *But when I made that statement before Samuel, he said to me, ‘But does the lamp have any sanctity?’*”

- B. *Objected R. Joseph to this statement, “But does blood have any sanctity? For it has been taught on Tannaite authority: ‘He shall pour out the blood thereof and cover it with dirt’ (Lev. 17:13) — what he pours it out with, with that he covers it; he mustn’t cover it with his foot, so that doing religious duties will not appear to him to be contemptible. Here, too, it is so that doing religious duties should not appear to him to be contemptible.”*

IX.19 A. *They asked R. Joshua b. Levi, “What is the law as to using the decorations of the tabernacle for all seven days?”*

B. He said to them, “Lo, they have said, ‘It is forbidden to count money by the Hanukkah lamp.’”

C. *Said R. Joseph, “Master of Abraham! The man is making what has been taught on Tannaite authority depend upon what was not taught on Tannaite authority! The laws concerning the tabernacle are taught on Tannaite authority, those concerning Hanukkah are*

not! For it has been taught on Tannaite authority: [If] one hung up in it nuts, peaches, pomegranates, bunches of grapes, and wreaths of ears of corn, it is valid. [But] one should not eat of any of these, even on the last day of the festival. But if one made a stipulation concerning them that he would eat of them on the festival, it is permitted to do so [T. Suk. 1:7G-I].”

D. Rather, said R. Joseph, “The generative analogy for all of these matters is the law governing covering the blood.”

IX.20 A. *It has been stated:*

B. Rab said, “In a Hanukkah candelabrum, one may not kindle one light from another light.”

C. And Samuel said, “In a Hanukkah candelabrum, one may kindle one light from another light.”

D. Rab said, “Show fringes may not be removed from one garment and put into another.”

E. And Samuel said, “Show fringes may be removed from one garment and put into another.”

F. Rab said, “The law does not accord with the position of R. Simeon on the matter of dragging an object on the Sabbath from one domain to another.”

G. And Samuel said, “The law does accord with the position of R. Simeon on the matter of dragging an object on the Sabbath from one domain to another.”

H. *Said Abbaye, “At every point, the master [Rabbah] acted in accord with Rab, except for these three items, in which case he acted in accord with Samuel, specifically: Show fringes may be removed from one garment and put into another; in a Hanukkah candelabrum, one may kindle one light from another light; and the law does accord with the position of R. Simeon on the matter of dragging an object on the Sabbath from one domain to another.”*

I. *For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

J. R. Simeon says, “On the Sabbath, one may drag a bed, chair, or bench, so long as he does not intend thereby to make a groove in the dirt.”

- IX.21** A. *In session before R. Adda bar Ahbah, one of the rabbis sat and said, “The operative consideration for Rab’s ruling [that in a Hanukkah candelabrum, one may not kindle one light from another light] is on account of treating the religious duty contemptibly.”*
- B. *He said to them, “Don’t pay any attention to him. The operative consideration behind Rab’s ruling is that he damages the doing of the religious duty [taking light from one lamp and giving it to another].”*
- C. *So what’s at stake in these contrasting explanations?*
- D. *At stake is a case in which he lights from lamp to lamp; if the operative consideration is that it is treating the religious duty contemptibly, one may light from lamp to lamp, but if it is because he damages the doing of the religious duty, it is forbidden even to light from lamp to lamp.*
- E. *Objected R. Avayya: “**With a sela of [22B] second tithe one may not weigh gold denars, even to redeem therewith other produce in the status of second tithe [T. M.S. 1:1C-D].** Now if you take the view that Rab and Samuel differ about lighting from lamp to lamp, there is no problem, for with a chip even Samuel would admit that it is forbidden; but if you say that in Samuel’s view it is permitted to do so even with a chip, then this would be a refutation!”*
- F. *Said Rabbah, “It is a precautionary decree lest one’s weights not be exact and he will leave the produce unconsecrated.” [Freedman: The gold denars may be deficient in weight and may not be declared second tithe after all, so he will have used the second tithe sela for a secular purpose.]*
- G. *Objected R. Sheshet, “‘Outside the veil of the testimony in the tent of meeting shall Aaron order it’ (Lev. 24: 3) — **[This serves as testimony for everyone in the world that the Presence of God is in Israel].***
- H. *“Now did they need a light? And is it not the case that all those forty years that the Israelites spent in the wilderness, they needed no light?*
- I. *“For it is said, ‘For over the tabernacle a cloud of the Lord rested by day, and fire would appear in the cloud by night, in the view of all the house of Israel throughout their journeys’ (Exo. 40:38).*

- J. "If so, why is it said, 'of the testimony'?:
- K. "This serves as testimony for everyone in the world that the Presence of God is in Israel" [Sifra CCXL:I.14].
 - L. *What is the meaning of "the testimony"?*
 - M. Said Raba, "This refers to the western lamp, into which the same quantity of oil was poured as was poured into the others, and yet he kindled the others from it and ended up with it." [Cf. **M. Tamid 6:1E**: And if he found the two easternmost lamps still flickering, he clears out the eastern one and leaves the western one flickering, for from it did he kindle the candlestick at twilight.]
- N. *[Reverting to Sheshet's objection:] "Now here, since the branches are fixed in place, it is only possible that he take a chip and kindle the flame of the other lamps with it. So it presents a problem both to the view that it was because of the consideration of treating the religious duty contemptibly, and also because he damages the doing of the religious duty."*
- O. *R. Pappa explained: "It was done by long wicks."*
- P. *Well, in the end, it still is a problem for one who says that the operative consideration is that he damages the doing of the religious duty.*
- Q. *So it's a problem.*

IX.22 A. *So what's the upshot?*

- B. *Said R. Huna b. R. Joshua, "We examine the circumstance: If lighting carries out the religious duty, one may light from lamp to lamp; if placing the lamp is what carries out the religious duty, one may not light from lamp to lamp."*
- C. *For the question was raised: Is it the act of kindling the lamp that carries out the religious duty, or the act of placing the lamp that constitutes the fulfillment of the religious duty?*
- D. *Come and take note of what Raba said, "If someone was holding the Hanukkah lamp and just standing there, he does nothing [to carry out the religious duty]." That proves that actually placing the lamp is what fulfills the religious duty.*
- E. *No, there, someone who sees it may think he's holding the lamp for his own purposes.*
- F. *Come and take note of what Raba said, "If someone lit the lamp inside and then takes the lamp outside, he has done nothing [to carry out the religious duty]." Now, if you say that lighting the lamp is what carries out the religious duty, that*

is why we require lighting the lamp to be done in the right place [which is out of doors]. That explains why he's done nothing. But if you say that placing the lamp is what carries out the religious duty, then why has he done nothing?

G. *No, there, too, someone who sees it may think he's holding the lamp for his own purposes.*

H. *Come and take note of what R. Joshua b. Levi said, [23A] "As to a lantern that was burning for the entire Sabbath day, at the end of the Sabbath, one puts it out and rekindles it." Now if you say that lighting the lamp is what fulfills the religious duty, there is no problem; but if you say that placing the lamp is what does the religious duty, the language "put out...rekindle" is inappropriate; what is needed is, "put it out and raise it up and put it down in the right place and then light it." And moreover, since we say the blessing, "who has sanctified us by His commandments and commanded us to kindle the Hanukkah lamp," that proves that it is the act of lighting the lamp that constitutes the religious duty.*

I. *That is decisive proof.*

IX.23 A. *Now that we have said that it is the lighting of the lamp that constitutes the religious duty, if a deaf-mute, idiot, or minor lit the lamp, he has done nothing.*

B. *But a woman certainly may light it, for said R. Joshua b. Levi said, "Women are liable to light the Hanukkah lamp, for they, too, were part of that miracle."*

IX.24 A. *Said R. Sheshet, "A lodger is also liable to kindle the Hanukkah lamp."*

B. *Said R. Zira, "To begin with, when we were at the household of the master, I shared the cost with my host. After I got married, I said, 'Now I certainly don't need to do it, because they're kindling the lamp in my behalf at home.'"*

IX.25 A. *Said R. Joshua b. Levi, "All types of oil are fine for the Hanukkah lamp, but olive oil is best."*

B. *Said Abbaye, "To begin with, the master [Rabbah] would go in search of sesame oil. He said, 'This oil lasts longer.' But when he heard the statement of R. Joshua b. Levi, he would go in search of olive oil, saying, 'This yields a clearer light.'"*

IX.26 A. *And said R. Joshua b. Levi, "All oils are fine for ink, but olive oil is best."*

B. *The question was raised: Is that for kneading or smoking [kneading with soot? or for making the smoke that makes the soot (Freedman)]?*

C. *Come and take note of that which R. Samuel bar Zutri repeated as a Tannaite statement:* “All oils are fine for ink, but olive oil is best both for kneading with soot and for smoking to create soot.”

D. *R. Samuel bar Zutra repeated the Tannaite statement in this language:* “All soot is fine for ink, but olive oil is best.”

E. Said R. Huna, “All gums are fine for ink, but balsam gum is best of all.”

IX.27

A. R. Hiyya bar Ashi said Rab said, “He who lights the Hanukkah light has to say a blessing.” [Since the lighting of the Hanukkah lamp is only on the authority of rabbis, it must follow that Rab will concur likewise that the case of the lulab, carried on the last six of the seven days solely on the authority of the rabbis, also requires a blessing, and the rest follows.]

B. R. Jeremiah said, “He who sees the Hanukkah light has to say a blessing.”

C. *What blessings does he say?*

D. Said R. Judah, “On the first day, the one who lights the flame says three blessings and the one who sees it says two. From that night onward, the one who lights the light says two blessings, and the one who sees it says only one blessing.”

E. *Which one does he leave out?*

F. He leaves out the blessing of the season [“who has brought us to this season”].

G. *Why not leave out the blessing over the miracle?*

H. *The miracle was every day.*

I. *What blessing does one say?*

J. “Blessed...who has sanctified us by his commandments and commanded us to light the Hanukkah light.”

K. And where did he so command us to light a Hanukkah lamp?

L. R. Avayya said, “It derives from the verse, ‘You shall not turn aside’ (Deu. 17:11). [Rabbis ordained the rite, but this verse shows that even what rabbis require enjoys the authority of the Torah.]”

M. And R. Nehemiah said, “‘Ask your father and he will tell you’ (Deu. 32:7). [The point is the same.]”

N. *Objected R. Amram [to the proposition that one has to say a blessing when carrying out a rabbinically ordained duty], “As to demai produce [which the purchaser has not yet tithed]: (1) They may make an symbolic meal of fusion [to unite distinct domains for purposes of carrying on the Sabbath] with it; and (2) they may make a fusion meal with it; and (3) they recite a benediction over it; and (4) one invites others to recite communal grace after eating it; and (5) they may separate [tithes from] it naked; (6) at twilight [on the eve of the Sabbath] [M. Dem. 1:4A-F]. Now if you maintain that any religious duty ordained by rabbis requires a blessing, here, when he is naked, how is he going to say a blessing? And lo, we require observance of the verse, ‘Therefore shall your camp be holy, that he see no unclean thing in you’ (Deu. 23:15), and that condition is not met.”*

O. *Said Abbaye, “A rabbinic ordinance that involves no matter of doubt requires a blessing, but one that rabbis have made that is subject to doubt [such as demai produce, which is doubtfully tithed] does not require a blessing.”*

P. *But what about the observance of the second day of festivals, which is a matter of doubt, and which derives from sages, and yet it requires the recitation of a blessing!*

Q. *That is so that the second day should not be treated disrespectfully.*

R. Raba said, “Well, the majority of people not meticulous about tithes do give the main tithes anyhow [and demai produce represents attention to what may not be subject to doubt at all].”

IX.28 A. Said R. Huna, “A courtyard that has two doorways has to have two lamps.”

B. Said Raba, “That is stated only if the doorways are in two different sides, but if they are on the same side, it isn’t necessary.”

C. *How come [two lamps are required]? Should I say because of the suspicion [that if one of the doors has no lamp, people may suppose the courtyard residents have neglected the rite]? But who will suspect? If we say it is suspicion of people in general, then even if there are two gates on one side, it should be required to have two lamps? If it is suspicion on the part of the people of the town in*

particular, then even if the gates are in two directions, there still should not be a requirement of having two [since people know what's what]!

D. In point of fact, it really is the suspicion of the townsfolk, but sometimes they go by one door and not the other, and they may conclude, "Just as there is no lamp lit at this door, so there is no lamp lit at the other."

IX.29 *A. And what makes you think that we legislate in response to suspicion? As has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

B. Said R. Simeon, "For [the following] four reasons, a person must designate [produce as] peah only [while harvesting] the rear of his field:

C. "On account of:

D. "(1) Robbery from the poor;

E. "(2) the idleness of the poor;

F. "(3) appearance's sake;

G. "(4) and because [Scripture] states, 'You may not completely harvest the rear corner of your field' (Lev. 19: 9).

H. "Robbery from the poor — how so?

I. "This assures that the farmer will not find an opportune moment and say to a poor relative, 'Come and collect [all of] this peah for yourself.' [If the farmer was allowed to designate all of the peah for his own family, the other poor people in the town would not have fair access to the produce, thus robbing them of what rightfully is theirs (cf. M. 8: 6).]

J. [23B] "The idleness of the poor — how so?

K. "This assures that poor people will not be sitting around and watching [the farmer] all day, saying, 'Now he is designating peah!' Rather, since [the farmer designates produce as peah while harvesting the rear of his field, the poor person] may go and gather poor-offerings from another [person's] field, and may return to collect [the peah] at the end [of the harvest].

L. “Appearance’s sake — how so?”

M. “This assures that passersby will not say, ‘Behold how So-and-so harvested his field and did not designate [any produce as] peah for the poor!’

N. “Because [Scripture] states, ‘You may not completely harvest the rear corner of your field’ (Lev. 19: 9) — [how so?].

O. “Since the produce actually designated as peah will not have been collected before the farmer finishes harvesting his field, when he does finish it will appear that he never designated any produce] [T. **Peah 1:6A-H** with variations] [Sifra CXCVI:II.4, trans. Roger Brooks].

P. *So aren’t these other reasons also on account of the verse, “you shall not finish off” (Lev. 19: 9)?*

Q. Said Raba, “It is a precaution against cheaters.”

IX.30 A. Said R. Isaac bar Redifah said R. Huna, “A lamp that has two openings serves for two individuals.”

B. Said Raba, “[If] one filled a dish with oil and surrounded the oil with wicks and put a utensil over it [so it looks like a lamp with a lot of spouts], it may serve for any number of people; but if he doesn’t put a utensil over it, all he has done is make a kind of bonfire, and it goes to no one’s credit.”

IX.31 A. *Said Raba, “It is clear to me that* [if someone can’t afford both and has to choose between] a lamp for his house and a lamp for Hanukkah, the lamp for his house takes precedence, for the welfare of the household. If he has to choose between a lamp for his house and wine for saying a prayer of sanctification of a holy day, a lamp for his house takes precedence, for the welfare of the household.”

B. *Raba raised this question:* “If one has to choose between buying a lamp for Hanukkah and wine for saying a prayer of sanctification for a holy day, what is the rule? Should the sanctification of the day take precedence, since it is a permanent and recurrent obligation, *or perhaps* the lamp for Hanukkah should take precedence, *because it thereby publicizes the miracle?*”

C. *After he raised the question, he went and solved it:* “The lamp for Hanukkah should take precedence, *because it thereby publicizes the miracle.*”

IX.32 A. Said R. Huna, “He who makes a practice of lighting the lamp will have sons who are disciples of sages. He who is meticulous about the mezuzah will have the merit of living in a beautiful house. He who is meticulous about show fringes on his garment will merit a beautiful cloak. He who is meticulous about saying the sanctification of the day will have the merit of full barrels of wine.”

IX.33 *A. R. Huna would regularly pass by the door of R. Abin the carpenter. He saw that they were accustomed to light a lot of lamps. He said, “Two eminent authorities will come forth from here.” R. Idi bar Abin and R. Hiyya bar Abin came forth from there.*

IX.34 *A. R. Hisda would regularly pass by the house of the father of R. Shizbi. He saw that he was accustomed to light a lot of lamps. He said, “An eminent authority will come forth from here.” R. Shizbi came forth from there.*

IX.35 *A. The wife of R. Joseph would like the Sabbath lights lit [at the last possible minute]. Said to her R. Joseph, “It has been taught on Tannaite authority: ‘He didn’t take away the pillar of cloud by day and the pillar of fire by night’ (Exo. 13:22) — this teaches that the pillar of cloud [Freedman:] overlapped the pillar of fire, and the pillar of fire overlapped the pillar of cloud.”*

B. She considered doing it very early. Said to her a certain elder, “The Tannaite statement [adds:] but that is on condition that it is not done too early or too late.”

IX.36 *A. Said Raba, “He who values rabbis will have sons who are rabbis; he who honors rabbis will have sons-in-law who are rabbis; he who fears rabbis will himself become a neophyte rabbi. But if he isn’t suitable for such a thing, then, at least, his words will be listened to like those of a neophyte rabbi.”*

X.1 A. **Oil [given to a priest as heave-offering which had become unclean and must therefore be] burned:**

- B. *What is the definition of oil [given to a priest as heave-offering which had become unclean and must therefore be] burned?*
- C. Said Rabbah, “It is oil in the status of heave-offering that has been made unclean.”
- D. *“And why is it called “oil that is to be burned”?*
- E. *“Since it is going to be burned [that is what it is called].*

- F. *“And why can’t it be used on the Sabbath?”*
- G. *“Since it is one’s religious duty to get rid of it, it is a precautionary decree, lest someone tilt the lamp [to burn up more oil].”*
- H. *Said to him Abbaye, “Well, then, it should be permitted to use it for the lamp for the festivals, but how come then we have learned in the Mishnah: **They do not kindle [a light] for the festival day with [heave-offering] oil [which had become unclean and must be] burned [M. 2:2A]?**”*
- I. *It is a precautionary decree with reference to the festival day because of the rule governing the Sabbath.*
- J. *R. Hisda said, “We don’t invoke the argument, ‘lest one tilt...,’ but here we deal with a festival that coincides with a Friday, and as for the reason the oil is prohibited, it is because it is forbidden to burn Holy Things on festivals.”*
- K. *But lo, since the next component of the passage states, **They do not kindle [a light] for the festival day with [heave-offering] oil [which had become unclean and must be] burned**, it must follow that in the opening clause [that is, the one before us] we are not dealing with the festival day!*
- L. *Said R. Hanina from Sura, “The formulation is meant to explain matters, so: What is the reason that **they do not kindle [a light] for the festival day with [heave-offering] oil [which had become unclean and must be] burned?** Because it is because it is forbidden to burn Holy Things on festivals.”*

X.2 A. [24A] *It has been taught on Tannaite authority along the lines of the view of R. Hisda:*

B. *In the case of all of these items of which they have said that they do not kindle on the Sabbath, they do kindle them on the festival day, except for oil that is to be burned, since they are not to burn Holy Things on a festival day.*

Hanukkah in the Liturgy

- X.3** A. *The question was raised: What is the law as to including a reference to Hanukkah in the grace after meals? Since the observance derives from rabbis, we do not make mention of it, or perhaps, so as to publicize the miracle, we do make mention of it?*
- B. *Said Raba said R. Sehorah said R. Huna, “One does not make mention of it, but, if one proposes to make mention of it, it is in the thanksgiving paragraph.”*
- C. *R. Huna bar Judah came to the household of Raba. He thought of including it in the paragraph, “...who builds Jerusalem.”*

D. Said to them R. Sheshet, "It is comparable to the prayer: Just as in the prayer, it is including in the paragraph of thanksgiving, so in the blessing after meals, it is included in the paragraph of thanksgiving."

- X.4** A. *The question was raised:* What is the law as to including a reference to the new moon in the blessing after meals? *If you should argue, with respect to Hanukkah, which is ordained by rabbis, it is not necessary to do so, well, then, the celebration of the new moon derives from the Torah, so it is necessary to do so? Or perhaps, since it is not forbidden on that day to do work, we do not make mention of it?*
- B. Rab said, "One does include it."
- C. R. Hanina said, "One doesn't include it."

D. Said R. Zeriqa, "Hold on to what Rab has said, because R. Oshayya stands with him. For R. Oshayya taught as a Tannaite statement: 'A day on which there is an additional offering, for example, the new moon and the intermediate days of festivals, at the evening, morning, and afternoon services, one says the eighteen blessings of the prayer, and alludes to the event in the prayer for the restoration of the sacrificial service. And if one did not say it, then they instruct him to go back and say it. And on those days, there is no recitation of the sanctification of the day over a cup of wine, but they do make mention of the occasion in the blessing after meals. On days on which there is no additional offering, for instance, Mondays and Thursdays and fast days and counterpart-celebrations in the villages of the work of that village's priestly celebration in Jerusalem....'"

E. *So what are Monday and Thursday doing on this list!?*

F. Rather: "The Monday, Thursday, and Monday of sequences of fasts, and counterpart celebrations in the villages of the work of that village's priestly celebration in Jerusalem, one recites the prayer of eighteen benedictions and alludes to the event in the paragraph ending, '...who hears prayer.' And if the one who reads the service did not make mention of it, they do not have him go back. And no mention is made of these occasions in the blessing after meals."

- X.5** A. *The question was raised:* What is the law as to making mention of Hanukkah in the additional service? *Since there is no additional offering on its own account, we do not make mention of it? Or perhaps it is a day on which there*

is an obligation to say the prayer four times [morning, afternoon, evening, and additional] [so it is mentioned]?

- B. *R. Huna and R. Judah both say, “One does not make mention of it.”*
- C. *R. Nahman and R. Yohanan both say, “One does make mention of it.”*

D. Said Abbaye to R. Joseph, “Lo, the position of R. Huna and R. Judah is the same as Rab’s. For said R. Giddal said Rab, ‘On the occasion of the new moon that coincided with the Sabbath, the one who recites the prophetic lection does not make mention of the new moon, since if it were not for the Sabbath, there would be no prophetic lection on the occasion of the new moon at all.’”

E. But how are these comparable? In that case, there is no prophetic lection in regard to the new moon at all, but here with respect to Hanukkah, there is a reference to Hanukkah in the evening, morning, and afternoon prayers. Rather, it is comparable to what R. Ahadeboy said R. Mattenah said Rab said, “On a new moon that coincided with the Sabbath, the one who reads the prophetic lection at the afternoon service on the Sabbath does not have to make mention of the festival, for were it not for the Sabbath, there would be no afternoon service on the festival day at all.”

- X.6** A. **[24B]** *But the decided law is not in accord with any of these rulings except in accord with what R. Joshua b. Levi said, “In the case of the Day of Atonement that coincided with the Sabbath, the one who says the prayer at the closing of the day has to make mention of the Sabbath day. It is a day on which four prayers are recited” [Freedman: and the same applies to festivals that coincide with the Sabbath].*

B. But then there is a contradiction between one decided law and another! For you say that the law accords with R. Joshua b. Levi, and it is an established fact that the law accords with Raba, but Raba has said, “A festival day that coincided with the Sabbath — the agent of the community who descends before the ark to read the service in the evening does not have to make mention of the festival day, since were it not for the Sabbath, on that occasion the agent of the community would not go down before the ark at all at the evening service on festivals”!

C. But how are these comparable? In that case, by law it is not required even on the Sabbath [that there be a reader who repeats the

service, just as this is optional at the evening service], and it was rabbis who ordained that practice to take account of the danger [of leaving people alone in the synagogue, should they come late and not complete their prayers along with the group as a whole, so services are prolonged in that way], but here, it is a day when four services are required [and it is not an ordinance of rabbis].

XI.1 A. Grease from the fat tail, or tallow:

- B. *Sages say the same thing as the opening Tannaite authority!*
- C. *At issue between them is what R. Barona said Rab said [In the case of melted tallow and the dissolved innards of fish, one may pour a little oil and light with that oil], but it is not clear who says what.*

2:2

- A. **They do not kindle [a light] for the festival day with [heave-offering] oil [which had become unclean and must be] burned.**
- B. **R. Ishmael says, “They do not kindle [the Sabbath lamp] with tar,**
- C. **“because of the honor owing to the Sabbath.”**
- D. **And sages permit all kinds of oils:**
- E. **(1) Sesame oil, (2) nut oil, (3) fish oil, (4) colocynth oil, (5) tar, and (6) naphtha.**
- F. **R. Tarfon says, “They kindle only with olive oil.”**

I.1 A. [They do not kindle a light for the festival day with [heave-offering oil which had become unclean and must be burned:] how come?

- B. Because they don’t burn Holy Things on the festival.
- C. *What is the scriptural source of that fact?*
- D. Said Hezekiah, *and so, too, a Tannaite authority of the household of Hezekiah [stated], “Said Scripture, ‘And you shall let nothing of it remain until the morning, but that which remains of it until the morning you shall burn with fire’ (Exo. 12:10). The second ‘until the morning’ is hardly required, and why does Scripture say it? Scripture comes to assign the second morning as the occasion for burning Holy Things” [in the context of Passover, the sixteenth of Nisan, which is not a festival day, and that indicates burning on the festival of unclean Holy Things is forbidden (Freedman)].*
- E. Abbayye said, “Said Scripture, ‘The burnt-offering of the Sabbath shall be burned on its Sabbath’ (Num. 28:10) — but not the burnt-offering of

weekdays on the Sabbath, not the burnt-offering of weekdays on festivals” [Freedman: hence Holy Things if unfit may not be burned on festivals].

- F. Raba said, “Said Scripture, ‘No manner of work shall be done in them, except that which every man must eat, that only may be done by you’ (Exo. 212:16) — ‘that’ — but not what is required to make that possible; ‘only’ — but not circumcision at other than its proper time on the eighth day, which otherwise might derive by an argument a fortiori.” [Freedman: Thus we learn that when an act need not be done on a particular day, it may not be done on the Sabbath or festivals; the same then applies to burning Holy Things that have become unclean.]
- G. R. Ashi said, “Said Scripture, ‘On the first day [25A] shall be a solemn rest’ (Lev. 23:39) is a commandment involving a positive action, and a commandment involving refraining from action in respect to the festival; a commandment involving a positive action cannot take effect over a commandment involving both a positive action and also refraining from action.” [Freedman: The negative “no manner of work,” the positive, “to burn what is left over,” at Exo. 12:10; the unfit Holy Things may not be burned on festivals.]

H. *Then burning unclean Holy Things is forbidden only on festivals, but on weekdays it is permitted to do so [and to gain an advantage by doing so, for instance, using it as fuel]. How come?*

I. Said Rab, “Just as it is a religious duty to burn Holy Things that have become unclean, so it is a religious duty to burn heave-offering that has become unclean. And the Torah has said, ‘When it is removed [and burned], you may enjoy benefit from it.’”

J. And where did the Torah give that message?

K. *It is in line with what R. Nahman [said], for* said R. Nahman said Rabbah bar Abbuha, “Said Scripture, ‘And I, behold I have given you charge of my heave-offerings’ (Num. 18: 8). By using the plural, Scripture makes reference to two classifications of heave-offering, the one then must be clean heave-offering, the other, unclean heave-offering, and the All-Merciful has said, ‘to you,’ meaning, ‘it shall belong to you for use for heating under your pot.’”

L. *And if you prefer, I shall say that it derives from what R. Abbahu said:*

M. Said R. Abbahu said R. Yohanan, “Said Scripture, ‘Neither have I burned of it when unclean’ (Deu. 26:14) — you may not burn of it, but you may burn oil in the status of priestly rations that has become unclean.”

N. *But might one say:* You may not burn of it, but you may burn oil in the status of Holy Things that has become unclean?

O. Does the opposite of that proposition not derive from an argument a fortiori, namely: If of tithe, which is less weighty, the Torah has said, “Neither have I burned of it when unclean” (Deu. 26:14), Holy Things, which is the more weighty, surely should be subject to the same rule!

P. *If so, why not same the same thing of food in the status of priestly rations on the basis of an argument a fortiori!*

Q. *But “of it” is stated!*

R. *So what makes you prefer one route rather than the other?*

S. *It stands to reason not to exclude food in the status of Holy Things, for the restrictions apply to it involving what is rendered abominable by the officiating priest’s improper intention at the time of slaughtering the animal to eat the meat or burn the sacrificial parts at the wrong time or place, not to eat what is left over, to preserve the holiness of the sacrifice, sacrilege, the penalty of extirpation, and the prohibition to a priest who has suffered a bereavement and not yet buried his dead.*

T. *To the contrary, food in the status of priestly rations should not be excluded, since to it pertain the considerations of the death penalty, the added fifth, [25B] the impossibility of redemption, and the prohibition to non-priests.*

U. *The former are more numerous, and, if you prefer, I shall say that the consideration of extirpation as the penalty outweighs everything else.*

V. *And if you prefer, I shall say, Holy Things are the weightier, since involved in them is the penalty of extirpation.*

W. R. Nahman bar Isaac said, “Said Scripture, ‘The first fruits of your grain, your wine, and your oil shall you give to him’ (Deu. 18: 4) — meaning, [the priest has the right to use

it] for his own purposes, so it cannot be unclean and fit only for burning. Then it follows that in any event it is suitable for burning.”

II.1 A. R. Ishmael says, “They do not kindle [the Sabbath lamp] with tar, because of the honor owing to the Sabbath”:

B. *How come?*

C. Said Rabbah, “Since it stinks, that is a precautionary decree lest he leave it and go out [of his house on that account].”

D. Said to him Abbayye, “So let him go.”

E. He said to him, “Lighting the lamp on the Sabbath is obligatory [and one cannot leave the lamp; he has to eat his meal by the Sabbath lamp].”

F. *For said R. Nahman bar R. Zabeda, and some say, said R. Nahman bar Raba said Rab, “Lighting the lamp on the Sabbath is obligatory; washing the hands and feet in warm water on the eve of the Sabbath is optional. But I say it is a religious duty.”*

G. *How is it a religious duty? That is in line with what R. Judah said Rab said, “This was the custom of R. Judah bar Ilai on the eve of the Sabbath: They would bring him a trough filled with warm water, and he would wash his face, hands, and feet, then wrap himself in his garment and sit in linen robes with fringes [made of wool], and he looked like an angel of the Lord of hosts. But his disciples hid from him the corners of their garments [since they did not put woolen fringes on a linen garment, maintaining that that violated the law against mixed species]. He said to them, ‘My sons, haven’t I told you that, with respect to fringes on a linen robe, the House of Shammai declare it exempt, and the House of Hillel declare it liable, and the decided law accords with the House of Hillel?’”*

H. *But they maintained, it is a precautionary decree on account of the possibility of doing the same with pajamas [which are not subject to the requirement of show fringes, and then such a forbidden mixture cannot be used].*

II.2 A. “And you have removed my soul far off from peace, I forgot prosperity” (Lam. 3:17):

B. *What is the meaning of “And you have removed my soul far off from peace”?*

C. Said R. Abbahu, "This refers to kindling the Sabbath light."

II.3 A. "I forgot prosperity" (Lam. 3:17):

B. Said R. Jeremiah, "This refers to taking baths."

C. Said R. Yohanah, "This refers to washing hands and feet in warm water."

D. R. Isaac Nappaha said, "This refers to having a nice bed and nice bedclothes for it."

E. R. Abba said, "This refers to disciples of sages' well-laid out beds and well-decked-out wives."

II.4 A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

B. "What is the definition of a rich man? It is anyone who has satisfaction from his wealth," the words of R. Meir.

C. R. Tarfon says, "It is anyone who has a hundred vineyards, a hundred fields, a hundred slaves to work them."

D. R. Aqiba says, "It is anyone who has a wife made beautiful by her deeds."

E. R. Yosé says, "It is anyone who has a toilet near his table."

II.5 A. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

B. **R. Simeon b. Eleazar says, "They don't kindle the Sabbath light with balsam" [T. Shab. 2:3A].**

II.6 A. *How come?*

B. Said Rabbah, "Because it smells so good, it is a precautionary decree not to use it, lest one derive secular pleasure from it."

C. *Said to him Abbayye, [26A] "Why not give as the reason, because it is volatile?"*

D. *He has stated matters as, for this reason and yet for another: First of all, because it is volatile, and, moreover, it is a precautionary decree not to use it, lest one derive secular pleasure from it.*

II.7 A. *There was a mother-in-law who hated her daughter-in-law. She said, "Go, dress yourself up with balsam oil." She went and did it. When she came back, she said to her, "Go, light the candle." She went and did it; a spark flew out on her and she was consumed in fire.*

II.8 A. “But Nebuzaradan, captain of the guard, left some of the poorest of the land to be vine dressers and husbandmen” (Jer. 52:16):

B. *R. Joseph set forth as a Tannaite statement:* “‘Vine dressers’: These are balsam gatherers from En Gedi to Ramah.

C. “‘Husbandmen’: These are those who catch purple fish for dyeing from the outcropping at Tyre as far south as Haifa.”

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

B. On a weekday they do not kindle the lamp with unclean produce that is liable for tithing but not yet tithed, and it goes without saying, on the Sabbath.

C. Along these same lines: On a weekday they do not kindle the lamp with white naphtha, and it goes without saying, on the Sabbath.

II.10 A. *Now there is no difficulty understanding the prohibition of white naphtha, since it is volatile; but how come unclean produce that is liable for tithing but not yet tithed cannot be used in this manner?*

B. Said Scripture, “And behold, I have given you charge of my heave-offerings” (Num. 18: 8): By using the plural, Scripture makes reference to two classifications of heave-offering, the one then must be clean heave-offering, the other, unclean heave-offering. Just as in the case of heave-offering that is clean, you have a right to it only when it has been designated and onwards [at which point the priest has access to it], so in the case of heave-offering that is unclean, you have a right to it only from the time that it is designated and onwards. [It can be used for fuel only when it has been designated.]

II.11 A. *Reverting to the body of the foregoing:* **R. Simeon b. Eleazar says, “They don’t kindle the Sabbath light with balsam” [T. [Shab. 2:3A](#)] –**

B. And so did R. Simeon b. Eleazar say, “Balsam is no more than a resin that exudes from the wood of the balsam tree.”

C. **R. Ishmael says, “With nothing that exudes from a tree do they kindle the Sabbath light.”**

D. **R. Ishmael b. R. Yohanan b. Beroqa says, “They kindle only with what exudes from produce.”**

E. **R. Tarfon says, “They kindle only with olive oil alone” [M. [Shab. 2:2F](#)].**

F. **R. Yohanan b. Nuri got up on his feet and said, “What will the people in Babylonia do, who have only sesame oil? What will the people in Media**

do, who have only nut oil? What will the people in Alexandria do, who have only radish oil? What will the people of Cappodocia do, who have neither the one nor the other but only naphtha? You have as prohibited only what sages have actually stated is prohibited” [T. **Shab. 2:3B-F**].

- G. One may kindle the Sabbath lamp with fish oil and with resin [cf. T. **2:4A**: They kindle the Sabbath light with the oil of colocynth and with naphtha].
- H. **R. Simeon Shezuri says, “They kindle the Sabbath light with oil of gourds and with naphtha.”**
- I. **Sumkhos says, “With anything that exudes from meat they do not kindle the Sabbath lamp, except for fish oil” [T. **2:4B-D**].**

II.12 A. *But what Sumkhos says is the same as the initial authority [Yohanan b. Nuri]!*

B. *At issue between them is what R. Barona said Rab said, but who takes which position is not spelled out.*

II.13 A. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. **R. Simeon b. Eleazar says, “[Cloth made from] whatever exudes from a tree is not subject to the rule that holds that a piece of cloth three fingerbreadths by three fingerbreadths is subject to uncleanness [but not anything smaller than that size, which would be deemed useless and therefore insusceptible]; they make use of such a fabric for covering a Sukkah, except for flax” [T. **Shab. 2:4D-F**].**

II.14 A. Said Abbaye, **[26B]** “R. Simeon b. Eleazar and a Tannaite authority of the household of R. Ishmael have said the same thing.”

B. *R. Simeon b. Eleazar: As we have just said.*

C. *And what about the Tannaite authority of the household of R. Ishmael?*

D. *It is as a Tannaite authority of the household of R. Ishmael [stated]:*

E. “Since ‘garments’ is stated without further explanation, except in one particular case in which Scripture specified ‘wool and linen,’ it is to be inferred that all garments are understood in context as being those that are wool and linen.”

F. *Raba said, “Where they differ, it is with reference to garments that are otherwise [and don’t have wool or linen]. R. Simeon b. Eleazar regards them as subject to uncleanness, the Tannaite authority of the*

household of R. Ishmael does not [garments meaning only wool or flax].

II.15 *A. In any event, all parties concur that a piece of cloth made of wool or linen that is three fingerbreadths by three fingerbreadths contacts uncleanness from plagues [the skin ailment of which Lev. 13-14 speak]. How on the basis of Scripture do we know that fact?*

B. It is as has been taught on Tannaite authority:

C. Scripture says, “the garment” (Lev. 13:47).

D. I know only about a garment, in which there are three-by-three fingerbreadths of woven stuff. But what about [the susceptibility of] a garment in which are not three-by-three fingerbreadths of woven stuff [vs. M. 12:2E]?

E. Scripture says, “And the garment” (Lev. 13:47) [Sifra CXLIV:I.1G-I].

F. But might one say, it is to encompass cloth three handbreadths square [a much larger minimum]?

G. But isn't it an argument a fortiori: If warp and woof become unclean, can there be any doubt that a cloth three handbreadths square is susceptible?

H. Then why not derive the rule covering a cloth three fingerbreadths square from the other by an argument a fortiori [Freedman: since cloth containing a warp and a woof can be less]?

I. Rather: A piece of cloth three handbreadths square, which is suitable for use by both wealthy and poor people, can be adduced a fortiori: A cloth that is three fingerbreadths square, which is useful only to the poor but not to the rich, cannot be derived a fortiori, so it is only because Scripture explicitly made mention of it; but if Scripture hadn't, then we could not compose the argument a fortiori.

J. But might one say, it is to encompass cloth three handbreadths square [a much larger minimum] in cloth made of other materials than wool or linen?

K. Said Scripture, “a woolen garment or a linen garment” (Lev. 13:48) — only a garment of wool or linen, but nothing else.

L. But might one say, when Scripture presented an exclusion it was from uncleanness affecting cloth three fingerbreadths square, but as

to such cloth that was three handbreadths square, that can contract uncleanness?

M. *What we have are not one but two exclusionary clauses, “a woolen garment or a linen garment” (Lev. 13:47, 48) — one eliminates cloth [other than that made of linen or wool of a size] less than three by three fingerbreadths, the other eliminates cloth [other than that made of linen or wool of a size less than] three by three handbreadths.*

N. *And from the perspective of Raba, who has said, “At issue between them is cloth three by three handbreadths made of other materials is liable to this uncleanness, and R. Simeon b. Eleazar maintains that cloth of that size and makeup is susceptible to uncleanness, while the Tannaite authority of the household of R. Ishmael says that it is not subject to uncleanness,” how does he know that cloth three by three handbreadths made up of other materials than linen and wool [27A] is susceptible to uncleanness?*

O. *He deduces that fact from the language, “or a garment” (Lev. 11:32). For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

P. *“A garment” (Lev. 11:32) — I know then that uncleanness pertains only to that. How do I know that it pertains to cloth three handbreadths square made of other materials than linen or wool? Scripture states, “or a garment.”*

Q. *And how does Abbaye interpret this usage, “or a garment”?*

R. *He requires it to encompass under the law of uncleanness exuding from dead creeping things [to which Lev. 11 refers] a piece of cloth three by three fingerbreadths that is made of wool or linen.*

S. *And Raba?*

T. *Scripture has made that point abundantly clear with reference to the uncleanness deriving from the skin*

ailment, and that would apply equally to uncleanness deriving from dead creeping things?

U. And Abbayye?

V. *There is the following flaw in the argument:* What characterizes the uncleanness of the skin ailment as it applies to cloth is that it applies to warp and woof [which is not the case for uncleanness deriving from dead creeping things].

W. *And the other party?*

X. If it should enter your mind that the uncleanness deriving from the skin ailment is a weightier kind, then the All-Merciful should have spelled out that fact with reference to dead creeping things, and the same as applied to the skin ailment could readily be derived from that simple fact.

Y. *And the other party?*

Z. *Rules governing the skin ailment's uncleanness cannot be derived from rules covering that of dead creeping things, because there is the following flaw in the analogy:* What characterizes dead creeping things is that they can impart uncleanness when in so small a volume as a lentil [while the minimum measure in the other case is uncleanness the size of a bean, which is larger than a lentil].

II.16 A. *Said Abbayye, "This formulation of the Tannaite authority of the household of R. Ishmael differs from the statement of another Tannaite authority of the household of R. Ishmael, for the Tannaite authority of the household of R. Ishmael [stated], 'By "garment" I understand only those that are wool and linen. How do I know that I should encompass wool of camels, hares, goats, raw silk, floss silk, or fine silk? Scripture states, "or a garment" (Lev. 47).'"*

B. *Raba said, "In what respect does this Tannaite authority of the household of R. Ishmael reject uncleanness so far as other materials than linen and wool are concerned? It is with regard to the minimum measure of three fingerbreadths*

square. But if the cloth is three handbreadths square, he maintains that cloth of other materials of that size is susceptible to uncleanness."

C. But lo, it was Raba who said, "R. Simeon b. Eleazar maintains that cloth of that size and makeup is susceptible to uncleanness, while the Tannaite authority of the household of R. Ishmael says that it is not subject to uncleanness," how does he know that cloth three by three handbreadths made up of other materials than linen and wool is susceptible to uncleanness"?!

D. Raba retracted that statement.

E. Or, if you prefer, I shall say, this latter statement was made by R. Pappa.

F. For R. Pappa said, "'...so all are of wool or flax' [stated by the Tannaite authority of the household of R. Ishmael] is to encompass a mixture of wool and flax." [Abraham: Only a mixture of wool or flax is forbidden, but no other; accordingly, the issue is not defilement at all, and there is no contradiction to the other teaching of Ishmael's household.]

G. But the prohibition of mixed fabrics is explicitly stated by Scripture: "You shall not wear mingled stuff, wool and linen together" (Deu. 22:11)!

H. It might have entered your mind to suppose that the prohibition concerns actually wearing such garments, but if it were merely to put it over one's body as a covering would not be forbidden, except because of the demonstration just now offered [on the strength of the exegesis of the verse].

I. But doesn't that fact derive from an argument a fortiori: If you have said that the prohibition extends to wearing such garments, in which case his entire body derives benefit from the mixed species, in which case wool and linen are alone forbidden but nothing else, then how much the more so should wrapping oneself in such a thing be forbidden! So it must follow that this statement of R. Pappa is a joke.

J. R. Nahman bar Isaac said, "... 'so all are of wool or flax' [27B] serves to encompass show fringes."

K. *But the issue of show fringes is explicitly covered by Scripture: Since it is written, “You will not wear hybrid fabrics” [for example, a garment made from both wool and flax which derive from different categories, vegetable and animal, respectively], and it is written, “You will make twisted cords [that is, show fringes] for yourself” (Deu. 22:11, 12). [This juxtaposition proves the fringes are required only in garments of wool and linen (Freedman).]*

L. *[Nahman replies:] “It might have entered your mind to argue as does Raba. For Raba contrasted verses as follows: ‘It is written, ‘The corner’ [Cashdan: which implies that the fringes are to be of] the same kind of material as the corner; but it is also written, ‘wool and linen.’ How so? Woolen threads along with linen threads carry out the obligation of a garment to have show fringes whether these garments are made of the same material or material of some other kind; other kinds of threads serve to fulfill the requirement of show fringes in a garment of the same material, but not in a garment of some other material.” So you might have imagined that it follows Raba’s view, and so we are informed that that is not the case.*

II.17 A. *Said R. Aha b. Raba to R. Ashi, “From the perspective of the Tannaite authority of the household of R. Ishmael, what differentiates uncleanness, in that it covers other garments as well as those of linen and wool? It is because ‘or garment’ is written — but then, here, too, with regard to show fringes, we may as well say that other garments are subject to the law, on the basis of the verse, ‘with which you cover yourself’ (Deu. 22:12)!”*

B. *[He said to him,] “That is required to encompass under the law of fringes the garment of a blind person, as it has been taught on Tannaite authority”:*

C. *“And you will look upon it” — excluding pajamas [which, worn by night, are not seen].*

D. You maintain the reading, “And you will look upon it” — excluding pajamas. But perhaps the sense is only to exclude a garment worn by a blind person!

E. When Scripture says, “with which you cover yourself” (Deu. 22:12), that self-evidently encompasses the garment worn by a blind person. So how am I to interpret “And you will look upon it”? It means, excluding pajamas.

F. So how come you extend the law to the garment worn by a blind person and exclude from the law of show fringes pajamas?

G. I extend the law to the clothing of a blind person, since they are subject to being seen by other people, but I exclude from the requirement pajamas, which are not going to be seen by other people.

H. *But might one say*, “with which you cover yourself” (Deu. 22:12) serves to encompass under the law other garments besides those of wool or linen?

I. *It is more reasonable that, when one is discussing garments of wool and linen, he means to include a garment of wool and linen, but when speaking of wool and linen, should one cover other garments as well?*

II.18 A. Said Abbaye, “R. Simeon b. Eleazar and Sumkhos have said the same thing.”

B. *R. Simeon b. Eleazar: As we have just said.*

C. *And as to Sumkhos, it is in line with that which has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

D. Sumkhos says, “If one covered a sukkah with spun flax, it is unfit, because it is subject to uncleanness by the skin ailment.”

E. *In accord with what authority does he make that statement? It is not in accord with the Tannaite authority behind that which we have learned in the Mishnah:*

F. **The warp and woof are subject to the uncleanness through plagues forthwith** [B. adds: the words of R. Meir].

G. **R. Judah says, “The warp — when it has been boiled. And the woof — forthwith.**

H. “And bundles of flax — after they have been bleached”
[M. Neg. 11:8A-C].

2:3A-B

- A. With nothing which exudes from a tree do they light [the Sabbath light], except for flax.
- B. And nothing which exudes from a tree contracts uncleanness [as a tent] through overshadowing [a corpse] except for flax.

I.1 A. *How on the basis of Scripture do we know that flax is classified as that which exudes from a tree?*

- B. *Said Mar Zutra, “Said Scripture, ‘But she had brought them up to the roof and hid them with the stalks of the flax’ (Jos. 2: 6) [and the word ‘stalks’ uses the same letters as the word ‘tree’].”*

II.1 A. **And nothing which exudes from a tree contracts uncleanness [as a tent] through overshadowing [a corpse] except for flax:**

- B. *How do we know this on the basis of Scripture?*
- C. *Said R. Eleazar, “One derives the meaning of the word ‘tent’ from its use in connection [28A] with the tabernacle in the wilderness. Here it is written, ‘This is the Torah. As to a man, when he dies in a tent’ (Num. 19:14). And elsewhere it is written, ‘And he spread the tent over the tabernacle’ (Exo. 40:19). Just as, in that later passage, the covering of linen is classified as a tent, so here, too, the covering of linen must be such as to be classified as a tent.”*
- D. *Well, then, just as in that case, it was twisted, its thread was doubled six times, so here, too, mustn’t it be twisted with its thread doubled six-fold [and otherwise there should be no uncleanness]?*
- E. *Scripture uses the language, “tent” repeatedly, and that serves to augment the coverage of the law.*
- F. *Then, if Scripture uses the language, “tent” repeatedly, which serves to augment the coverage of the law, everything else [of any material] also should be covered by the rule!*
- G. *If that were the case, what purpose would the verbal analogy just now given have served?*
- H. *But say: Just as in the case of the tabernacle, it was made of boards, so here, too, a tent of boards was meant?*

- I. Said Scripture, “And you shall make boards for the tabernacle” (Exo. 26:15): It is the tabernacle itself [Freedman: twelve joined strips passing over the boards and forming the roof] that falls into the classification of a tabernacle, but boards on their own don’t fall into the classification of a tabernacle.
- J. *Well, then, what about the following possibility:* “And you shall make a covering for the tent” (Exo. 26:14) — *here, too, isn’t a covering classified as a tent?*
- K. *So, when R. Eleazar raised the question, “What is the law as to the hide of an unclean beast becoming unclean when it overshadows a corpse” — why should he have been in doubt, since the hide of a clean animal cannot contract uncleanness* [Freedman: on the present hypothesis, that the covering, which included ram skins, which are clean, is not a tent, it is excluded from the rule of overshadowing a corpse at Num. 19:14]? *So if the hide of a clean beast does not contract uncleanness, is there any doubt as to the rule covering the hide of an unclean beast?*
- L. *There is an exceptional situation there, for Scripture went and restored [under the category of tent] the hide of an unclean animal, as it is written, “they shall bear the curtains of the tabernacle and the tent of meeting, its covering and the covering of sealskin that is above it” (Num. 4:25), meaning: there is an analogy drawn between the upper covering and the lower one, so that, just as the lower one is classified as a tent, so the upper one is classified as a tent.*

II.2 A. *Reverting to the body of the foregoing: R. Eleazar raised the question, “What is the law as to the hide of an unclean beast becoming unclean when it overshadows a corpse” —*

B. *So what is he asking?* [Freedman: How can he think that it is subject to such uncleanness, seeing that he derives the definition of “tent” from the tabernacle, where the skins of clean animals alone were used?]

C. *Said R. Adda bar Ahbah, “What he is asking about is the badger that existed in the time of Moses, specifically, was it unclean or clean?”*

D. *Said R. Joseph, “What’s sort of a problem is that? We have learned as a Tannaite statement: Validated for the sacred work is only the skin of a clean animal.”*

E. *Objected R. Abba, “R. Judah says, ‘There were two coverings, one of dyed rams’ hides, the other of badger hides.’ R. Nehemiah says,*

‘There was one covering, and it was like a squirrel’s hide.’ But the squirrel is unclean!”

F. *This is the sense of the statement:* Like a squirrel’s hide, which has many colors, *but not really a squirrel, for the squirrel in general is unclean, but here, only a clean animal is under discussion.*”

G. *Said R. Joseph, “If so, that’s why we render the word sasgawna as ‘that it rejoices in having many colors.’”*

II.3 A. *Raba said, “The fact that the hide of an unclean animal is made unclean when it overshadows a corpse derives from the following, which was taught on Tannaite authority:*

B. *“Since Scripture could have said, ‘skin,’ when it says, ‘or in skin’ (Lev. 13:48) it serves to extend susceptibility to uncleanness to the hide of an unclean beast or one that was smitten with the skin ailment while subject to the examination of a priest. If someone cut off a piece of any of these materials listed in that verse, and made one piece of them all, how do we know that the composite is subject to uncleanness? Scripture says, ‘or in any thing made of hide’ (Lev. 13:48).”*

C. *But there is the following flaw in the proposed proof [deriving in particular from the uncleanness of the skin ailment, for the proposition that concerns uncleanness deriving from overshadowing a corpse, namely:] what distinguishes what is affected by the skin ailment is that the warp and woof would be made unclean through that form of uncleanness [which is not the case of corpse uncleanness].*

D. *Well, then, derive the same fact from the case of dead creeping things, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

E. *Scripture says, “skin” (Lev. 11:32). I know only that the hide of a clean beast is affected by the uncleanness of a dead creeping thing. How do I know that the same is so for the hide of an unclean beast? Scripture says, “or skin” (Lev. 11:32) [and that extends the law to the hide of an unclean beast].*

F. *But here, too, there is the following flaw:* What distinguishes uncleanness deriving from dead creeping things is that the minimum volume that suffices for uncleanness is a lentil in bulk [which is not the same for a corpse, which must

be the volume of an olive, much bigger than a lentil].
[Freedman: Since the defilement of dead creeping things is stricter in that respect, it may also be stricter in respect of the skin of an unclean animal.]

G. But the uncleanness of the skin ailment proves the contrary.

H. So we find ourselves going about in a circle, for the governing taxonomic trait of the one is not the same as that of the other, and that of the other is not the same as that of the one, but what they have in common is that the hide in both cases may contract uncleanness, and the hide of an unclean animal is treated as equivalent to the hide of a clean animal. So I introduce the matter of the overshadowing of a corpse, in which the hide is unclean in that case, so that the hide of an unclean animal should be treated as equivalent to the hide of a clean animal.

I. *Said Raba of Barnesh to R. Ashi, "But there is the following flaw in the proposed argument:* The common taxonomic trait among them is that these sources of uncleanness impart uncleanness in less than the volume of an olive. But will you say the same of a corpse, which imparts uncleanness only if it is of the volume of an olive?"

J. Rather, said Raba of Barnesh, [\[28B\]](#) "The proposition derives from an argument a fortiori from the case of goats' hair: That is not subject to uncleanness deriving from the skin ailment, yet it does contract uncleanness when it overshadows a corpse; so the hide of an unclean animal, which does contract uncleanness via the skin ailment, surely should contract uncleanness when it overshadows a corpse."

II.4 A. *Now then, when R. Joseph stated as a Tannaite teaching, "Validated for the sacred work is only the skin of a clean animal," for what concrete purpose did he make that statement?* [Freedman: It does not teach that the hide of an unclean animal is not defiled by overshadowing the dead, so what is the point?]

B. It pertains to phylacteries [showing that the parchment must derive from a clean animal].

C. *But that fact is stated in so many words with regard to phylacteries:* “That the Torah of the Lord may be in your mouth” (Exo. 13: 9), meaning something that is permitted in your mouth.

D. Rather, it has to do with the hide [that makes the capsules for the parchment].

E. But didn’t Abbayye say, “The law governing the hide of the phylacteries is revealed by God to Moses at Sinai”?

F. But it has to do with tying the phylacteries with the hair and sewing it with the tendons of a clean beast and not an unclean beast.

G. *This, too, is a law revealed by God to Moses at Sinai, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

H. The fact that the boxes containing the prayer parchments have to be square is a law revealed to Moses at Sinai. They must be tied with their hair and sewn with their tendons [that is, those of the same type of animal that proves the parchment and the leather, a clean animal].

I. Rather it pertains to the straps.

J. But didn’t R. Isaac say, “The fact that the straps of the prayer parchments must be black is a law given to Moses at Sinai”?

K. *Well, granted that we have learned from that source the fact that they have to be black, have we learned from that source that they must derive from a clean beast?*

II.5 A. *So what’s the upshot with respect to the badger that existed in the time of Moses?*

B. Said R. Ilai said R. Simeon b. Laqish, “R. Meir would say, ‘The badger that existed in the time of Moses was sui generis, and sages did not settle the question of whether it was assigned to the genus of wild beasts or to the genus of domesticated animals; it was a unicorn, and it was just for the occasion that it

was prepared for Moses, so that he could make the tabernacle from its hide. He hid it away.”

C. *Now since it is stated, it was a unicorn, it follows that it was clean. For said R. Judah, “The ox that the first man offered was a unicorn, as it is said, ‘And it shall please the Lord better than an ox whose horns extend beyond its hooves’ (Psa. 69:32).”*

D. *But does not the language “horns” mean that there were two?*

E. *Said R. Nahman b. Isaac, “The word for horns is spelled defectively.”*

F. *Well, then, why not solve the problem from that fact, to determine that it was a domesticated animal [an ox or a bullock, such as Adam offered]?*

G. *Since there is the unicorn, which is a species of wild beast, which has only one horn, one may also imagine that this was a species of wild beast too.*

2:3C-E

- C. **A wick made of cloth which one twisted but did not singe —**
- D. **R. Eliezer says, “It is susceptible to uncleanness, and they do not kindle [the Sabbath lamp] with it.”**
- E. **R. Aqiba says, “It is insusceptible to uncleanness, and they do kindle [the Sabbath lamp] with it.”**

- I.1** A. *There is no problem understanding the issue involving uncleanness, for this is what is subject to dispute: R. Eliezer maintains that twisting is null, so the wick remains in its prior classification [it was a rag, part of a garment, and susceptible to uncleanness; twisting without singeing doesn’t make it a wick, so it is still subject to uncleanness (Freedman)]. R. Aqiba maintains that twisting does make a difference, so that it’s prior character is now null. But as to lighting the candle with it, what is at issue between them?*
- B. *Said R. Eleazar said R. Oshayya, and so said R. Adda bar Ahbah, “We deal here with a piece of cloth that was exactly three by three fingerbreadths, and we deal with a festival that comes on a Friday. Both parties concur with R. Judah, who has said, ‘On a festival one may make a fire in an oven with whole utensils but not with broken ones.’ [It is permitted to handle a whole utensil*

on the festival; one that just broke is something new, and was not designated prior to the holy day for use thereon; hence it may not be handled.] *Both parties furthermore concur with what Ulla said, for said Ulla, ‘He who kindles must kindle the greater part of what protrudes of the wick.’ R. Eliezer maintains that, since twisting makes no difference, as soon as one kindles the wick ever so slightly, it enters the classification of a broken utensil, and when he goes on kindling that wick, he is kindling with a broken utensil. R. Aqiba takes the view that twisting makes a difference and it has no bearing on the character of the utensil; therefore, when he kindles with that wick, he is kindling what amounts to a mere piece of wood.”*

C. Said R. Joseph, “That is in line with that which has been formulated as a Tannaite statement: A piece of cloth that was exactly three by three fingerbreadths, but I didn’t know to what the law made reference.”

I.2 *A. Now, since R. Adda bar Ahbah has set out matters in accord with the position of R. Judah, it must follow that he concurs with R. Judah? But is it the fact that R. Adda bar Ahbah made any such statement? And didn’t R. Adda bar Ahbah state, [29A] “A gentile who hollowed out an artificial leg from a log — on a festival, an Israelite may heat the oven with it” [even though it was made after the advent of the festival and so was not designated for use on that day]? But why should that be the case? It is that which has been brought into existence on that day [and not prior].*

B. He is making his statement within the premises of R. Eliezer and R. Aqiba, but he does not share their premises.

I.3 *A. Raba said, “This is the reason for the position of R. Eliezer: One may not light the Sabbath lamp with a wick that is not singed or rags that are not singed [which don’t burn well].”*

B. Then, as to R. Joseph’s Tannaite statement, a piece of cloth that was exactly three by three fingerbreadths, to what concrete circumstance does that allude?

C. It pertains to uncleanness, as we have learned in the Mishnah: “Three by three [fingerbreadths] concerning which they spoke is exclusive of the hem,” the words of R. Simeon. And sages say, “Three by three [fingerbreadths] exactly” [M. Kel. 28:7A-C].

- I.4** A. Said R. Judah said Rab, “‘On a festival one may make a fire in an oven with whole utensils but not with broken ones’ — the words of R. Judah. But R. Simeon permits.
- B. “‘On a festival one may make a fire with dates [being food, they may be handled for other purposes as well], but if they are eaten, one may not light a fire with their pits’ — the words of R. Judah. But R. Simeon permits.
- C. “‘On a festival one may make a fire with nuts, but if they are eaten, one must not make a fire with their shell’ — the words of R. Judah. But R. Simeon permits.”

I.5 A. *All three cases are required. For had we been informed of the first, it would be in the first item that R. Judah took the position that he did, because to begin with, it was a utensil, but now it is a broken utensil, in which case it was surely something that had come into being on the festival day and so would be forbidden. But as to dates, which to begin with had pits and now have pits, I might argue that it is permitted. And if I had the rule only concerning dates, I might say that that is because the pits were originally concealed but now have come into view, but as to nutshells, which originally were in full view and now are in full view, I might have thought that it would be permitted. So all are required.*

I.6 A. *Now this ruling of Rab was not stated in so many words but was stated on the basis of inferential reasoning. For Rab ate dates and threw the pits into a pan. Said to him R. Hiyya, “Son of aristocrats! A similar act on festival days would be forbidden.”*

B. *Did he accept this instruction from him, or did he not accept it?*

C. *Come and take note: When Rab came to Babylonia, he ate dates and threw the pits to the animals. Now surely this refers to Persian dates [which are very ripe, so the whole of the fruit can be removed from the pits; he threw the pits to the animals, so held the pits could be handled and so would have used them for fuel (Freedman)], rejecting Hiyya’s view.*

D. *No, they were Aramaean dates, since they may be handled on account of their meat.*

I.7 A. Said R. Samuel bar bar Hannah to R. Joseph, “In the opinion of R. Judah, who has said, ‘On a festival one may make a fire in an oven with whole utensils but not with broken ones,’ *once one has kindled only a small bit of them, he has nothing other than broken utensils, and when he turns over the fuel, he is turning over something that is forbidden!*”

B. *He acted in accord with R. Mattenah, for* said R. Mattenah said Rab, “Wood that falls from a palm into the oven on a festival day — one may add more wood, which is already prepared, and light the whole.” [The wood that falls may not be handled on its own, since it was not designated for that purpose prior to the festival; but if one adds more wood set aside for fuel, then both may be handled together; the same applies here (Freedman).]

I.8 A. R. Hammuna said, “Here in the Mishnah paragraph, we deal with a piece of cloth less than three by three fingerbreadths in size, and both authorities here set forth lenient rulings that they have made with reference to rags, with R. Eliezer consistent with views of his expressed elsewhere, and R. Aqiba likewise. For we have learned in the Mishnah: **[A piece of cloth] less than three-by-three [handbreadths] which one used (1) to stop up [a hole in] the bathhouse; (2) to empty out a cooking pot; [or] (3) to wipe off the millstones — whether kept in readiness or not kept in readiness, it is unclean,**” the words of R. Eliezer. R. Joshua says, “Whether kept in readiness or not kept in readiness, it is clean.” R. Aqiba says, “That which is kept in readiness is unclean, and that which is not kept in readiness is clean” [M. Kel. 28:2]. And said Ulla, and some say, Rabbah bar bar Hannah said R. Yohanan, ‘All concur that if one threw it away into the garbage, all parties hold that it is no longer susceptible to uncleanness. **[29B]** If one put it away in a chest, all agree that it is susceptible to uncleanness [being valued, it is regarded as a usable garment]. They differ only in a case in which he hung it on a frame or put it behind the door. R. Eliezer takes the view that, since he didn’t throw it into the garbage, he values it. So why does he call it ‘unprepared’? Because, relative to putting it away in a chest, it isn’t prepared. R. Joshua takes the view that since he didn’t put it away in a chest, he has treated it as null, and why does he call it ‘repaired’? Because relative to throwing it into the garbage, it is prepared. And R. Aqiba concurs with R. Eliezer when he hangs it on a clothes frame, but with R. Joshua when he puts it behind the door.’”

- B. *But didn't R. Aqiba retract in favor of the view of R. Joshua?*
- C. *How do you know it?*
- D. *Said Raba, "Since the Tannaite formulation is **a wick made of cloth**. Now why use the formulation **a wick made of cloth**, when the formulation **a wick of cloth** would have served just as well? That shows that it is still classified as a cloth."*

2:4

- A. **A person should not pierce an eggshell with oil and put it on the opening of a lamp so that [the oil] will drip [out and sustain the lamp],**
- B. **even if it is made out of earthenware,**
- C. **and R. Judah permits [doing so].**
- D. **But if the potter joined it to begin with [to the lamp], it is permitted,**
- E. **because it is one utensil.**
- F. **A person may not fill a dish with oil and put it beside a lamp and place the head of the wick into it,**
- G. **so that it will draw [oil from the dish of oil].**
- H. **And R. Judah permits [doing so].**

I.1 A. *All three cases have to be spelled out, that is, the eggshell, the earthenware, and the dish. For if we had been informed only of the rule concerning the eggshell, I might have supposed that in that item in particular rabbis stated the rule, for, since it is not repulsive, someone might come to draw a supply from it, but as to one of clay, which is repulsive, I should suppose that they would concur with R. Judah. And had we been informed of the rule concerning earthenware, I might have thought that in that item in particular R. Judah takes the position that he does, but in the other, I might suppose he concurs with rabbis. And had we been informed of these two, I might have supposed that in these two items R. Judah takes the position that he does, because in these nothing interposes [between the lamp and the shell] [Judah regards it all as one, even when not actually joined (Freedman)], but with regard to the other two, I might suppose that rabbis concur with R. Judah. So all three are necessary.*

- II.1** A. **But if the potter joined it to begin with [to the lamp], it is permitted, because it is one utensil:**
- B. *A Tannaite statement: If he joined it with plaster or potter's clay, it is permitted.*

- C. *But we have learned in the formulation of the Mishnah, the potter joined, [who presumably uses potter's clay]!*
- D. *What is the meaning of the potter joined? It means, in the manner of the potter.*

II.2 A. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. **Said R. Judah, “Once we spent the Sabbath in the upper room of the household of Niseh in Lud, and they brought before us an eggshell, and we filled it with oil and pierced it and placed over the mouth of the lamp. Now even though R. Tarfon and elders were right there in the room, they said nothing at all to us.”**
- C. **They said to him, “Is there proof from that case [T. [Shab. 2:5](#)]?** *The household of Niseh was exceptional, being alert in the law.”*

II.3 A. *Abin of Sepphoris dragged a bench in the upper chamber that was paved with stone; this was in the presence of R. Isaac b. Eleazar. He said to him, “If I keep silence for you as the colleagues of R. Judah kept silence for him, chaos will follow. It is forbidden to drag such a thing in a chamber that is paved with stone, as a precautionary decree because of the possibility of doing so in one that is not [since in that case the bench will form a rut, and it is forbidden to make a rut on the Sabbath].”*

II.4 A. *The head of the synagogue of Bosrah dragged a heavy bench in the presence of R. Jeremiah the Elder. He said to him, “In accord with what authority do you do so? In accord with R. Simeon? Well, I can concede that R. Simeon made that ruling in the case of big ones, since there is no alternative, but did he say that it is permissible with little ones [such as this]?”*

B. *And he differs from Ulla, for said Ulla, “The dispute concerns little ones, but as to big ones, all parties concur that it is permitted.”*

C. *Objected R. Joseph, “R. Simeon says, ‘On the Sabbath, one may drag a bed, chair, or bench, so long as he does not intend thereby to make a groove in the dirt.’ Both big and little ones are thus covered in the Tannaite statement, and that presents a challenge to both views!”*

D. *Ulla irons matters out according to his theory of matters, and R. Jeremiah the Elder irons matters out according to his theory of matters.*

E. *Ulla irons matters out according to his theory of matters: A bed is comparable to a chair.*

F. *And R. Jeremiah the Elder irons matters out according to his theory of matters: A chair is comparable to a bed.*

G. *Objected Rabbah, “Clothes dealers sell [garments of diverse kinds] in their usual manner provided that they do not intend, in a hot sun, [for the garments to protect them] from the hot sun, or in the rain, [for the garments to protect them] from the rain. And the more scrupulous ones tie [the garments of diverse kinds] on a stick [M. Kil. 9:5]. Now here is a case in which it is possible to act as do the more scrupulous ones, and the case is comparable to one involving small objects, and yet, when one has no improper intention, R. Simeon permits the practice to begin with! Thus surely refutes the position of R. Jeremiah the Elder!”*

H. *Sure does.*

2:5

- A. He who puts out a lamp because he is afraid of gentiles, thugs, a bad spirit,
- B. or if it is so that a sick person might sleep,
- C. is exempt [from liability to punishment].
- D. [If he did so], to spare the lamp, the oil, the wick,
- E. he is liable.
- F. And R. Yosé exempts [him from liability to punishment] in all instances except for [one who does so to spare] the wick,
- G. because he [thereby] makes [it into] charcoal.

- I.1** A. [30A] [He who puts out a lamp because he is afraid of gentiles, thugs, a bad spirit, or if it is so that a sick person might sleep, is exempt [from liability to punishment]. If he did so, to spare the lamp, the oil, the wick, he is liable:] *Since the second clause rules, he is liable* [even for work not needed for itself but only for some ulterior purpose, for example, to spare the

oil, and Judah declares that class of work involves liability (Freedman)], *it follows that it represents the position of R. Judah.*

- I.2** A. *So to what case does the opening clause refer? Should we say, it is to a dangerously sick person? Then the language that is required is, it is permitted. But if it is not to a dangerously sick person, then the language that is required is, he is liable to a sin-offering!*
- B. *In point of fact, it is a dangerously sick person, and it would have been entirely logical to use the language, it is permitted, but since the framer of the passage wished to formulate the Tannaite rule at the end, **he is liable**, he used the same language at the outset, **he is exempt**.*
- C. *And as for that which R. Oshayya repeated as a Tannaite teaching, if it is so that the sick person might sleep, he should not put out the fire, but if he did so, he is not liable, though such an act is forbidden, that represents the view of R. Simeon [that work that is not required for its own sake is not penalized].*

- I.3** A. *This question was asked of Mar Tanhum of Nave: “What is the law as to putting out a burning lamp for the sake of a sick person on the Sabbath?”*
- B. *He commenced in response: “You, Solomon, where is your wisdom, where is your understanding? Isn’t it enough for you that what you say contradicts what your father David said, but what you say is itself contradictory! Your father David said, ‘The dead don’t praise the Lord’ (Psa. 115:17), but you say, ‘Wherefore I praised the dead that are already dead’ (Qoh. 4: 2), and then you went and said, ‘for a living dog is better than a dead lion’ (Qoh. 9: 4). But there really is no contradiction. For as to what David said, ‘The dead don’t praise the Lord’ (Psa. 115:17), this is the sense of his statement: ‘A person should always engage in the study of Torah and the doing of religious deeds before death, for once one dies, he becomes null as to Torah study and religious deeds, and the Holy One, blessed be He, gets no praise from him.’”*
- C. *This is what R. Yohanan said, “What is the meaning of the verse, ‘Among the dead I am free’ (Psa. 88: 6)? When someone dies, he is free of the Torah and of religious duties.”*
- D. *[Reverting to B:] “And as to what Solomon said, ‘Wherefore I praised the dead that are already dead’ (Qoh. 4: 2), for when the Israelites sinned in the wilderness, Moses stood before the Holy One, blessed be He, and said ever so many prayers and words of supplication before him, but he was not answered. But when he said, ‘Remember Abraham, Isaac, and Israel, your servants’*

(Exo. 32:13), on the spot he was answered. Wasn't Solomon right when he said, 'Wherefore I praised the dead that are already dead' (Qoh. 4: 2)?

- E. "Another matter: In the way of the world, a mortal prince issues a decree. People may or may not carry it out. And if you should wish to say, they carry it out, then they may carry it out while he is yet alive, but then they may not carry it out after he is dead. But our lord, Moses, issued ever so many decrees and set up ever so many ordinances, and they are carried out for ever and ever. So wasn't Solomon right when he said, 'Wherefore I praised the dead that are already dead' (Qoh. 4: 2)?"
- F. Another matter: "Wherefore I praised the dead that are already dead" (Qoh. 4: 2) — *that is in line with what R. Judah said Rab said, for said R. Judah said Rab, "What is the meaning of the verse of Scripture, 'Show me a token for good that those that hate me may see it and be ashamed' (Psa. 86:17)? Said David before the Holy One, blessed be He, He said before him, 'Lord of the world, forgive me for that sin.'*
- G. "He said to him, 'It is forgiven to you.'
- H. "'Then show me a token for good, that they who hate me may see it and be ashamed, because you, Lord, have helped me and comforted me' (Psa. 86:17).
- I. "He said to him, 'While you are alive, I shall not reveal [the fact that you are forgiven], but I shall reveal it in the lifetime of your son, Solomon.'
- J. "When Solomon had built the house of the sanctuary, he tried to bring the ark into the house of the Holy of Holies. The gates cleaved to one another. He recited twenty-four prayers [Freedman, p. 734, n. 4: in 2Ch. 6 words for prayer, supplication and hymn occur twenty-four times], but was not answered.
- K. "He said, 'Lift up your head, O you gates, and be lifted up, you everlasting doors, and the King of glory shall come in.' *They rushed on him to swallow him up, crying out, 'Who is this King of glory? The Lord strong and mighty, the Lord mighty in battle' (Psa. 24:7ff.).*
- L. "And it is further said, 'Lift up your heads, O you gates even lift them up, you everlasting doors, and the king of glory shall come in. Who is this king of glory? The Lord of hosts, he is the king of glory' (Psa. 24: 7).
- M. "But he was not answered.

N. “When he said, ‘Lord God, turn not away the face of your anointed, remember the mercies of David, your servant’ (2Ch. 6:42), forthwith he was answered.

O. “At that moment the faces of David’s enemies turned as black as the bottom of a pot, for all Israel knew that the Holy One, blessed be He, had forgiven him for that sin.”

P. [Reverting to F:] “So wasn’t Solomon right when he said, ‘Wherefore I praised the dead that are already dead’ (Qoh. 4: 2)?”

Q. And so it is written, “On the eighth day he sent the people away, and they blessed the king and went to their tents joyful and glad of heart for all the goodness that the Lord has showed to David his servant and to Israel his people” (1Ki. 8:66):

R. “Went to their tents”: They found their wives menstrually clean.

S. “Joyful”: Because they had the joy of the splendor of the presence of God.

T. “And glad of heart”: Because their wives conceived, and everyone of them produced a son.

U. “For all the goodness that the Lord has showed to David his servant”: That he had forgiven him for that sin.

V. “And to Israel his people”: *For he had forgiven them the sin they had committed on the Day of Atonement [which they treated as a feast day rather than as a fast day, for the fourteen days included the tenth day of the seventh month].*

W. *And as to what Solomon said, “For a living dog is better than a dead lion” (Qoh. 9: 4), that is to be understood in accord with what R. Judah said Rab said, for said R. Judah said Rab, “What is the meaning of the verse of Scripture, ‘Lord, make me to know my end, and the measure of my days, what it is; let me know how frail I am’ (Psa. 89: 5)?*

X. “Said David before the Holy One, blessed be He, ‘Lord of the world: Make me to know my end!’

Y. “He said to him, ‘It is a decree of mine that mortals are not to be informed of their end.’ ‘...And the measure of my days, what it is!’

Z. “He said to him, ‘It is a decree of mine that mortals are not to be informed how long they will live.’ ‘...Let me know how frail I am!’

AA. “‘You will die on the Sabbath.’

BB. “‘So let me die on Sunday.’

CC. “‘The reign of your son, Solomon, already will have become due, and one reign may not overlap another by even a hairbreadth.’

DD. “‘Then let me die on Friday afternoon.’

EE. “He said, “‘For a day in your courts is better than a thousand” (Psa. 84:11) — I prefer one day on which you will go into session and engage in Torah study more than a thousand burnt-offerings that your son, Solomon, is destined to offer before me on the altar.’

FF. **[30B]** *“Every Sabbath day he would go into session and study the entire day. That day on which his soul was to find rest, the angel of death stood before him but couldn’t prevail against him, because he didn’t interrupt repeating his lessons. He said, ‘What should I do with him?’*

GG. *“There was a garden behind his house. The angel of death came and climbed up and stirred the branches. David went out to see; as he was climbing a ladder, it broke under him. At that point, he fell silent [and ceased from repeating his lessons], and his soul found repose.*

HH. *“Solomon sent word to the house of study: ‘Father has died and is lying in the sun; the dogs of my father’s household are hungry. What should I do?’*

II. *“They sent him word, ‘Cut off a piece of carrion meat and put it before the dogs, but as to your father, put a loaf of bread or a child on top of him and carry him away [but you can’t handle the corpse without some further, legitimate purpose].”*

JJ. [Reverting to F:] “So wasn’t Solomon right when he said, ‘Wherefore I praised the dead that are already dead’ (Qoh. 4: 2)?

KK. *“Now as to the question that I have presented to you: A lamp bears the classification of lamp, and a human soul is in that same classification of lamp. It is better that the lamp of a mortal be put out before the lamp of the Holy One, blessed be He [so where life is endangered, the lamp may certainly be put out (Freedman)].”*

Topical Appendix: The Status of the Books of Qohelet and Proverbs

- I.4** A. *Said R. Judah b. R. Samuel bar Shilat in the name of Rab*, “Sages proposed to suppress the book of Qohelet, because statements in it contradict one another. And how come they didn’t suppress it? Because it starts with teachings of Torah and it concludes with teachings of Torah.
- B. “It starts with teachings of Torah: ‘What profit does someone have of all his work in which he works under the sun’ (Qoh. 1: 3), *on which the household of R. Yannai stated, ‘It is “under the sun” that he has no profit, but prior to the sun [when the Torah existed but the sun didn’t], he does have profit.’*
- C. “And it concludes with teachings of Torah: ‘Let us hear the conclusion of the matter: Fear God and keep his commandments, for this is the whole of man’ (Qoh. 12:13).”
- D. *What is the meaning of the phrase: For this is the whole of man?*
- E. Said R. Eleazar, “The entire world was created only for this man.”
- F. R. Abba bar Kahana said, “This man weighs in the balance equally to the whole world.”
- G. Simeon b. Azzai says, and some say, Simeon b. Zoma says, “This entire world was created only to keep this man company.”
- I.5** A. *And how is it the case that* statements in it contradict one another?
- B. “Anger is better than play” (Qoh. 7: 3) vs. “I said of laughter, it is to be praised” (Qoh. 2: 2).
- C. “Then I commended joy” (Qoh. 8:15) vs. “And of joy I said, what does it do” (Qoh. 2: 2).
- D. *No problem!* “Anger is better than play” — the anger that the Holy One, blessed be He, shows the righteous in this world is better than laughter that the Holy One, blessed be He, directs at the wicked in this world. “I said of laughter, it is to be praised” (Qoh. 2: 2) — this speaks of the laughter that the Holy One, blessed be He, directs to the righteous in the world to come.
- E. “Then I commended joy” — this is the joy of carrying out a religious duty. “And of joy I said, what does it do” (Qoh. 2: 2) — this refers to joy coming from the doing of a religious duty.
- F. This teaches you that the Presence of God comes to rest not in gloom nor in lassitude nor in silliness nor in levity nor in garrulousness nor in chitchat, but only in a matter of joy coming from the doing of a religious duty: “But now,

bring me a minstrel. And it came to pass, when the minstrel played, that the hand of the Lord came upon him” (2Ki. 3:15).

G. Said R. Judah, “The same is true of study of law.”

H. Said Raba, “And so is the case with a good dream.”

I. Is that true? But didn’t R. Giddal say Rab said, “Every disciple of a sage who goes into session before his master, and whose lips don’t drip bitterness — the lips will be smitten: ‘His lips are as lilies dropping liquid myrrh’ (Son. 5:13) — read the letters translated liquid myrrh with vowels that yield ‘bitterness,’ and read the word translated lilies as though its vowels yielded ‘that study’?”?

J. *No problem, the one speaks of the teacher, the other, the disciple. Or if you prefer, both speak of the teacher, but still no problem: The one applies before he starts, the other afterward.*

K. *That is in line with the case of Rabbah: Before he opened his lesson for the rabbis, he would say something funny, and the rabbis were amused; then he went into session in solemnity and began the tradition.*

I.6 A. So, too, the book of Proverbs they proposed to suppress, because its statements contradict one another. And how come they didn’t suppress it? *They said, “Didn’t we study the book of Qohelet so as to harmonize what is in it? Here, too, let’s study the document.”*

B. *What is the meaning of the allegation that its statements contradict one another?*

C. “Don’t answer a fool according to his folly” (Pro. 26: 4) vs. “Answer a fool according to his folly” (Pro. 26: 5).

D. *No problem — the one refers to teachings of Torah [in which case answer], the other, things in general [in which case don’t answer].*

E. *That would be in line with the case of someone who came before Rabbi. He said to him, “Your wife is really my wife, your children are really my children.”*

F. He said to him, “So how about a glass of wine?!”

G. He drank and exploded.

I.7 A. *Somebody came before R. Hiyya. He said to him, “Your wife is really my wife, your children are really my children.”*

B. He said to him, “So how about a glass of wine?!”

C. *He drank and exploded.*

**Answer not a Fool According to his Folly.
The Importance of Humility**

I.8 A. Said R. Hiyya, *“The prayer of Rabbi served so far as to make sure his children were not declared mamzers. For when Rabbi prayed, he would say, ‘May it please you, Lord our God, to save me today from arrogance and impudence.’”*

I.9 A. *The one refers to teachings of Torah [in which case answer]: For example?*

B. *It is in line with the following: Rabban Gamaliel went into session and expounded, “A woman is destined to give birth every day: ‘The woman conceives and bears simultaneously’ (Jer. 31: 7).”*

C. *A certain disciple ridiculed this statement: “‘There is nothing new under the sun’ (Qoh. 1: 9).”*

D. *He said to him, “Come and I shall show you its equal in this world.” He took him outside and showed him a chicken.*

E. *Again, Rabban Gamaliel went into session and expounded, “Trees are destined to give a crop of fruit every day: ‘And it shall bring forth boughs and bear fruit’ (Eze. 17:23). Just as there are boughs every day, so there will be fruit every day.”*

F. *A certain disciple ridiculed this statement: “‘There is nothing new under the sun’ (Qoh. 1: 9).”*

G. *He said to him, “Come and I shall show you its equal in this world.” He took him outside and showed him a caper bush.*

H. *Again, Rabban Gamaliel went into session and expounded, “The Land of Israel is destined to bring forth cakes and woolen robes: ‘There shall be a handful of grain in the land’ (Psa. 72:16).” [Freedman: The Hebrew of the verse may be translated pure wool garments.]*

I. *A certain disciple ridiculed this statement: “‘There is nothing new under the sun’ (Qoh. 1: 9).”*

J. *He said to him, “Come and I shall show you its equal in this world.” He took him outside and showed him morels and truffles; for silk robes, the bark of a young palm shoot.*

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

- B. A person always should be humble, like Hillel the Elder, and not captious, like Shammai the Elder.
- C. There was the case of two people, [31A] who went and made a bet with one another for four hundred zuz.
- D. They stipulated, "Whoever can go and infuriate Hillel will get the four hundred zuz."
- E. One of them went [to try]. That day was a Friday, toward nightfall, and Hillel was washing his hair. The man came and knocked on the door, saying, "Where is Hillel, where is Hillel?"
- F. Hillel wrapped himself up in his cloak and came to meet him. He said to him, "My son, what do you require?"
- G. He said to him, "I have a question to ask."
- H. He said to him, "Ask, my son, ask."
- I. He said to him, "How come the Babylonians have round heads?"
- J. He said to him, "My son, you have asked quite a question: It's because they don't have skilled midwives."
- K. He went and waited a while and came back and knocked on the door. He said, "Who's here? Who's here?"
- L. Hillel wrapped himself up in his cloak and come out.
- M. He said to him, "My son, what do you need?"
- N. He said to him, "Why are the eyes of the people of Palmyra [Tadmor] bleary?"
- O. He said to him, "By son, you've asked quite a question. It's because they live in the sands of the desert and the winds blow and scatter the sand into their eyes. Therefore their eyes are bleary."
- P. He went and waited a while and came back and knocked on the door. He said, "Who's here? Who's here?"
- Q. Hillel wrapped himself up in his cloak and come out.
- R. He said to him, "My son, what do you need?"
- S. He said to him, "I need to ask a question."
- T. He said to him, "Go ahead."
- U. He said to him, "Why are the feet of the Africans flat?"
- V. He said to him, "Because they live by swamps, and every day walk in water, therefore their feet are flat."

- W. He said to him, "I have a lot of questions to ask, but I'm afraid that you'll get mad."
- X. He said to him, "Whatever questions that you have, go and ask."
- Y. He said to him, "Are you the Hillel, whom people call the patriarch of Israel?"
- Z. He said to him, "Yup."
- AA. He said to him, "Well, if that's who you are, then I hope there won't be many in Israel like you!"
- BB. He said to him, "My son, how come?"
- CC. He said to him, "You have cost me four hundred zuz."
- DD. He said to him, "You should be careful of your moods! Hillel is worth your losing four hundred zuz without Hillel's losing his temper" [The Fathers according to Rabbi Nathan XV:IV.1].

- I.11** A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- B. There was the incident of a certain gentile who came before Shammai. He said to him, "How many Torahs do you have?"
 - C. He said to him, "Two, one in writing, one memorized."
 - D. He said to him, "As to the one in writing, I believe you. As to the memorized one, I do not believe you. Convert me on condition that you will teach me only the Torah that is in writing."
 - E. He rebuked him and threw him out.
 - F. He came before Hillel. He said to him, "Convert me." [ARN: My lord, how many Torahs were given?" He said to him, "Two, one in writing, one memorized." He said to him, "As to the one in writing, I believe you. As to the memorized one, I do not believe you."]
 - G. On the first day he said to him, "Alef, bet, gimel, dalet." The next day he reversed the order on him.
 - H. He said to him, "Well, yesterday, didn't you say it differently?"
 - I. He said to him, "Didn't you depend on me then? Then depend on me when it comes to the fact of the memorized Torah too." [ARN: He said to him, "My son, sit." He wrote for him, Alef, bet. He said to him, "What is this?" He said to him, "An alef." He said to him, "This is not an alef but a bet." He said to him, "What is this?" He said to him, "Bet." He said to him, "This is not a bet but a gimmel." He said to him, "How do you know that this is an alef and this a bet and this a gimmel? But that is

what our ancestors have handed over to us — the tradition that this is an alef, this a bet, this a gimmel. Just as you have accepted this teaching in good faith, so accept the other in good faith” [The Fathers According to Rabbi Nathan XV:V.1].

- I.12** A. There was another case of a gentile who came before Shammai. He said to him, “Convert me on the stipulation that you teach me the entire Torah while I am standing on one foot.” He drove him off with the building cubit that he had in his hand.
- B. He came before Hillel: “Convert me.”
- C. He said to him, “*‘What is hateful to you, to your fellow don’t do.’* That’s the entirety of the Torah; *everything else is elaboration. So go, study.*”
- I.13** A. There was another case of a gentile. **He was passing behind a synagogue and heard a child reciting in Scripture: This is the clothing which they shall make: A breastplate, ephod, and robe (Exo. 28: 4).**
- B. **He said to them, “All this honor — for whom is it designated?”**
- C. **They said to him, “It is for the high priest who stands and carries out the service at the altar.”**
- D. **That gentile said to himself, “I’m going to go and convert so that they’ll make me high priest.”**
- E. **He came before Shammai and said to him, “Convert me on the stipulation that you make me high priest so that I may carry out the service at the altar.”**
- F. **He threw him out with the builder’s cubit that he had in his hand. [ARN: He said to him, “Is there no priesthood in Israel, and do we not have high priests to stand and carry out the acts of service at the altar assigned to the high priest, so that a mere convert who has come only with his staff and wallet may come and take up the service of the high priest?”]**
- G. **He came before Hillel and said to him, “My lord, convert me, [ARN: on the stipulation that you make me high priest so that I may carry out the service at the altar].”**
- H. **He said to him, “Do they appoint a king unless it is someone who knows the rules of government? Go, study the art of kings.”**

- I. He went and studied Scripture. When he came to the sentence, “The non-priest who draws near [the altar] shall die (Num. 1:51), he said to him, “Concerning what sort of person is this verse stated?”
- J. He said to him, “Even David the king of Israel.”
- K. The proselyte constructed an argument a fortiori concerning himself: If an Israelite, who is called a son of the Omnipresent, and concerning whom the Presence of God has said, ‘And you shall be mine as a kingdom of priests and a holy people’ (Exo. 19: 6), nonetheless is subject to Scripture’s admonition, ‘The non-priest who draws near [the altar] shall die’ (Num. 1:51), I, who am a mere proselyte, who has come only with my wallet, all the more so!”
- L. He came before Shammai. He said to him, “So am I suitable for taking the office of high priest? And isn’t it written in the Torah, ‘The non-priest who draws near [the altar] shall die’ (Num. 1:51)?”
- M. He came before Hillel the Elder and said to him, “Hillel the humble! May all the blessings that are in the Torah rest on your head, for if you had been like Shammai the Elder, you would have wiped me out of this world and of the world to come. Your humility has brought me into this world and the coming one.”
- N. After a while the three of them happened to meet. He said, “The surliness of Shammai wanted to drive me from the world, the kindness of Hillel brought me under the wings of the Presence of God [The Fathers According to Rabbi Nathan XV:V.2].

Miscellany: The Study of the Torah and the Presence of God

- I.14** A. *Said R. Simeon b. Laqish, “What is the meaning of the verse of Scripture, ‘And there shall be faith in your times, strength, salvation, wisdom, and knowledge’ (Isa. 33: 6)?*
- B. “‘Faith’: This refers to the Mishnah division of Seeds.
 - C. “‘In your times’: This refers to the Mishnah division of Holy Seasons.
 - D. “‘Strength’: This refers to the Mishnah division of Women.
 - E. “‘Salvation’: This refers to the Mishnah division of Damages.
 - F. “‘Wisdom’: This refers to the Mishnah division of Holy Things.
 - G. “‘And knowledge’: This refers to the Mishnah division of Purities.
 - H. “‘Nonetheless: ‘The fear of the Lord is his treasure’ (Isa. 33: 6).”

- I.15** A. Said Raba, “When they bring a man to judgment, they say to him: ‘Have you done business in good faith? Have you set aside time for the Torah? Have you engaged in procreation and the raising of children? Have you hoped for salvation? Have you penetrated deeply into wisdom? Have you drawn one conclusion from another?’ Nonetheless: ‘The fear of the Lord is his treasure’ (Isa. 33: 6). *If yes, yes, if no, no.*
- B. “The matter may be compared to the case of a man who said to his agent, ‘Bring me a kor of wheat up to the upper room,’ and the other went and brought it up for him.
- C. “He said to him, ‘Did you mix in with it a qab of preservative?’
- D. “He said to him, ‘Nope.’
- E. “He said to him, ‘Then it would have been better if you hadn’t brought it up there.’”

I.16 A. *A Tannaite statement of the house of R. Ishmael: One may mix a qab of preservative without scruple. [That would not constitute adulteration.]*

- I.17** A. Said Rabbah bar R. Huna, “Any man who has Torah but not **[31B]** fear of heaven is comparable to a treasurer to whom they handed over the keys to the inner treasury but the keys to the outer door they did not hand over to him. *So how’s he supposed to get in?*”
- B. *R. Yannai proclaimed, “Woe for the person who has no courtyard but who makes a gate for a courtyard.”*
- C. Said R. Judah, “The Holy One, blessed be He, created his world only so that people should fear him: ‘And God has done it, that men should fear before him’ (Qoh. 3:14).”

I.18 A. *R. Simeon and R. Eleazar were in session. R. Jacob bar Aha passed by. One said to the other, “Let’s rise in his honor, for he is a man who fears sin.”*

B. *The other said, “Let’s rise in his honor, for he is a man who is a master of the Torah.”*

C. *He said to him, “I say to you that he is a man who fears sin, and you say to me that he is a man who is a master of the Torah!”*

D. *You may draw the conclusion that it was R. Eleazar who said, “He is a man who fears sin,” for said R. Yohanan in the name of R. Eleazar, “All that the Holy One, blessed be He, possesses in his world*

is the fear of heaven alone: 'And now, Israel, what does the Lord your God require of you, but to fear the Lord your God' (Deu. 10:12), 'And to man he said, behold, the fear of the Lord, that is wisdom,' and in Greek, the word for 'one' is the same as the Hebrew 'behold.'"

E. *That's pretty decisive.*

I.19 A. *Expounded R. Ulla, "What is the meaning of the verse: 'Be not much wicked' (Qoh. 7:17)? So one mustn't be much wicked, but he may be a little wicked? Rather: If someone has eaten garlic and his breath stinks, can he eat more garlic so his breath may stink some more?"*

I.20 A. *Expounded Raba b. R. Ulla, "What is the meaning of the verse, 'For there are no pangs in their death, but their strength is firm' (Psa. 73: 4)? Said the Holy One, blessed be He, 'For the wicked it's not enough that they are not trembling and troubled in the face of the day of death, but their heart is as strong in them as a palace!"*

B. *And this is in line with what Rabbah said, "What is the meaning of the verse, 'This their way is their confidence' (Psa. 49:14)? The wicked know that their way is to death, but they have fat on their loins [the words for confidence and loins share the same consonants]. But lest you think that that is because they merely forget, it is stated, 'and they approve their end by their own statements' (Psa. 49:14)."*

II.1 A. **[If he did so] to spare the lamp, the oil, the wick, he is liable. And R. Yosé exempts [him from liability to punishment] in all instances except for [one who does so to spare] the wick, because he [thereby] makes [it into] charcoal:**

B. *With what other Tannaite authority does R. Yosé concur in his principle here? If it were with R. Judah, then even in these other items, one should be liable; and if it were in accord with R. Simeon, then even for sparing the wick, he should be exempt!*

C. *Said Ulla, "In point of fact he accords with R. Judah. And R. Yosé takes the view that demolishing something on the stipulation of building something else on the same spot constitutes demolition; if it is on the stipulation of building something not on the same spot, it does not constitute demolition."* [Freedman: One is not liable for desecrating the Sabbath when his work is destructive; but if he demolishes a house in order to rebuild, it is constructive and so culpable. Extinguishing a wick, destroying its light, is equivalent to demolishing a house; if the purpose is to save the wick to be used again, it is

analogous to demolishing a house to build on the same site, since it is the wick that is extinguished and the wick to be relit; if the purpose is to save the oil or the lamp, it is analogous to demolishing a house in order to rebuild elsewhere; while the wick is extinguished, it is the oil or lamp that is saved for subsequent use.]

- D. *Said to him Rabbah, “Note: The classification of all modes of labor and their prohibition we derive from the generative analogy of the tabernacle. And yet, there it was dismantling so as to rebuild elsewhere.”*
- E. *He said to him, “That case is exceptional, since it is written, ‘At the commandment of the Lord they encamped, and at the commandment of the Lord they journeyed’ (Num. 9:23), so it was comparable to demolishing something on the stipulation of building something else on the same spot.”*
- F. *And R. Yohanan said, “In point of fact he concurs with R. Simeon. And what makes the wick exceptional? It is in accord with what R. Hamnuna said, and some say, R. Adda bar Ahbah: ‘Here we deal with a wick that is needed for singeing [to burn clearer].’ In such a case, even R. Simeon concurs [that he is liable], because his object is to render the wick fit for its purpose [and that is a labor needed for its own purpose and therefore culpable].”*
- G. *Said Raba, “A close reading of the Tannaite formulation yields the same result, for it says, **because he [thereby] makes [it into] charcoal**. That is, and not because charcoal is formed [on its own].”*
- H. *That’s decisive.*

2:6

- A. **On account of three transgressions do women die in childbirth:**
- B. **Because they are not meticulous in the laws of (1) menstrual separation; (2) in [those covering] the dough-offering; and (3) in [those covering] the kindling of a lamp [for the Sabbath].**

I.1 A. **Menstrual separation:** *How come?*

- B. *Said R. Isaac, “She went wrong through the innermost chamber of her belly. Therefore she is smitten in the innermost chamber of her belly.”*
- C. *Well, that accounts for the penalty inflicted for violation of menstrual separation. What about explaining the penalty inflicted for violation of the laws of dough-offering and in [those covering] the kindling of a lamp [for the Sabbath]?*

- D. *It is in line with what a certain Galilean expounded before R. Hisda, "Said the Holy One, blessed be He, 'I put a quarter-log of blood in you [which sustains life]. I admonished you in matters having to do with blood. [32A] I called you 'first.' I commanded you concerning the first [portion of the dough, dough-offering]. The soul I placed in you is called a lamp. I admonished you concerning a lamp. If you fulfill these things, well and good, and if not, I'll take your soul."*

- I.2**
- A. *And why single out the moment of childbirth?*
 - B. *Said Rabbah, "When the ox falls, sharpen the knife."*
 - C. *Abbaye said, "So let the slave girl rebel still more — in the end it will all be punished by the same rod."*
 - D. *R. Hisda said, "Leave the drunkard be; he'll fall down all by himself."*
 - E. *Mar Uqba said, "With a lame shepherd and fast goats, at the gate of the fold are plenty of excuses, but in the fold, a real accounting."*
 - F. *R. Pappa said, "At the gate of the prosperous shop are plenty of brothers and friends; at the door of bankruptcy are neither brothers nor friends."*

- I.3**
- A. *So, by contrast, as to males, when are they subject to the same [dangerous] examination [when they are subject to punishment]?*
 - B. *Said R. Simeon b. Laqish, "When they are crossing a bridge."*
 - C. *Just a bridge, nothing else?*
 - D. *Say: In a situation such as when they are crossing a bridge.*

I.4 A. *Rab wouldn't cross a bridge on which a gentile was sitting. He said, "Maybe he'll be examined in judgment, and I'll be trapped with him."*

B. *Samuel would cross a bridge only when a gentile was sitting on it. He said, "Satan can't rule over two nations [all at once]."*

C. *R. Yannai would inspect the bridge carefully and then would cross.*

D. *R. Yannai is consistent with views expressed elsewhere, for he said, "A person should never stand still in a dangerous place, saying that they'll do a miracle for him. Maybe they won't do a miracle for him. And if they do do a miracle for him, they will then deduct it from his store of merit."*

E. *Said R. Hanin, "What is the pertinent verse of Scripture? 'I am become diminished by reason of all the deeds of kindness and all the truth' (Gen. 32:10)."*

F. R. Zira on a day of a strong south wind wouldn't walk among palm trees.

- I.5** A. Said R. Isaac b. R. Judah, “A person should always seek mercy that he not fall ill, for if he falls ill, they will say to him, ‘Bring merit and be done with it.’”
- B. *Said Mar Uqba, “What is the pertinent verse of Scripture? ‘If any man fall from us’ (Deu. 22: 8) — the word ‘from us’ can be read as ‘from him,’ meaning, ‘from him proof must be brought’ [that he is entitled to recover from his injuries (Freedman)].”*
- I.6** A. *A Tannaite statement of the household of R. Ishmael: “If any man fall from us’ (Deu. 22: 8) — This man was worthy of falling from the very beginning of the six days of creation, for lo, he hasn’t yet fallen, but the Scripture refers to him as ‘one who is falling.’ But **evil is brought about through the agency of sinful men, and good through that of worthy men** [T. **Yoma 4:12**].”*
- I.7** A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- B. One who is ill and is tending toward death — they say to him, “Confess, for lo, all those who are to be put to death confess.”
- C. When someone goes out to the marketplace, it should appear to him as though he were handed over to a cop. When he has a headache, it should appear to him as though he were put in chains. If he went to bed, it should appear to him as though he had ascended the scaffold to be punished.
- D. For whoever ascends the scaffold to be punished, if he has great advocates, is saved, and if not, he is not saved.
- E. So who are the advocates for a person? Repentance and good deeds.
- F. And even if nine hundred and ninety-nine argue for his guilt, but one argues for his acquittal, he is saved: “If there be with him an angel, an advocate, one among a thousand, to show to a man what is right for him, then he is gracious to him and says, deliver him from going down to the pit” (Job. 33:23).
- G. R. Eliezer b. R. Yosé the Galilean says, “Even if nine hundred and ninety-nine parts of that very angel favor guilt, and one acquittal, he is acquitted, as it is said, ‘an advocate, one among a thousand.’”
- I.8** A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- B. For three sins women die in childbirth.
- C. R. Eleazar says, “Women die young.”
- D. R. Aha says, “For the sin of covering up their babies’ shitty diapers on the Sabbath.”

E. Others say, "Because they call the holy ark '*chest*.'"

I.9 A. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

B. R. Ishmael says, "For two sins ignorant people die, because they call the holy ark '*chest*,' and because they call a synagogue 'a house of the people.'"

I.10 A. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

B. **R. Yosé says, "There are three who are created in a woman to examine her as to liability to the death penalty" [T. **Shab. 2:10B**].**

C. Others say, "Three causes of death: (1) Menstrual separation; (2) in [those covering] the dough-offering; and (3) in [those covering] the kindling of a lamp [for the Sabbath]."

D. *One accords with R. Eleazar, the other, rabbis.* [Freedman: Yosé's statement refers to sins that scrutinize a woman when she is in a situation of danger, and that accords with Eleazar's statement that women dies young.]

I.11 A. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

B. **Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel says, "The laws on consecrating objects as Holy Things, heave-offering, and tithe are the essentials of the Torah. [32B] They are handed over to the testimony of ordinary folk" [T. **Shab. 2:10C**].**

I.12 A. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

B. R. Nathan says, "On account of the sin of a man's unfulfilled vows a man's wife dies: 'If you have not wherewith to pay your vows, why should he take away your bed from under you?' (Pro. 22:27)."

C. Rabbi says, "On account of the sin of a man's unfulfilled vows a man's children die when they are young: 'Suffer not your mouth to cause your flesh to sin, neither say before the angel that it was an error. Wherefore should God be angry at your voice and destroy the work of your hands?' (Qoh. 5: 5). What is 'the work of a man's hands'? Say: It is his sons and daughters."

I.13 A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

B. "On account of the sin of unfulfilled vows children die," the words of R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon.

C. R. Judah the Patriarch says, "It is on account of the sin of neglect of the Torah."

D. *Now there is no problem understanding the position of him who said, "On account of the sin of unfulfilled vows children die," since it is as we just have said. But what verse of Scripture supports the position of him who has said, "It is on account of the sin of neglect of the Torah"?*

E. *"Have I smitten your children for nought? They received no instruction" (Jer. 2:30).*

F. *R. Nahman bar Isaac said, "The position of him who said, On account of the sin of unfulfilled vows children die, may find proof also in the following verse: 'For nought I have smitten your children' — it is on account of vain vows."*

G. *Note: R. Judah the Patriarch is the same as Rabbi, and yet Rabbi has said that it is on account of unfulfilled vows!*

H. *He said that after he had heard what R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon said.*

I.14 A. *There was a dispute on the same matter between R. Hiyya bar Abba and R. Yosé. One of them said, "It is on account of violating the laws of the mezuzah." The other said, "It is on account of neglect of the Torah."*

B. *From the perspective of him who said, "It is on account of violating the laws of the mezuzah," a verse of Scripture is to be read in the context of the immediately preceding verse, but not in the context of the verse before that; on the view of him who said that it is for the sin of neglect of the Torah, a verse is to be read both in the context of the preceding verse and also the one before that. [Freedman: Deu. 11:19-21: "And you shall teach them your children...and you shall write them upon the doorposts of your house...that your days may be multiplied and the days of your children." One maintains that the promise "and the days of your children" is made conditional upon the immediately preceding command, "and you shall write them," that is, the mezuzah; the other holds that it refers to the previous verse, too, that is, "and you shall teach them your children."]*

I.15 A. *There is a dispute along the same lines between R. Meir and R. Judah. One says, "It is on account of transgression of the requirement of a sign on the doorpost." The other said, "It is on*

account of the transgression of the requirement to have show fringes."

B. Now there's no problem with the verse of him who said, "It is on account of violation of the law of the sign on the doorposts," for it is written, "and you shall write them upon the doorposts of your house...that your days may be multiplied and the days of your children." But what is the scriptural basis for the view that it is for neglect of show fringes?

C. Said R. Kahana and some say Shila Mari, "Since it is written, 'Also in your skirts is found the blood of the souls of the innocent poor' (Jer. 2:34)."

D. R. Nahman bar Isaac said, "From the viewpoint of him who said that it is on account of the sin of neglecting the sign on the doorpost, proof derives also from the following verse of Scripture: 'Didn't I find them like caves' (Jer. 2:34), meaning, they treated the entrances of their homes like nothing more than caves."

I.16 A. Said R. Simeon b. Laqish, "Whoever is careful about the requirement of show fringes will in response enjoy the merit that two thousand eight hundred slaves will serve him: 'Thus says the Lord of hosts, in those days it shall come to pass that ten men shall take hold, out of all the languages of the nations, shall even take hold of the skirt of him who is a Jew, saying, we will go with you' (Zech. 8:23)." [The skirt is the fringe, there are four, and there are seventy languages, hence seventy languages times ten men times four corners, or 2800 (Freedman).]

I.17 A. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

B. R. Nehemiah says, "For the sin of nursing a grudge [causeless hate], discord grows in someone's house, his wife will miscarry, and his sons and daughters will die young."

II.1 A. **[The dough-offering:]** R. Eleazar b. R. Judah says, "For the sin of neglect of the dough-offering, no blessing comes upon what is in storage, prices are cursed, seed is sown but others eat it up: 'I also will do this to you: I will visit you with terror, even consumption and fever, that shall consume the eyes and make the soul to pine away, and you shall sow your seed in vain, for your enemies shall eat it' (Lev. 26:16). Read the word translated as terror as though it were written, dough-offering."

- B. “But if they give it, they are blessed: ‘You shall also give to the priest the first of your dough, to cause a blessing to rest on your house’ (Eze. 44:30).”

II.2 A. For the sin of neglect of heave-offering and tithes, the heavens are shut up from bringing down dew and rain; prices are high; wages low; people pursue a living but don’t catch up to it: “Drought and heat consume the snow waters, so does the grave those who have sinned” (Job. 24:19).

B. *How does that verse yield that point?*

C. *A Tannaite statement of the household of R. Ishmael:* “On account of the things that I commanded you concerning the summer [the word drought is connected with the word commanded, heat with summer, through the use of the same consonants but different vowels (Freedman)], which you didn’t do, the snowy waters will rob you in winter.

D. “But if they give it, they are blessed: ‘Bring you the whole tithe into the storehouse, that there may be meat in my house, and prove me now with it, says the Lord of hosts, if I don’t open for you the windows of heaven and pour out for you a blessing, that there shall not be room enough to receive it’ (Mal. 3:10).”

II.3 A. *What is the meaning of that there shall not be room enough to receive it (Mal. 3:10)?*

B. Said R. Ammi bar Hama, “Until you lips get tired from saying, ‘Enough.’”

II.4 A. For the sin of robbery, locusts come up and famine follows, and people eat the flesh of their sons and daughters: “Hear this word, you cows of Bashan, who are in the mountain of Samaria, who oppress the poor, who crush the needy” (Amo. 4: 1).

B. *Said Raba, “For instance, the women of Mahoza, [33A] who eat but don’t work.”*

C. And it is written, “I have smitten you with blasting and mildew; the multitude of your gardens and your vineyards and your figs trees and your olive trees has the palmer-worm devoured” (Amo. 4: 9); and further, “That which the palmer-worm has left has the locust eaten; that which the locust has left the cankerworm has eaten; that which the cankerworm has left the caterpillar has eaten” (Joe. 1: 4); “And one shall snatch on the right hand and be hungry and he shall eat on the left hand and they shall not be satisfied; they shall eat every

man the flesh of his own arm” (Isa. 9:19). Don’t read the consonants that yield “the flesh of his own arm” in that way but as though they bore vowels to yield “the flesh of his own seed.”

- II.5** A. For the transgressions of the delay of judgment, perversion of judgment, spoiling judgment, and neglect of the Torah, sword and spoil increase, pestilence and famine come, people eat and are not satisfied, and they measure out the bread that they eat by weight: “And I will bring a sword upon you, that will execute the vengeance of the covenant” (Lev. 26:25). Covenant refers only to the Torah: “But for my covenant of day and night, I had not appointed the ordinances of heaven and earth” (Jer. 33:25), and “When I break your staff of bread, ten women shall bake your bread in one oven and they shall deliver your bread again by weight” (Lev. 26:26), “Because, even because they rejected my judgments” (Lev. 26:43).
- II.6** A. For the sin of vain oaths, false oaths, profanation of the Divine Name, and desecration of the Sabbath, wild beasts multiply, domestic ones become few, the population declines, the roads become desolate: “And if by these things you will not be rebuked by me” (Lev. 26:23); Read the letters translated by “these things” as though they bore vowels to yield “by reason of oaths” [that are false]. Further, “and I will send the beast of the field among you” (Lev. 26:22). In regard to false oaths it is written, “And you shall not swear by my name falsely, so that you profane the name of God” (Lev. 19:12), and of the profanation of the Divine Name it is written, “that you do not profane my holy name” (Lev. 22: 2), and the profanation of the Sabbath is set forth, “every one who profanes it shall surely be put to death” (Exo. 31:15), and the penalty for profanation derives from the penalty for a false oath. [Freedman: Just as this is punished by the sending of wild beasts, so are the others.]
- II.7** A. For the sin of bloodshed the Temple was destroyed and the Presence of God left Israel: “So you shall not pollute the land in which you are, for blood pollutes the land. And you shall not defile the land which you inhabit, in the midst of which I dwell” (Num. 35:33-4). “Lo, if you do make it unclean, you won’t live there, and I won’t live there.”
- II.8** A. For the sin of incest, idolatry, and neglect of the years of release and Jubilee, exile comes into the world, they go into exile, and others come and take their place: “For all these abominations have the men of the land done” (Lev. 18:27), “and the land is defiled, therefore I visit the iniquity thereof upon it” (Lev. 18:25), “that the land vomit you not out also when you defile it”

(Lev. 18:28). With regard to idolatry: “And I will cast your carcasses upon the carcasses of your idols” (Lev. 26:30), “and I will make your cities a waste and will bring your sanctuaries into desolation” (Lev. 26:31), “and you will I scatter among the nations” (Lev. 26:33). In regard to the years of release and Jubilee Years: “Then shall the land enjoy her Sabbaths, as long as it lies desolate, and you shall be in your enemies land” (Lev. 26:34), “as long as it lies desolate it shall have rest” (Lev. 26:35).

II.9 A. For the sin of a foul mouth, troubles multiply, evil decrees are renewed, Israel’s youth die, and the fatherless and widows cry out and are not answered: “Therefore shall the Lord not rejoice over their young men, neither shall he have compassion over their fatherless and their widows; for every one is profane and an evil doer, and every mouth speaks folly. For all this his anger is not turned away, but his hand is stretched out still” (Isa. 9:16).

B. *What is the meaning of* but his hand is stretched out still?

C. Said R. Hanan bar Raba, “Everyone knows why a bride enters the bridal canopy, but anybody who talks foully [in that regard] — even though a decree of seventy years of goodness had been sealed in his favor, they reverse it for evil.”

II.10 A. Rabbah bar Shila said R. Hisda said, “For him who uses a foul mouth they deepen Gehenna: ‘A deep pit is for the mouth that speaks perversity’ (Pro. 22:14).”

B. R. Nahman bar Isaac said, “The same is so for one who hears such talk and accedes by silence: ‘He who is abhorred of the Lord shall fall therein’ (Pro. 22:14).”

II.11 A. R. Oshayya said, “He who polishes himself up to sin — wounds and bruises break out over him: ‘Stripes and wounds are for him who polishes himself up for evil’ (Pro. 20:30). He is punished by dropsy: ‘And strokes reach the innermost parts of the belly’ (Pro. 20:30).”

B. Said R. Nahman bar Isaac, “A sign of having sinned is dropsy.”

II.12 A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

B. There are three kinds of dropsy: [Dropsy that is punishment] for sin is thick; [dropsy that is] caused by hunger is swollen; [dropsy that is] caused by magic is thin [following Freedman].

II.13 A. *Samuel the Younger suffered from it. He said,* “Lord of the world, who will cast the lots [to find out the cause of this ailment of mine]?”

- B. *Abbayye suffered from it. Said Raba, "I know of Nahmani [Abbayye] that he habitually fasts."*
- C. *Raba suffered from it.*
- D. *But lo, Raba is the one who said, "More numerous are those killed by holding in their shit than by those who died of starvation"?*
- E. *Raba is exceptional, for rabbis forced him against his will [to hold in his shit] because of the fixed times set for his lectures.*

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

- B. There are four signs: Dropsy, a sign of sin; jaundice, a sign of causeless hatred; poverty, a sign of conceit; croup, a sign of slander.

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

- B. Croup comes to the world **[33B]** on account of neglecting tithing.
- C. R. Eleazar b. R. Yosé says, "On account of gossip."
 D. *Said Raba, and some say, R. Joshua b. Levi, "What is the pertinent verse of Scripture? 'But the king shall rejoice in God; everyone who swears by him shall glory; for the mouth of them that speak lies shall be stopped' (Psa. 63:13)." [The words for stopped and dropsy share consonants.]*

II.16 A. *The question was raised: Does R. Eleazar b. R. Yosé say that this is only on account of gossip, or that it is on account of gossip too? [The following story shows that it is the latter reading of his view that is sound.]*

B. *Come and take note:* When our rabbis entered the vineyard in Yavneh, present were R. Judah, R. Eleazar b. R. Yosé, and R. Simeon. This question was raised before them: "As to this affliction, how come it starts in the belly and ends in the throat?"

C. Responded R. Judah b. R. Ilai, chief among speakers in every circumstance, and said, "The kidneys counsel, the heart discerns, the tongue shapes [words], but it is the mouth that completes the matter."

D. Responded R. Eleazar b. R. Yosé and said, "Because with it people eat unclean things."

E. *Do you really imagine, unclean things? Rather:* "Because with it people eat food that is not properly prepared through tithing." [So it is gossip too, not gossip alone.]

F. Responded R. Simeon and said, “It is for the sin of neglect of the Torah.”

G. They said to him, “Women will prove to the contrary.”

H. “It will be because they hold their husbands back from Torah study.”

I. “Gentiles will prove to the contrary.”

J. “That is because they hold back Israelites from Torah study.”

K. “Children will prove the contrary.”

L. “That is because they hold back their fathers from study of the Torah.”

M. “School children will prove the contrary.”

N. *In that matter, the answer accords with R. Gurion, for said R. Gurion, and some say, R. Joseph b. R. Shemaiah, “When there are righteous people in a generation, the righteous are caught up in the sins of the generation [and die on account of other peoples’ sins]; when there are no righteous in a generation, school children are caught up in the sins of the generation.”*

O. *Said R. Isaac bar Zeiri, and some say, said R. Simeon b. Nezira, “What is the relevant verse of Scripture? ‘If you don’t know, O you fairest among women, go the way forth by the footsteps of the flock’ (Son. 1: 8), which we interpret in this way: The verse refers to goats taken as pledges for the debts of the shepherds.”*

P. *The story then proves that what he said was, it is on account of gossip too.*

II.17 A. *Why is R. Judah bar Ilai called “chief among speakers in every circumstance”?*

B. *For R. Judah, R. Yosé, and R. Simeon were in session, and Judah, the child of proselytes, was in session with them.*

C. R. Judah commenced and said, “What beautiful things this nation does! They organize markets, repair bridges, set up bathhouses.”

D. R. Yosé shut up.

E. R. Simeon b. Yohai responded and said, "Yeah, but whatever they set up, they set up only for their own convenience. Sure, they organize markets. But that's for places for their whores. Bathhouses? To preen themselves in them. Bridges? To collect tolls."

F. So Judah, child of proselytes, went and reported what they'd said, so the government heard about it.

G. They said, "Judah, who promoted us, will be promoted; Yosé, who shut up, will go into exile to Sepphoris; Simeon, who badmouthed us, will die."

H. *He and his son went and hid out in the house of study, and his wife brought him bread and a jug of water every day and they ate. But when the enforcement of the decrees became harsher, he said to his son, "Women are not reliable. Maybe they'll torture her and she'll rat on us."*

I. *They went and hid out in a cave. A miracle was done for them, and a carob tree and well of water appeared for them. They took off their clothes and sat up to their necks in sand all day long. When it came time to say their prayers, they put them on and covered themselves and said their prayers. Then they would again take off their clothes so that they would not wear out. In that way, they spent twelve years in the cave.*

J. *Elijah came and stood at the opening of the cave. He said, "Who will inform the son of Yohai that Caesar is dead and his harsh decrees annulled."*

K. *They came out.*

L. *They saw people ploughing and sowing. They said, "They abandon eternal life and engage in the life of the moment."*

M. Everywhere they looked was burnt up on the spot. An echo came forth and said to them, "So did you emerge so as to destroy my world? Get back into your cave."

N. *They went back and stayed there twelve months, saying, "The judgment against the wicked to stay in Gehenna is for twelve months."*

O. A heavenly echo came forth and said, "Leave your cave."

P. *They came out.*

Q. *Wherever R. Eleazar made wounds [by the evil eye], R. Simeon brought healing. He said to him, "My son, you and I are enough for the world."*

R. *On Friday before dark, they saw an older man holding two bundles of myrtle, running at twilight. They said to him, "What do you need these for?"*

S. *He said to them, "It is for the honor of the Sabbath."*

T. *"Wouldn't one be enough for you?"*

U. *"One matches 'remember' and the other matches 'observe' [at Exo. 20:8, Deu. 5:12]."*

V. *He said to his son, "See how precious are religious duties to Israel." His mind was set at ease.*

W. *R. Phineas b. Yair, his son in law, heard and came forth to greet him. He took him to the baths to heal his flesh. Seeing the holes in his body made by the sand, he wept, and tears flowed from his eyes, and this made more pain. "Woe is me, that I see you in such a condition!"*

X. He said to him, "Happy are you that you have seen me in such condition, for if you didn't see me in such a condition, you also would never have found me in such a condition [with the mastery that I achieved in isolation]!"

Y. *For to begin with, when R. Simeon b. Yohai would raise a question, R. Phineas b. Yair could give him twelve answers, while now, when R. Phineas b. Yair raised a question, R. Simeon b. Yohai could give him twenty-four answers.*

Z. *He said, "Since a miracle has taken place, I'm going to go and correct some sort of problem or situation."*

AA. For it is written, "And Jacob came in one piece to the city of Shechem" (Gen. 38:18), on which Rab said, "In one piece in body, in wealth, and in his Torah."

BB. "And he was gracious to the city" (Gen. 33:18):

CC. Said Rab, "He founded currency for them."

DD. And Samuel said, "He founded free markets for them."

EE. R. Yohanan said, "He founded bathhouses for them."

FF. [Reverting to Z:] *he said, "Is there anything that demands attention?"*

GG. *They said to him, "There's a place there which is subject to uncleanness by reason of doubt [since we don't know where human bones were buried], [34A] so this is inconvenient for the priests, who have to go around the spot [so as not to contract corpse uncleanness]."*

HH. *He said, "Is there anybody around who knows that this place was assumed to be free of uncleanness?"*

II. *Said to him a certain elder, "Here Ben Zakkai cut down radishes in the status of heave-offering" [having planted them in that status and cut them down after they had grown].*

JJ. *He did the same. Wherever the grown was hard, he declared the spot uncontaminated, but wherever it was loose, he marked it out as unclean.*

KK. *Said to him a certain elder, "Ben Yohai has declared a cemetery free of corpse uncleanness."*

LL. He said to him, “If you weren’t with us, or, if you were with us but didn’t vote, you might have made such a statement. But now that you were with us and you took a position with us, people are going to say, ‘So the whores are beautifying each other — disciples of sages all the more so’!”

MM. *He glared at him and he died.*

NN. *He went out into the market. He saw Judah, the child of proselytes. He said, “Is this fellow still around?” He glared at him and turned him into a pile of bones.*

2:7

- A. **Three things must a man state in his house on the eve of Sabbath at dusk:**
- B. (1) “Have you tithed?”
- C. (2) “Have you prepared the symbolic meal of fusion [to unite distinct domains for purposes of carrying on the Sabbath]?”
- D. (3) “[Then] kindle the lamp [for the Sabbath].”
- E. [If] it is a matter of doubt whether or not it is getting dark,
- F. (1) they do not tithe that which is certainly untithed,
- G. (2) and they do not immerse utensils,
- H. (3) and they do not kindle lamps.
- I. (1) But they do tithe that which is doubtfully tithed produce,
- J. (2) and they do prepare the symbolic meal of fusion [to unite distinct domains for purposes of carrying on the Sabbath],
- K. (3) and they do cover up what is to be kept hot.

I.1 A. *What is the source in Scripture for this rule?*

- B. Said R. Joshua b. Levi, “Said Scripture, ‘And you shall know that your tent is in peace and you shall visit your habitation and shall not err’ (Job. 5:24).”

I.2 A. *Rabbah b. R. Huna said, “Although rabbis have said, **Three things must a man state in his house on the eve of Sabbath at dusk**, nonetheless, he must say them in a serene manner, so that the household will accept instruction from him.”*

B. Said R. Ashi, *"If I hadn't heard this statement of Rabbah b. R. Huna's, I would have reached the same conclusion through common sense."*

- I.3** A. *There is a contradiction in the body of the rule. First you say, **Three things must a man state in his house on the eve of Sabbath at dusk, with the result, at dusk, that is the rule, but if it is a matter of doubt whether or not it is getting dark, that is not the rule*** [Freedman: which implies that there is no purpose in his saying it then, since an symbolic meal of fusion [to unite distinct domains for purposes of carrying on the Sabbath] may not be prepared then]; *but then you say, **[If] it is a matter of doubt whether or not it is getting dark...they do prepare the symbolic meal of fusion [to unite distinct domains for purposes of carrying on the Sabbath]!***
- B. *Said R. Abba said R. Hiyya bar Ashi said Rab, "No problem. The one speaks of the symbolic meal prepared at the Sabbath boundaries, the other, to the symbolic meal that fuses ownership of courtyards."* [The former may not be prepared at twilight, since the Sabbath may have begun, but it would serve if it were; the latter may be prepared at twilight in any event.]
- I.4** A. And said Raba, *"If two persons said to someone, 'Go and prepare for us a symbolic fusion meal,' and for one party he prepared the meal while it was clearly still day, but for the other he prepared the fusion meal at dusk [so we don't know whether or not it was the Sabbath, in which case the meal is null], and the meal of him for whom he set forth the fusion meal by day was eaten after nightfall, then both acquire the rights that the meal is supposed to confer."* [Freedman: The meal must be prepared by day and also must still be in existence when the Sabbath starts. The first had the meal placed by day but it was eaten at twilight; it is regard as night, so when the Sabbath started, the meal still existed; as to the second, twilight is assigned to the day, so it was placed by day, and it also is valid.]
- B. *But what's your preference? If twilight is day, then the latter should acquire the rights conferred by the fusion meal, the former shouldn't; if it is night, the former should have those rights, the latter shouldn't!*
- C. *The status of twilight is subject to doubt, and when there is a doubt affecting a ruling made by rabbis, it is resolved in a lenient way.*
- I.5** A. And said Raba, *"On what account did sages rule, 'After nightfall they don't store food [to keep it warm] even in a substance that doesn't add heat'? It is a precautionary decree, lest he bring it to a boil."*

- B. *Said to him Abbaye, "If so, then also such a decree should be made covering twilight!"*
- C. He said to him, "Common pots are kept at a boil [at twilight, having just then been taken off the fire]."

I.6

- A. And said Raba, [34B] "On what account did sages rule, 'They do not put away food in something that adds heat even by day [prior to the Sabbath]'? It is a precautionary decree, lest he put it in hot ashes that contain a burning coal."
- B. *Said to him Abbaye, "So let him put it away. [Since it's still day, what difference does it make?]"*
- C. He said to him, "It is a precautionary decree, lest he rake the coals [in the evening]" [Freedman].

I.7

- A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- B. Twilight is subject to doubt, first as to whether it is assigned to the day or to the night, second, as to whether the whole of it belongs to the day or to the night. So they assign to that period of time the strict rulings of both days [Friday, the Sabbath].
 - C. And what is the definition of twilight?
 - D. "It is the time from sunset for so long as there is a glow on the eastern horizon; when the lower horizon is dark but the upper not, that is twilight; but when the upper horizon is dark and so is the lower, then it is night," the words of R. Judah.
 - E. R. Nehemiah says, "It is a span of time from actual sunset that is sufficient for someone to walk a half a mile."
 - F. R. Yosé says, "Twilight lasts for as long as the blinking of an eye. As soon as the one [night] comes in, the other [day] goes out. It is not possible to fix it exactly."

I.8

- A. The master has said: "So they assign to that period of time the strict rulings of both days [Friday, the Sabbath]" –
- B. *For what practical purpose is this rule stated?*
- C. *Said R. Huna b. R. Joshua, "It concerns the matter of uncleanness, as we have learned in the Mishnah: [If] he saw one flow of flux by day and one at twilight, one at twilight and one on the following day — if it is known that part of the appearance was on one day and part of it on the next, he is certain as to the sacrifice and as to uncleanness. If it is a matter of doubt whether part of the*

appearance [of flux] appeared on one day and part on the next, he is certain as to uncleanness but in doubt as to the requirement to bring a sacrifice. [If] he saw [flux] on two days at twilight [on each day], he is in doubt as to imparting uncleanness and in doubt as to bring a sacrifice. [If he saw] one [appearance of flux] at twilight, he is in doubt [even as to] uncleanness [M. Zab. 1:6].”

I.9 A. *There is a contradiction in the formulation of the rule. You have said, “And what is the definition of twilight? It is the time from sunset for so long as there is a glow on the eastern horizon.” So it follows, if the lower horizon is dark but not the upper, it is night. Then the Tannaite statement proceeds: When the lower horizon is dark but the upper not, that is twilight!*

B. Said Rabbah said R. Judah said Samuel, “Wrap them all up together *and repeat the Tannaite statement in this way*: What is the definition of twilight? It is the time from sunset for so long as there is a glow in the east. And if the lower horizon is dark but not the upper, that is twilight; but if the upper horizon is dark and so is the lower one, that is night.”

C. And R. Joseph said R. Judah said Samuel said, “*This is the proper version of the Tannaite statement*: From sunset for so long as there is a [reddish] glow in the east, it is day. If the lower horizon is dark but not the upper, that is twilight; if the upper is pale and so is the lower, that is night.”

I.10 A. *And both parties are consistent with views expressed elsewhere, for it has been stated:*

B. What is the definition of twilight?

C. Said Rabbah said R. Judah said Samuel, “It is time for walking three parts of a mil.”

D. *What is the definition of three parts of a mil? Should we say it means, three half mils? Then say simply, a mil and a half. If it is three thirds of a mil, let him say, a mil. So it must mean, three quarters of a mil.*

E. And R. Joseph said R. Judah said Samuel said, “Two parts of a mil.”

F. *What is the definition of two parts of a mil? Should we say two halves? Then let him say, a mil. if it means two quarters, then let him say, a half mil. So it must mean [35A] two thirds of a mil.*

G. *So what's at stake between them? A half of a sixth [Rabbah's being a twelve longer than Joseph's].*
[Freedman: Rabbah gives a longer period than Joseph.]

I.11 A. *When it comes to a beehive, they reverse positions.*

B. *For said Rabbah, "A beehive that holds two kors may be moved on the Sabbath, but one that holds three kors is forbidden for handling on the Sabbath [since that still constitutes a utensil, larger would be more than an ordinary utensil]."*

C. *And R. Joseph said, "A beehive that holds three kors also may be moved; one that holds four may not."*

I.12 A. Said Abbaye, "I ask the master in what was actually a concrete situation, and even one that holds only a kor he would not permit me to carry."

B. *In accord with what authority is that position?*

C. *It is in accord with the Tannaite authority behind the Mishnah passage that we have learned as follows: ...A straw hive, and a reed hive [basket], and a tank of an Alexandrian ship which have [flat] bottoms and hold forty seahs in liquid measure, which are the same as two kors in dry measure lo, these are clean [M. Kel. 15:1E-I, the opinion of Meir].*

D. Said Abbaye, "That proves that a heap in dry measures is a third."

I.13 A. *Abbaye saw Raba looking westward. He said to him, "But hasn't it been taught on Tannaite authority: So long as there is a [reddish] glow in the east, it is day?"*

B. *He said to him, "Do you think the statement, so long as there is a [reddish] glow in the east, it is day, is meant literally? No, what it means is, 'the face that casts a red glow upon the east'" [Freedman: by reflection, hence, westward].*

C. *There are those who say: Raba saw Abbayye looking eastward. He said to him, "Do you think the statement, so long as there is a [reddish] glow in the east, it is day, is meant literally? No, what it means is, 'the face that casts a red glow upon the east' and you will remember this by 'a window'"* [Freedman: through which light enters and shines on the opposite wall].

I.14 A. R. Nehemiah says, "It is a span of time from actual sunset that is sufficient for someone to walk a half a mile" –

B. Said R. Hanina, "He who wants to know to what measure of time R. Nehemiah referred should leave when the sun is at the top of the Carmel, go down, dip in the ocean, and climb up again, and that is the period of time to which R. Nehemiah makes reference."

I.15 A. Said R. Hiyya, "He who wants to see the well of Miriam should go up to the top of Carmel and gaze. When he sees a kind of sieve in the occasion, that is Miriam's well."

I.16 A. Said Rab, "A movable well is insusceptible to uncleanness, and that would be Miriam's well."

I.17 A. Said R. Judah said Samuel, "At twilight as defined by R. Judah, priests may immerse [so as to be clean to eat heave-offering thereafter]."

B. According to whom? Should we say, R. Judah himself? But it is a time that is subject to doubt [and it might be night, in which case the immersion would not be confirmed by sunset at all]! *But if it means twilight as defined by R. Judah in the view of R. Yosé, then why say, priests may immerse at that time? That's pretty obvious!*

C. *What might you otherwise have supposed? That the twilight as defined by R. Yosé in fact continues twilight as defined by R. Judah? So we are informed that when twilight as defined by R. Judah comes to an end, then twilight as defined by R. Yosé begins.*

I.18 A. Said Rabbah bar bar Hannah said R. Yohanan, "The decided law accords with R. Judah so far as the Sabbath is concerned, and the decided law accords with R. Yosé's definition so far as [immersion to achieve purification, after sunset, for priests to eat their] heave-offering is concerned."

B. *Well, there's no problem in understanding the statement, The decided law accords with R. Judah so far as the Sabbath is concerned, since this yields a strict ruling. But what's the point of saying, the decided law accords with R. Yosé's definition [Twilight lasts for as long as the blinking of an eye. As soon as the one [night] comes in, the other [day] goes out. It is not possible to fix it exactly] so far as [immersion to achieve purification, after sunset, for priests to eat their] heave-offering is concerned? What's the point? Should we say that it is immersion [at twilight as defined by Judah is permitted because the law follows Yosé, so it is then still day]? But it is subject to doubt [Freedman: since he rules that the law follows Judah in respect to the Sabbath, he must regard Judah's view as possibly correct].*

C. **[35B]** *Rather, it pertains to the eating of food in the status of heave-offering, meaning, priests may not eat that food until the end of twilight as R. Yosé defines it.*

I.19 A. Said R. Judah said Samuel, "One star signifies that it is still day, two stars signify that it is twilight, three stars signify that it is night."

B. *So, too, it has been taught on Tannaite authority:* One star signifies that it is still day, two stars signify that it is twilight, three stars signify that it is night.

C. Said R. Yosé, "This doesn't refer to large stars, that are visible by day, nor small ones, visible only at night, but middling ones."

I.20 A. Said R. Yosé bar Zebida, "He who performs an act of labor on Friday evening when two stars are visible at twilight is liable to a sin-offering. For what are the possibilities?"

I.21 A. *Said Raba to his slave, "You people, who aren't certain as to the time measures given by rabbis, while the sun is at the top of the palm trees should light the lamp."*

B. *Well, what about a cloudy day?*

C. *In town look at what the chickens do, in the field look at the ravens or the marsh plants.*

I.22 A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

B. "Six blasts of the ram's horn are sounded on the eve of the Sabbath: The first, to mark the end of work time for the people out in the fields; the second, to

mark the end of work time for people in town and for the shops to close; the third to mark the time for lighting the Sabbath lamp,” the words of R. Nathan.

C. R. Judah the Patriarch says, “The third is to mark the moment for removing phylacteries. Then there is a waiting time for a period long enough to bake a small fish or put a loaf in the oven. Then come a long blast, short blasts, and a long blast, and the Sabbath begins.”

D. Said Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel, “So what shall we do for the Babylonians, who sound a long blast, then a short blast, and then mark the beginning of the Sabbath in the midst of the short blasts?”

E. *If they blow a long blast and a short blast only? Then there are just five! Rather: They blow a long blast, repeat that, then blow a short blast, and start the Sabbath in the midst of that.*

F. What they have in hand is ancestral practice.

I.23 A. R. Judah repeated for R. Isaac, his son, “The second is for kindling the Sabbath lamp.”

B. *In accord with which authority is this view? It can’t accord with either R. Nathan or R. Judah the patriarch! So it must be, “at the third blast it is time to kindle the Sabbath lamp.” In accord with whom? R. Nathan.*

I.24 A. *A Tannaite statement of the household of R. Ishmael: “Six sounds of the ram’s horn do they sound on the eve of the Sabbath. When one began to sound the first sound of the ram’s horn, people standing out in the fields stopped hoeing, ploughing, and doing any work in the fields; those who were near town were not permitted to enter until the ones from a distance had arrived, so all should enter simultaneously. The shops were still open, the shutters still lying on trestles. When the second blast began, the shutters were removed from the trestles and the shops were closed. But hot water and pots still stood on the stove. When the third blast began, what was to be removed was removed, and what was to be stored away and kept warm was stored away, and the lamp was lit. Then there is a waiting time for a period long enough to bake a small fish or put a loaf in the oven. Then come a long blast, short blasts, and a long blast, and the Sabbath begins.”*

I.25 A. Said R. Yosé b. R. Hanina, “I have heard that if someone came to light the lamp after the six blasts on the ram’s horn, he may do so, since the sages give the leader of the synagogue time to bring his ram’s horn home.”

- B. He said to him, "If so, you've set forth a rule for each one to apply any way he likes [Freedman: 'If so, your rule depends on variable standards']. Rather, the leader of the synagogue has a hiding place on the top of his roof, where he puts his ram's horn, because neither a ram's horn nor a trumpet [which may not be sounded on the Sabbath] may be handled on the Sabbath."

C. *But hasn't it been taught on Tannaite authority:* A ram's horn may be handled on the Sabbath, but a trumpet may not?

D. *Said R. Joseph, "No problem, one belongs to a private party, the other to the community."*

E. *Said to him Abbaye, "So if it's an individual's, what's it good for [in connection with the Sabbath, since you cannot sound it]?"*

F. "Since with it you can give **[36A]** a child a drink."

G. *"Well, one that belongs to the community also can be used to give a drink to a poor child. Furthermore, it has been taught on Tannaite authority:* Just as a ram's horn may be handled on the Sabbath, so may a trumpet be handled on the Sabbath! *So whom can that formulation possibly represent?"*

H. *Well, anyhow, there's no problem, the one represents R. Judah, the next, R. Simeon, the third, R. Nehemiah.* [Freedman: Judah holds that a shofar can be handled, since it can be put to a permitted use; but not a trumpet. Simeon rejects the whole idea of not touching what can't be moved, so both may be handled. Nehemiah holds that a utensil can be handled only for its normal use, excluding both items.]

I. *Further, what's the meaning of ram's horn here? It means trumpet too, in line with what R. Hisda said, for Said R. Hisda, "The following three things traded names after the destruction of the Temple: The trumpet was called ram's horn, the ram's horn, trumpet. So what difference does it make? It has to do with the ram's horn used on the New Year [which must be what is ordinarily called a trumpet but which is really a ram's horn]. The willow was called a twig, a twig, a willow. For what purpose? For the palm branch for Tabernacles. A small moneychanger's table was*

called a bench, [bank] a bench, a table. For what purpose? For business dealings."

J. Said Abbayye, "So we, too, say the same: The second stomach of ruminants was then called the first, the first, the second. So what? In regard to the rule governing a needle found in the thickness of the one, which, if found on one side, leaves the animal fit for food, if found through both sides, makes the animal unfit for food."

K. Said R. Ashi, "So we, too, say: Babylonia changed its name to Borsip, and Borsip to Babylonia. **[36B]** So what? In regard to writs of divorce."
[Freedman: With respect to Babylonia and Borsip, the names after the change must be the ones used in a writ of divorce.]