

XXIV.

BAVLI SHABBAT CHAPTER TWENTY-FOUR

FOLIOS 153A-157B

24:1

- A. He who was overtaken by darkness on the road
- B. gives his purse to a gentile.
- C. If there is no gentile with him, he leaves it on an ass.
- D. [When] he reaches the outermost courtyard [of a town], he removes [from the ass] those utensils which may be handled on the Sabbath.
- E. And [as to] those [utensils] which are not to be handled on the Sabbath, he unloosens the ropes, and the bundles fall by themselves.

- I.1** A. [He who was overtaken by darkness on the road gives his purse to a gentile:] *How come rabbis permitted him to give his purse to a gentile?*
- B. *It is an established fact for rabbis that a person will not practice restraint so far as his money is concerned; if you don't permit him to do it, he'll end up carrying it for four cubits in public domain.*

- I.2** A. *Said Raba, "But that pertains in particular to his purse, but not to something he may have found."*
- B. *Well, now, that's pretty obvious! The language of the Mishnah explicitly speaks of his purse!*
- C. *Well, what might you otherwise have supposed? That the same rule applies to something he has found, and the reason that the language his purse is used is because that is the way things usually are. So we are informed to the contrary.*

D. *And we have stated that rule only in a case in which it has not come into his possession prior to the Sabbath, but if what he found has come into possession once the Sabbath took effect, it is in the same category as his purse.*

E. *There are those who say: Raba raised the question, "As to something that may have come to hand, what is the law? Since it has come to hand, it is comparable to his purse? Or perhaps, since he didn't have to go to any trouble to get this thing, it is not in the category of his purse?"*

F. *That question stands.*

II.1 A. If there is no gentile with him, he leaves it on an ass:

B. *So the operative consideration is that there is no gentile with him. But if there is a gentile with him, he gives it to a gentile in preference. How come? In respect to an ass, you are commanded with respect to his Sabbath rest, but in respect to a gentile, you are not commanded in respect to his Sabbath rest.*

II.2 A. If there are an ass, a deaf-mute, idiot, and minor — he puts it on the ass, but he doesn't give it to the deaf-mute, idiot, or minor. How come? These are human beings, the former isn't. If there are a deaf-mute and an idiot, he gives it to the idiot; if there are an idiot and a minor, he gives it to the idiot.

B. *The question was raised: If there are a deaf-mute and a minor, what is the rule?*

C. *In response to the position of R. Eleazar, you need not raise the question, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Isaac says in the name of R. Eleazar, "Priestly rations designated by a deaf man [153B] should not go forth to unconsecrated status, because its status is subject to doubt." Where the question arises, it concerns the position of rabbis, for we have learned in the Mishnah: **Five [sorts of people] may not separate heave-offering, and if they separated heave-offering, that which they have separated is not [valid] heave-offering: (1) a deaf-mute, (2) an imbecile, (3) a minor, and (4) one who separates heave-offering from [produce] which is not his own, (5) a gentile who separated heave-offering from [the produce of] an Israelite, even with permission — that which he has separated is not [valid] heave-offering [M. Ter. 1:1A-D]. So what's the upshot? Should he give it to the deaf-mute, since the***

minor will ultimately reach sound senses [so potentially is an adult]? Or should he give it to the minor, since the deaf-mute may be confused with an adult of sound senses?

- D. *There are those who say he should give it to a deaf-mute, and there are those who say, he should give it to a minor.*

II.3 A. *If there is neither a gentile nor an ass nor a deaf-mute, idiot, or minor — what is the rule?*

- B. Said R. Isaac, “There was an option, but sages didn’t want to say what it is.”

C. *What is the option?*

- D. He could bring it along in less than four cubits at a time.

E. Why didn’t sages want to say what it is?

F. It is on account of “It is the glory of God to conceal a thing, but the glory of kings is to search out a matter” (Pro. 25: 2).

G. *So what’s the glory of God in this situation?*

H. *It is possible that one might carry the object for four cubits in public domain.*

II.4 A. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

B. **R. Eliezer says, “On that day they overfilled the seah-measure.”**

C. **R. Joshua says, “On that day they broke the seah-measure” [T. **Shab. 1:17A-C**].**

II.5 A. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority: A parable from the perspective of R. Eliezer: To what is the matter likened? To a basket full of cucumbers and gourds; someone puts a mustard seed into it, and the basket can hold it.*

B. *A parable from the perspective of R. Eliezer: To a tub full of honey: If one puts in pomegranates and nuts, the tub throws them up.*

II.6 A. The master has said: **If there is no gentile with him, he leaves it on an ass**
—

- B. But then isn’t he leading an ass, and Scripture has said, “In it you shall do no work, you nor your cattle” (Exo. 20:10)?

C. Said R. Ada bar Ahbah, “He puts it on the ass while it is walking along.”

- D. *But lo, it's not possible that it's not going to stand still and piss or drop shit, in which case there will be a taking up and a putting down!*
- E. He puts it on an ass while it's walking along, and when it stops, he takes it off the beast.
- F. *If so, he can do the same with his neighbor! [Why specify an ass?]*
- G. Said R. Pappa, "In any case in which, if one did the deed himself, he would be liable to a sin-offering, in the case of his fellow even though he is not liable, such a deed is forbidden, but in any case in which for the neighbor's action one is not liable, though it is a forbidden action, in respect to his own ass it is permitted to begin with."

- II.7** A. Said R. Ada bar Ahbah, "If his bundle was lying on his shoulder, he runs until he gets home. He may run, but not walk in a leisurely way. *How come? Since there is no means of marking off a distinction, he will end up taking up the object and putting it down.*"
- B. *Well, anyhow, when he gets home, it's impossible that he won't stop for a moment and so will end up carrying it from public to private domain!*
- C. *He tosses it in a backhanded [unusual] manner [so to mark the distinctiveness of the situation].*

II.8 A. Said R. Ammi bar Hama, "He who drives his beast on the Sabbath inadvertently is liable to a sin-offering; if he does it deliberately, he is liable to death by stoning."

B. *How come?*

C. Said Rabbah, "Said Scripture, 'You shall not do any work — you nor your cattle' (Exo. 20:10) — *his cattle is treated as comparable to the man himself*; just as in his case, if he does it inadvertently, he is liable to a sin-offering, and if he does it deliberately, he is liable to death through stoning, so in the case of his beast likewise, if he does it inadvertently, he is liable to a sin-offering, and if he does it deliberately, he is liable to death through stoning."

D. Said Raba, "There are two replies to this matter. First of all, it is written, 'You shall have one law for him who does aught unwittingly... but the soul that does anything with a high hand' (Num. 15:29): All laws are treated as comparable to idolatry. *Just as in the case of idolatry, the penalty is incurred if the man personally does the deed, so here, too, one incurs a sin-offering only if he personally does the*

deed. And furthermore, we have learned in the Mishnah: He who profanes the Sabbath in regard to a matter, on account of the deliberate doing of which they are liable to extirpation, and on account of the inadvertent doing of which they are liable to a sin-offering [M. Shab. 7:8A]. So it follows that there is something on account of the deliberate doing of which they are not liable to extirpation, and on account of the inadvertent doing of which they are not liable to a sin-offering, and what might that be? Isn't it driving his beast on the Sabbath?"

E. No, it is the violation of the Sabbath limits in accord with the position of R. Aqiba [who regards the prohibition as deriving from the Torah (Freedman)], or the lighting of a flame in accord with the position of R. Yosé.

F. [154A] R. Zebid repeated matters in this way:

G. Said R. Ammi bar Hama, "He who drives his beast on the Sabbath inadvertently is not liable to a sin-offering; if he does it deliberately, he is liable to death by stoning."

H. Objected Raba, "He who profanes the Sabbath in regard to a matter, on account of the deliberate doing of which they are liable to extirpation, and on account of the inadvertent doing of which they are liable to a sin-offering [M. Shab. 7:8A]. Lo, if one is not liable on account of the inadvertent doing of such a deed to a sin-offering, they also are not liable on account of the deliberate doing of which they are liable to extirpation."

I. But is the Tannaite formulation as just stated: Lo, if one is not liable on account of the inadvertent doing of such a deed to a sin-offering, they also are not liable on account of the deliberate doing of which they are liable to extirpation?! This is the statement before us: In regard to a matter, on account of the deliberate doing of which they are liable to extirpation, and on account of the inadvertent doing of which they are liable to a sin-offering. But there is something on account of the deliberate doing of which they are not liable to extirpation, and on account of the inadvertent

doing of which they are not liable to a sin-offering, and what might that be? Isn't it driving his beast on the Sabbath?

J. *Raba, brother of R. Mari bar Rahel, and some say, father of R. Mari bar Rahel — and in the latter case, there is a problem, for Rab validated R. Mari bar Rahel to hold office and appointed him one of the collectors of Babylonia — but maybe there were two people called Mari bar Rahel — repeated this tradition in the name of R. Yohanan, declaring him exempt, in the following formulation: Said R. Yohanan, “He who drives his ass on the Sabbath is exempt from all penalty. If he did it inadvertently, he doesn't incur the obligation of a sin-offering, because the whole Torah is treated as comparable, so far as violations of the law are concerned, to idolatry. If he did it deliberately, he is exempt, because we have learned in the Mishnah: **He who profanes the Sabbath — in regard to a matter, on account of the deliberate doing of which they are liable to extirpation, and on account of the inadvertent doing of which they are liable to a sin-offering** [M. San. 7:8A]. *Lo, the deed done inadvertently doesn't involve a sin-offering, so the deed done deliberately doesn't involve stoning. Neither is he liable for violating a negative commandment, because this is a negative commandment for which a warning that capital punishment at the hands of an earthly court is to be given, and for such a deed there is no flogging* [154B] *And even from the perspective of him who has said that they do flog, the All-Merciful should say, “You shall not do any work nor your cattle.” Why use the language, “you...”? It is to teach, only when he personally does the work is he liable, but if the animal works, he isn't liable.”**

III.1 A. [When] he reaches the outermost courtyard [of a town], he removes [from the ass] those utensils which may be handled on the Sabbath:

- B. Said R. Huna, "If his beast was loaded with glassware, he brings pillows and bolsters and puts them under the beast and then he lets the ropes loose, and the bundles fall onto them."
- C. *But lo, we have learned in the Mishnah the language, he removes [from the ass] those utensils which may be handled on the Sabbath! [So why go through such a procedure?]*
- D. *When R. Huna made his statement, he spoke of bleeder's horns, which are not to be handled on the Sabbath.*
- E. *But in this procedure, he nullifies the use of the utensils that he utilizes [the pillows and bolsters]!*
- F. *He refers to little bags [out from under which he can pull the pillows; he thus accomplishes his goal].*
- G. *An objection was raised: If one's beast was laden with food subject to tithing but not yet tithed or with glass balls, he loosens the ropes and the sacks fall on their own, even though they may break in that way.*
- H. *In that case we speak of lumps of glass. A close reading of the language of the rule shows that fact, since the rule treats the glass as analogous to food subject to tithing but not yet tithed. Just as that is of no practical use to him, here, too, it refers to something that is of no practical use to him.*
- I. *So why say even though they may break in that way?*
- J. *What might you otherwise have supposed? We take account even of a rather trivial loss? So we are informed that that is not the case.*

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

- B. R. Simeon b. Yohai says, "If one's beast was loaded with a bag of grain, one puts his head under it and moves it to the other side so that it falls off on its own."

III.3 A. The ass of Rabban Gamaliel was loaded with honey, and he didn't want to unload it until the end of the Sabbath. But at the end of the Sabbath, it died.

B. *But we have learned in the Mishnah: He removes [from the ass] those utensils which may be handled on the Sabbath! [So why go through such a procedure?]*

C. *The honey had turned rancid [and could not be used].*

D. *Well, if it had turned rancid, what good was it [that he bothered to bring it into the household at all]?*

- E. *For camel's sores.*
- F. *Why not loosen the ropes and let the bundles fall off on their own?*
- G. *The gourds that held the honey might burst.*
- H. *Why not bring pillows and bolsters and put them under the beast?*
- I. *They would get dirty, and he would turn out to invalidate a utensil for the use for which it was designated prior to the Sabbath.*
- J. *Well, what about the consideration of cruelty to animals?*
- K. *He takes the view that the consideration of cruelty to animals derives only from the authority of rabbis [and doesn't override the prohibitions of the Sabbath].*

- III.4** A. *Abbaye found Rabbah letting his son slide down the back of an ass. He said to him, "The master is exploiting living creatures."*
- B. *He said to him, "It's only down the side, and rabbis didn't make a precautionary decree concerning the sides of the beast [since using the animal as a slide is not the normal way that it serves]."*
- C. *How do we know that fact?*
- D. *Because we have learned in the Mishnah: And [as to] those [utensils] which are not to be handled on the Sabbath, he unloosens the ropes, and the bundles fall by themselves. Doesn't that speak of a pair of [Freedman:] coupled haversacks, in which case one makes use of the sides of the beast, demonstrating that rabbis didn't make a precautionary decree concerning the sides of the beast?*
- E. *No, it refers to a balanced load, in which case one doesn't make use of the sides of the beast; or, it means where the sacks are fastened by a bolt [Freedman: a wooden cross bar that can easily be pulled out, letting the sacks drop].*
- F. *An objection was made: [If] two [sides of a sukkah] are [formed by] a tree, and one is made by man, or two are made by man and one is [formed by] a tree, it is valid. But they do not go up into it on the festival day [M. Suk. 2:3E-F]. Doesn't this mean that one made grooves on the tree [where the sides were fit], so it is only the sides that would be used and so it is clear they are forbidden?*
- G. *No, he bent over the branches of the tree and put the sukkah-roofing on it, so he makes use of the tree.*

H. *Then note what follows: [If] three are made by man and one is [formed by] a tree, it is valid. And they do go up into it on the festival day [M. Suk. 2:3I-K]. But if it is the fact that he bent the tree over, how come he may go up into that sukkah on the festival?*

I. So what is the sense, that the sides are forbidden? Then how come one may go up into the sukkah on the festival?

J. *The point is, there it deals with branches that spread, with the tree itself merely serving as a wall. [The thick branches form the fourth wall, the roofing rests on the other three, not on the branches.] And that may be shown in a close reading of the Mishnah language: [This is the governing principle: In the case of any [sukkah] in which the tree may be removed, and [the sukkah] can [still] stand by itself, it is valid. And they go up into it on the festival day.]*

K. *That is decisive.*

III.5 A. *May we say that this represents a dispute between Tannaite authorities? They do not go up into such a sukkah on the festival. R. Simeon b. Eleazar says in the name of R. Meir, “They do go up into it on the festival.” Isn’t this what is at issue here, namely, the one authority holds that it is forbidden to make use of the sides, and the other, that it is permitted?*

B. *Said Abbaye, “Not at all. All parties maintain that utilizing the sides is forbidden. But here what is at issue are the sides of the sides [Freedman: the laths or canes fitted in the grooves are the sides, the roofing that rests on the laths are the sides of the sides; may one make indirect use of the sides]. One party holds that the sides of the sides are forbidden, the other, that they are permitted.”*

C. *Raba said, “The one who forbade the sides also forbade the sides of the sides, and the one who permitted the sides of the sides also permitted the sides.”*

D. *Objected R. Mesharshayya to Raba, “If one pushed [155A] a peg into a tree and hung a basket on it [in which he put the meal that fuses private property into a single fictive domain], if it is above ten handbreadths from the ground, the fusion meal is not valid, if it is below, it is.” [If it is ten above the ground, the basket, four handbreadths square, is private domain and the*

ground below is public; the meal then is not accessible and so is null.] *So the operative consideration is that he stuck a peg into a tree. Lo, if he hadn't done so, then even if it were located less than ten handbreadths above the ground, the fusion meal still wouldn't have been valid. And here is a Tannaite authority who forbids the use of the sides but permits the indirect use of the sides!*"

E. *Said R. Pappa, "Here we deal with a basket which is narrow at the mouth, so that, in removing the fusion meal, he would sway the tree and so utilize the tree itself."*

F. *The decided law is: The sides are forbidden, the sides of the sides are permitted.*

G. *Said R. Ashi, "Now that you have said the sides are forbidden, one may not rest a lodge ladder [Freedman] on a palm tree, since that is equivalent to using the sides of the trees, but he must rest it on pegs outside of the tree, and when he ascends, he should put his foot not on the pegs but on the rungs."*

24:2

- A. **They loosen bundles of hay in front of cattle,**
- B. **and they spread out bunches,**
- C. **but not small bundles.**
- D. **And they do not chop up unripe stalks of corn or carobs before cattle,**
- E. **whether large or small [beasts].**
- F. **R. Judah permits in the case of carobs for small beasts.**

I.1 A. *Said R. Huna, "Bundles and bunches are the same thing, but bundles are two bunches tied together, bunches are three; small bundles are young shoots of cedar trees. This is the sense, then, of the statement before us: **They loosen bundles of hay in front of cattle, and they spread them out,** and the same is the rule for **bunches, but not small bundles.** These may not be spread out nor untied."*

B. *Said R. Hisda, "What is the operative consideration in the mind of R. Huna? He takes the view that we do go to trouble in connection with food that is in the state of nature, but we don't turn something into food [for example, young shoots used for fuel]."*

- C. R. Judah said, “Bundles and bunches are the same thing, *but bundles are two bunches tied together, bunches are three; small bundles are young shoots of cedar trees. This is the sense, then, of the statement before us: **They loosen bundles of hay in front of cattle**, but they may not be spread out; **and they spread them out bunches, but not small bundles.*** These may not be spread out but may be untied.”

D. *Said Raba, “What is the operative consideration in the mind of R. Judah? He takes the view that we do go to the trouble of turning something into fodder, but we may not take the trouble of preparing fodder”* [when bundles are tied, they are not fit for fodder so may be untied, but we do not permit spreading them out (Freedman)].

E. *We have learned in the Mishnah: **And they do not chop up unripe stalks of corn or carobs before cattle, whether large or small [beasts].** Is it not then appropriate to compare carobs to fodder? Just as fodder is soft, so soft carobs are meant, which shows that we do not go to trouble over foodstuff, a refutation of R. Huna?*

F. *R. Huna may say to you, “No, it is fodder comparable to carobs: Just as carobs are hard, so hard fodder is meant. How so? In the case of very young foals.”*

G. *Come and hear: **R. Judah permits in the case of carobs for small beasts.** For little ones, not for big ones! Now, if you maintain that, in the opinion of the first Tannaite authority, we may not go to any trouble for foodstuffs but may turn something into foodstuffs, then there is no problem in understanding R. Judah’s position, which is that cutting up carobs for small cattle also is to turn it into fodder. But if you take the view that the initial Tannaite authority maintains we may not turn anything into fodder, yet we may take trouble over fodder, then should **R. Judah permit in the case of carobs for small beasts only?** He should permit all the more so for large cattle [since if they’re o.k. not cut up for small cattle, they’re certainly fine for big ones].*

H. *But do you think that the meaning of “small” is literal? What it means is large cattle, but they’re called “small” because they grind food small.*

I. *Well, since the opening clause is explicit, **whether large or small [beasts]**, it must follow that R. Judah means small literally!*

J. *So that's a problem.*

K. *Come and take note: **They cut up [155B] gourds before cattle, and carrion meat before dogs [M. 24:4A-B].** Doesn't this yield: Gourds comparable to carrion. Just as carrion is soft, so soft gourds are meant, and that proves we may go to trouble over foodstuffs — a refutation of R. Judah?*

L. *R. Judah may say to you, "No, the equation is: A carcass like gourds; just as gourds are hard, so hard carrion is meant. And what might that be? Meat that has splits in it, in the case of young dogs [for whom that kind of meat has to be chopped up]."*

M. *Come and take note, for recited R. Hanan of Nehardea, "We break up straw and fodder and mix them together." That proves we go to trouble over fodder.*

N. *Straw here means putrefying straw; fodder is for young foals.*

24:3

- A. **They do not stuff food into a camel or cram it [into its mouth].**
- B. **But they put food into its mouth.**
- C. **And they do not fatten calves [with food against their will], but they put food into their mouths [in the normal way].**
- D. **And they force-feed chickens,**
- E. **They put water into the bran, but they do not knead it,**
- F. **And they do not put water before bees or doves which are in dovecotes.**
- G. **But they do put it before geese, chickens, and Herodian doves.**

- I.1**
- A. *What is the meaning of **they do not stuff food into a camel or cram it [into its mouth]**?*
 - B. *Said R. Judah, "They don't make a manger in its stomach [by overfeeding it]."*
 - C. *Is such a thing possible?*
 - D. *Yes, in line with what R. Jeremiah of Difti said, "I personally saw a Tai-Arab feed a camel with a kor of wheat and load it with a kor of wheat."*

- II.1** A. **And they do not fatten calves [with food against their will], but they put food into their mouths [in the normal way]:**
- B. *What is the meaning of “fattening” and what is the meaning of “putting food into their mouths”?*
- C. Said R. Judah, “Fattening is forcing food so far down the throat that it can’t come up again; feeding is doing so only so far that it can come up again.”
- D. R. Hisda said, “*Both words refer to pushing the food in so far it can’t come up again, but the former is done with a tool and the latter is done by hand.*”
- E. *Objected R. Joseph, “They force chickens to take food, and it goes without saying that they may fatten them; but one may not fatten doves in the dovecote of loft, and it goes without saying, they may not force them [T. Shab. 17:23C]. What is the definition of forcing feeding and what is the definition of hand feeding? Should we say that the latter is hand feeding, the other, throwing grain in front of them? Then it would follow that we could not even throw grain before doves of the dovecote or loft [which makes no sense]. So it must follow that force feeding means, forcing food so far down that it can’t come back, and hand feeding means, putting it down so that it can return? And it would therefore follow that stuffing food means, with a utensil, and that would refute R. Judah.”*
- F. *R. Judah may say to you, “In point of fact, the one means hand feeding, the other, casting food before the animals. And as to your question, it would follow that we could not even throw grain before doves of the dovecote or loft [which makes no sense], that’s true, for you’re responsible for food for the fowl but not for the latter [doves can get their own in the fields]. That is in line with what has been taught on Tannaite authority: They put food before dogs but they don’t put food before pigs. And what’s the difference between the one and the other? Feeding the one is your responsibility, but feeding the other is not your responsibility.”*
- G. *Said R. Ashi, “The language of our Mishnah paragraph supports that view: **And they do not put water before bees or doves which are in dovecotes. But they do put it before geese, chickens, and Herodian doves.** How come? Isn’t the reason that you’re responsible for food for the latter but not the former?”*
- H. *Well, from your perspective, why make reference in particular to water? Even wheat and barley should be covered by the prohibition.*
- I. *But: Water is exceptional, since it’s found in pools.*

II.2 A. *Expounded R. Jonah at the gate of the patriarch's household, "What is the meaning of the verse of Scripture, 'The righteous knows the cause of the poor' (Pro. 29: 7)? The Holy One, blessed be He, knows that a dog's food is scanty, so he keeps his food in his belly for three days."*

B. *That is in line with what we have learned in the Mishnah: [A dog which ate the flesh of the corpse, and the dog died and was lying on the threshold — R. Meir says, "If his neck is a handbreadth wide, he brings the uncleanness, and if not, he does not bring the uncleanness." R. Yosé says, "We examine the uncleanness. [If the dog's belly is] from directly beneath the lintel and inside, [toward the house], the house is unclean. [If it is] from directly beneath the lintel and [towards the] outside, the house is clean." R. Eleazar says, "[If] his mouth is inside, the house is clean; [if] his mouth is outside, the house is unclean, for the uncleanness exudes through his hind-parts." R. Judah b. Beterah says, "One way or the other, the house is unclean."]* How much must it remain in his intestines? Three whole days. And in birds and fish? "Sufficient time for it to fall into the fire and be burned" the words of R. Simeon. R. Judah b. Beterah says, "In birds and fish, twenty-four hours" [M. **Oh. 11:7**].

C. *Said R. Hamnuna, "That implies that it is proper to throw raw meat to a dog."*

D. How much?

E. *Said R. Mari, "Give it the measure of its ear, and then give it the stick [and drive it off]."*

F. *That is the case in the fields, but not in town, because in town it will follow him.*

G. *Said R. Pappa, "There is nothing poorer than a dog or richer than a pig."*

II.3 A. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority in accord with the view of R. Judah:*

B. **What is stuffing calves?** It is forcing it down and opening the mouth wide and putting in water and vetches simultaneously. **What is putting food into the mouth of a camel?** It is feeding it standing and giving it water standing and putting vetches out separately and water separately [T. **Shab. 17:21-22**].

III.1 A. And they force feed chickens:

- B. *Said Abbaye, "I said before the master, 'In accord with which authority is our Mishnah's rule?' And he said to me, 'It is R. Yosé bar Judah, for so it has been taught on Tannaite authority: 'One party puts in the flour and a second party puts in the water, the second party [having completed the process] is liable for having violated the Sabbath,' the words of Rabbi. R. Yosé says, 'He is liable only when he kneads the mixture.'"*
- C. *[Abbaye replies:] "But maybe R. Yosé takes the position that he does only in the case of flour, which requires kneading, but as to bran, which doesn't require kneading, I might say that R. Yosé b. R. Judah would concur."*
- D. *"Don't let the thought enter your mind, for it has been stated on Tannaite authority, 'Water is not to be poured into bran,' the words of Rabbi. R. Yosé b. R. Judah says, "Water may be poured into bran."*

III.2 A. Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:

- B. They do not mix mashed grain.
- C. Others say, "They do."
- D. *So who are the others?*
- E. Said R. Hisda, "It is **[156A]** R. Yosé b. R. Judah."

III.3 A. And that is the rule only if he does it in an extraordinary manner.

- B. *What is the definition of an extraordinary manner?*
- C. Said R. Hisda, "Little by little."
- D. But they concur that they may stir flour and honey beer on the Sabbath, and they may drink Egyptian beer.
- E. But you said, "They don't mix"!
- F. *No problem, the one speaks of a thick mass, the other, a thin one.*
- G. *And that is the rule only if he does it in an extraordinary manner.*
- H. *What is the definition of an extraordinary manner?*
- I. Said R. Joseph, "On a week day they pour in vinegar and then the flour and honey beer, but on the Sabbath, they pour in the flour and honey beer and then the vinegar."

III.4 A. Levi b. R. Huna bar Hiyya on the Sabbath found the worker in his father's household in charging of mixing the fodder for the cattle mashing up bran and feeding the oxen. He criticized him. His father came and found him. He said to

him, *"This is what the father of your mother said in the name of Rab, and who might he be? R. Jeremiah bar Abba: 'They mash bran but don't force feed the animal; and if the animal can't take the fodder up with its tongue, one may feed it, on condition that that be done in an unusual way.'"*

B. *How would one change the usual practice?*

C. Said R. Yemar bar Shelamayya in the name of Abbaye, *"Stirring it crosswise."*

D. *But then it won't be well mixed!*

E. Said R. Judah, *"He shakes up the utensil itself."*

III.5 A. *It was written in the notebook of Zeiri, "I asked my teacher, and who might that be? R. Hiyya, 'What about kneading?' He said, 'It is forbidden.'*

B. *"What about emptying mash from utensil to utensil?" He said, 'It is permitted.'"*

III.6 A. *Said R. Menassayya, "One measure for one measure, two for two are fine. But three for two animals is forbidden" [since they don't eat that much during the week (Freedman)].*

B. R. Joseph said, *"A qab, even two."*

C. Ulla said, *"A kor, even two."*

III.7 A. *It was written in the notebook of Levi, "I spoke to my lord, and who might that be? Our holy master [Judah the Patriarch] about those who mix beer in Babylonia, and my lord, our holy master, objected against that practice, but no one obeyed him, and he didn't have the power to prohibit their doing so, on account of [the contrary opinion of] R. Yosé b. R. Judah."*

Composite on Astrology.

Attached for Formal Reason

["It was written in the notebook of "]

III.8 A. *It was written in R. Joshua b. Levi's notebook, "One who is born on Sunday will be a man without 'one thing' in him."*

B. *What is the meaning of a man without 'one thing' in him?*

C. *Should I say, without one good quality? But didn't R. Ashi say, "I was born on Sunday"? So it must be, "A man without one thing to his disgrace."*

D. But didn't R. Ashi say, "I and Dimi bar Qaquzeta were born on Sunday, I am a king and he is a capo di capi"?

E. Rather, it means, either wholly good or wholly bad. How come? Because light and darkness were created on that day.

- F. [Reverting to the notes:] "One who is born on Monday will be contentious. How come? Because the waters were divided that day. One who was born on a Tuesday will be wealthy and promiscuous. How come? Because herbs were created that day [which multiply rapidly and mix with other herbs (Freedman)]. One who was born on Wednesday will be wise and have a great memory. How come? Because that is the day on which the heavenly luminaries were hung up. One who was born on Thursday will do deeds of generosity. How come? Because fish and birds were created that day [Freedman: which are fed by God's generosity]. One who was born on Friday will be someone who makes the rounds [in his search for learning]."

G. Said R. Nahman bar Isaac, "One who makes the rounds to do religious deeds."

- H. [Reverting to the notes:] "One who is born on the Sabbath will die on the Sabbath, because the preeminent Sabbath day was desecrated on his account."

I. Said Raba bar R. Shila, "And he will be called a great saint."

J. R. Hanina said to [his disciples], "Go and tell Bar Levi [R. Joshua], 'It is not the star that rules over the day in general on which one was born that governs, but the star that controlled that very hour that governs. He who was born under the sun will be an outstanding person; he will eat and drink of his own property, and his secrets will be uncovered; if he is a thief, he will not succeed. He who is born under Venus will be wealthy and promiscuous. How come? Because fire was created under that star. He who was born under Mercury will have a wonderful memory and be smart. How come? Because Mercury is the scribe of the sun. He who is born under the moon will be a man to suffer evil, building and destroying, destroying and building, eating and drinking what is not his, and his secrets will remain hidden. If he is a thief, he will be successful. He who is born under Saturn will be a man who never accomplishes what he sets out to do.'"

- K. *Others say, "All plans against him will be frustrated."*
- L. *"He who is born under Jupiter [called 'righteous'] will be a person who habitually does righteousness."*
- M. *R. Nahman bar Isaac said, "Doing righteousness in good deeds."*
- N. *"He who is born under Mars will shed blood."*
- O. *R. Ashi said, "That means he'll be a surgeon, thief, slaughterer, or circumciser."*
- P. *Rabbah said, "I was born under Mars."*
- Q. *Said Abbaye, "Yeah, and you inflict punishment and kill [with words]."*

III.9 A. *It has been stated:*

- B. *R. Hanina says, "One's star is what makes one smart, one's star is what gives wealth, and Israel is subject to the stars."*
- C. *R. Yohanan said, "Israel is not subject to the stars."*
- D. *And R. Yohanan is consistent with views expressed elsewhere, for said R. Yohanan, "How on the basis of Scripture do we know that Israel is not subject to the stars? As it is said, 'Thus says the Lord, Do not learn the way of the gentiles, nor be dismayed at the signs of the heavens, for the nations are dismayed at them' (Jer. 10: 2). They are dismayed, but the Israelites are not dismayed."*

- III.10** A. *And so Rab takes the view that Israel is not subject to the stars, for said R. Judah said Rab, "How on the basis of Scripture do we know that Israel is not subject to the stars? As it is said, 'And he brought him forth outside' (Gen. 15: 5). Said Abraham before the Holy One, blessed be He, 'Lord of the world, "Someone born in my household is my heir" (Gen. 15: 3).' He said to him, 'Not at all. "But he who will come forth out of your own loins" (Gen. 1: 4).' He said before him, 'Lord of the world, I have closely examined my star, and I have seen that I am destined to have no children.' He said to him, 'Abandon this astrology of yours — Israel is not subject to astrology. Now what's your calculation? [156B] Is it that Jupiter stands in the west [and that is your constellation]? I'll turn it back and set it up in the East.' And so it is written, 'Who has raised up Jupiter from the east? He has summoned it for his sake' (Isa. 41: 2)."*
- B. *It is also the position of Samuel that Israel is not subject to the stars.*

C. *For Samuel and Ablat were in session, and some people going along to a lake. Said Ablat to Samuel, "That man is going but won't come back, a snake will bite him and he'll die."*

D. *Said to him Samuel, "Yeah, well, if he's an Israelite, he will go and come back."*

E. *While they were in session, he went and came back. Ablat got up and took of the man's knapsack and found in it a snake cut up and lying in two pieces.*

F. *Said Samuel to the man, "What did you do [today in particular]?"*

G. *He said to him, "Every day we tossed our bread into one pot and ate, but today one of us had no bread, and he was shamed. I said to him, 'I will go and collect the bread.' When I came to him, I made as if to go and collect the bread, so he shouldn't be ashamed."*

H. *He said to him, "You have carried out a religious duty."*

I. *Samuel went forth and expounded, "'But charity delivers from death' (Pro. 10: 2) — not from a grotesque death, but from death itself."*

III.11 A. *It is also the position of Aqiba that Israel is not subject to the stars.*

B. *For R. Aqiba had a daughter. Chaldaeans [astrologers] told him, "On the day that she goes into the bridal canopy, a snake will bite her and she'll die."*

C. *This worried him a lot. On that day she took a brooch and stuck it into the wall, and by chance it sank into the eye of a snake. The next day when she took it out, the snake came trailing along after it.*

D. *Her father said to her, "What did you do [today in particular]?"*

E. *She said to him, "In the evening a poor man came to the door, and everyone was busy with the banquet so no one could take care of him, so I took some of what was given to me and gave it to him."*

F. *He said to her, "You have carried out a religious duty."*

G. *R. Aqiba went forth and expounded, "'But charity delivers from death' (Pro. 10: 2) — not from a grotesque death, but from death itself."*

III.12 A. *It is also the position of R. Nahman bar Isaac that Israel is not subject to the stars.*

B. *For to the mother of R. Nahman bar Isaac the Chaldaean said, "Your son will be a thief." She didn't let him go bareheaded, saying, "Keep your head covered, so fear of Heaven may be upon you, and pray for mercy."*

C. *He didn't know why she said that to him. One day he was in session, studying under a palm tree. His head covering fell off. He lifted his eyes and saw the palm tree, and was overcome by temptation; he climbed up and bit off a cluster of dates with his teeth.*

24:4

- A. **They cut up gourds before cattle,**
- B. **and carrion meat before dogs.**
- C. **R. Judah says, "If it was not carrion on the eve of the Sabbath, it is prohibited,**
- D. **"because it is not something which has been made ready [before the Sabbath for use on the Sabbath] ."**

I.1

- A. *It has been stated:*
- B. Said Ulla, "The decided law accords with R. Judah [that is, the principle that something that has not been designated for use on the Sabbath may not be handled on that day]."

C. *So, too, Rab takes the view that the decided law accords with R. Judah. This follows from the case of the ship mattings, which Rab forbids and Samuel permits.*

D. *And so, too, Levi takes the view that the decided law accords with R. Judah. As in the case of a terefah beast that was brought before him on a festival; he would inspect it only while in session by a garbage dump, thinking, Maybe it won't be found fit and in that case it won't be any good even for dogs.*

- E. And Samuel maintains, "The law accords with R. Simeon [who rejects the principle that something that has not been designated for use on the Sabbath may not be handled on that day]."

F. *And so, too, Zeiri maintains that the law accords with R. Simeon, for we have learned in the Mishnah: **A domesticated beast that [on a festival day] died — one should not move it from where it is located [M. Bes. 3:5A].** Zeiri explained it with respect to a sanctified animal. [Such an animal may not be given to dogs at all.*

Therefore, no matter when it dies, it is not in the category of food and may not be moved on the Sabbath.] But in the case of an unconsecrated beast, it can [be thrown to the dogs and is not prohibited on the stated principle.]

G. And so, too, R. Yohanan said, “The law accords with R. Simeon [who rejects the principle that something that has not been designated for use on the Sabbath may not be handled on that day].”

H. *But did R. Yohanan make any such statement?* And lo, said R. Yohanan, “The decided law accords with the unattributed Mishnah teaching,” and we have learned in the Mishnah: **[157A] [To obtain firewood on a festival day] they may not split wood from beams nor [take wood] from a beam that broke on the festival day [itself, since in neither of these cases was the wood available for use before the festival] [M. Bes. 4:3A].**

I. *R. Yohanan repeated that Tannaite formulation in the name of R. Yosé b. R. Judah.*

J. *Come and take note:* They open up a shed to get at a heap of straw kept for fuel, but not to get at timber stored therein [in accord with Judah’s principle that the latter is not designated for use].

K. *That speaks of cedar and cypress planks, for where there is the consideration of monetary loss in respect to what is prohibited for use by reason of not having been designated for that purpose in advance, even R. Simeon concurs.*

L. *Come and take note:* They don’t give water to or slaughter field animals, but they do give water to and slaughter domestic animals. [That, too, is by reason of the principle that the former are not designated for use].

M. *R. Yohanan found another unattributed rule, namely:* **The House of Shammai say, “They take up bones and shells from the table.” And the House of Hillel say, “One removes the entire table and shakes it out” [M. Shab. 21:3A-B].** And said R. Nahman, “As to us, we have no alternative but to conclude that the House of Shammai accord with the principle of R. Judah, and the House of Hillel accord with R. Simeon.”

N. *There was a dispute on this matter between R. Aha and Rabina. One said,* “In all matters having to do with the

Sabbath, the decided law accords with the view of R. Simeon, except in the matter of what is not designated for use on the Sabbath by reason of repulsiveness, which may not be handled on that day, *and what might that involve?* An old lamp.”

O. *The other said*, “In the matter of what is not designated for use on the Sabbath by reason of repulsiveness, which may not be handled on that day, too, the law accords with the position of R. Simeon — except in the matter of what is forbidden on the stated principle by reason of a prohibition, *and what might that involve?* A lamp that was lit on that very Sabbath. But in the matter of what is forbidden for handling on the Sabbath by reason of not being designated for use on that day, where there is monetary loss, even R Simeon agrees, *for we have learned in the Mishnah: All utensils are handled, except for a large saw or plowshare* [M. **Shab. 17:4A**].”

24:5

- A. They abrogate vows on the Sabbath.
- B. And they receive questions concerning matters which are required for the Sabbath.
- C. They stop up a light hole.
- D. And they measure a piece of stuff and an immersion pool.
- E. There was the following case: In the time of the father of R. Sadoq and of Abba Saul b. Botnit, they stopped up the light hole with a pitcher and tied a pot with reed grass [to a stick] to know whether or not there was in the roofing an opening of a handbreadth square.
- F. “And from their deed we learned that they stop up, measure, and tie up on the Sabbath.”

- I.1** A. **They abrogate vows on the Sabbath:** *The question was raised: Do they abrogate on the Sabbath vows only if it is necessary for purposes of the Sabbath observance, while absolution is given only when it is necessary but not otherwise, and that explains the dispute? Or perhaps abrogation of the vow also is done only if it is for the sake of the Sabbath, but not if it is not for the necessities of the Sabbath, and the reason that there is a dispute concerns the fact that abrogation doesn't require a court but absolution does require a court?*

B. *Come and take note of what R. Zuti of the household of R. Pappi presented as a Tannaite statement: Vows are nullified on the Sabbath only when they have to do with the necessities of observing the Sabbath. So if it is required for keeping the Sabbath, it is done, but if not, it isn't.*

C. *Another version:*

D. *The question was raised: Does the language, concerning matters which are required for the Sabbath apply to both, but not when they are not required for the purposes of keeping the Sabbath? Therefore the annulment of vows is permitted over a period of twenty-four hours. Or maybe, the language, concerning matters which are required for the Sabbath speaks only of receiving questions, but not for abrogating vows, even when doing so is not for the necessity of keeping the Sabbath. Therefore abrogating vows may be done for only the whole day on which the vow is taken.*

E. *Come and take note of what R. Zuti of the household of R. Pappi presented as a Tannaite statement: Vows are nullified on the Sabbath only when they have to do with the necessities of observing the Sabbath. So if it is required for keeping the Sabbath, it is done, but if not, it isn't. Therefore abrogating vows may be done for only the whole day on which the vow is taken.*

F. *Said R. Ashi, "But lo, we have learned in the Mishnah: The annulment of vows [may be done] all day long. There is in this matter a basis for a lenient ruling and for a stringent ruling. How so? [If] she vowed on the night of the Sabbath, [the husband] annuls the vow on the night of the Sabbath and on the Sabbath day, down to nightfall. [But if] she vowed just before nightfall, he annuls the vow only until it gets dark. For if it should get dark and he should not annul the vow, he cannot annul the vow [any longer] [M. Ned. 10:8]!"*

G. *It is in fact a conflict among Tannaite authorities, as has been taught on Tannaite authority: The annulment of vows [may be done] all day long. R. Yosé b. R. Judah and R. Eliezer b. R. Simeon say, "Twenty-four hours [from the taking of the vow]" [T. Ned. 6:1A].*

- II.1** A. **And they receive questions concerning [absolution of vows covering] matters which are required for the Sabbath:**
- B. *The question was raised: Is that the rule only if he had no time to do so prior to the Sabbath, or even if he had time to do so prior to the Sabbath does that rule apply?*
- C. *Come and take note of the fact that rabbis accepted an inquiry for the son of R. Zutra b. R. Zeira even in the case of vows when they had sufficient time to do so while it was still day.*
- III.1** A. **...They stopped up the light hole with a pitcher and tied a pot with reed grass [to a stick] to know whether or not there was in the roofing an opening of a handbreadth square:**
- B. Said R. Judah said Rab, “There was a small passage between two houses, with something unclean there, [157B] and a split barrel shaped defective roofing on top of them [Freedman]. They closed the window with a pitcher and tied a fire pot with a reed rope, to find out whether the roofing had an opening of a handbreadth or not.”
- IV.1** A. **And from their deed we learned that they stop up, measure, and tie up on the Sabbath:**
- B. *Ulla visited the household of the exilarch. He saw Rabbah bar R. Huna sitting in a bathtub of water and measuring the volume. He said to him, “Well, I may well say that the rabbis spoke of taking a measurement in this way in connection with doing a religious duty [for example, measuring the volume of an immersion pool], but did they say that it was all right to do it not in connection with a religious duty?”*
- C. *He said to him, “I’m just keeping myself busy” [Freedman: but had no intention of actually measuring].*