

XXV.

THE STRUCTURE OF BABYLONIAN TALMUD SHABBAT

Whether or not the Talmud of Babylonia is carefully organized in large-scale, recurrent structures and guided by a program that we may call systematic forms the principal question addressed by an academic commentary. The preceding chapters therefore have pointed toward the presentation set forth here.

By “structure” I mean, a clearly-articulated pattern that governs the location of fully-spelled out statements. By “system,” I mean, a well-crafted and coherent set of ideas that explain the social order of the community addressed by the writers of a document, a social philosophy, a theory of the way of life, world view, and character of the social entity formed by a given social group. I see a collective, anonymous, and political document, such as the one before us, as a statement to, and about, the way in which people should organize their lives and govern their actions. At issue then in any document such as the remarkable one before us is simple: does this piece of writing present information or a program, facts to whom it may concern, or a philosophically and aesthetically cogent statement about how things should be?

The connection between structure and system is plain to see. From the way in which people consistently frame their thoughts, we move to the world that, in saying things one way rather than in some other, they wish to imagine the world in which they wish to live, to which they address these thoughts. For if the document exhibits structure and sets forth a system, then it is accessible to questions of rationality. We may ask about the statement that its framers or compilers wished to make by putting the document together as they did. But if we discern no structure and perceive no systematic inquiry or governing points of analysis, then all we find here is inert and miscellaneous information, facts but no propositions, arguments, viewpoints.

Now the Talmud commonly finds itself represented as lacking organization and exhibiting a certain episodic and notional character. That view moreover characterizes the reading and representation of the document by learned and experienced scholars, who have devoted their entire lives to Talmud study and exegesis. It must follow that upon the advocate of the contrary view — the one implicit in the representation of the document for academic analysis — rests the burden of proof. I set forth the allegation that the Talmud exhibits a structure and follows a system and therefore exhibits a commonly-intelligible rationality. The claim to write an academic commentary explicitly states that proposition. For the tractate before us, I have therefore to adduce evidence and argument.

I maintain that through the normal procedures of reasoned analysis we may discern in the tractate a well-crafted structure. I hold that the structure made manifest, we may further identify the purpose and perspective, the governing system of thought and argument, of those who collected and arranged the tractate's composites and put them together in the way in which we now have them. By "structure" I mean, how is a document organized? and by "system," what do the compilers of the document propose to accomplish in producing this complete, organized piece of writing? The answers to both questions derive from a simple outline of the tractate as a whole, underscoring the types of compositions and composites of which it is comprised. Such an outline tells us what is principal and what subordinate, and how each unit — composition formed into composites, composites formed into a complete statement — holds together and also fits with other units, fore and aft. The purpose of the outline then is to identify the character of each component of the whole, and to specify its purpose or statement. The former information permits us to describe the document's structure, the latter, its system.

While the idea of simply outlining a Talmud-tractate beginning to end may seem obvious, I have never made such an outline before, nor has anyone else.* Yet, as we shall now see, the character of the outline dictates all further analytical initiatives. Specifically, when we follow the layout of the whole, we readily see the principles of organization that govern. These same guidelines on organizing discourse point also to the character of what is organized: complete units of thought, with a beginning, middle, and end, often made up of smaller, equally complete units of thought. The former we know as composites, the latter as compositions.

*I have provided complete outlines for the Mishnah and for the Tosefta in relationship to the Mishnah, and, not always in outline form, for the Midrash-compilations of late antiquity as well.

Identifying and classifying the components of the tractate — the composites, the compositions of which they are made up — we see clearly how the document coheres: the plan and program worked out from beginning to end. When we define that plan and program, we identify the facts of a pattern that permit us to say in a specific and concrete way precisely what the compilers of the tractate intended to accomplish. The structure realizes the system, the program of analysis and thought that takes the form of the presentation we have before us. From what people do, meaning, the way in which they formulate their ideas and organized them into cogent statements, we discern what they proposed to do, meaning, the intellectual goals that they set for themselves.

These goals — the received document they wished to examine, the questions that they brought to that document — realized in the layout and construction of their writing, dictate the points of uniformity and persistence that throughout come to the surface. How people lay out their ideas guides us into what they wished to find out and set forth in their writing, and that constitutes the system that defined the work they set out to accomplish. We move from how people speak to the system that the mode of discourse means to express, in the theory that modes of speech or writing convey modes of thought and inquiry.

We move from the act of thought and its written result backward to the theory of thinking, which is, by definition, an act of social consequence. We therefore turn to the matter of intention that provokes reflection and produces a system of inquiry. That statement does not mean to imply I begin with the premise of order, which sustains the thesis of a prior

system that defines the order. To the contrary, the possibility of forming a coherent outline out of the data we have examined defines the first test of whether or not the document exhibits a structure and realizes a system. So everything depends upon the possibility of outlining the writing, from which all else flows. If we can see the order and demonstrate that the allegation of order rests on ample evidence, then we may proceed to describe the structure that gives expression to the order, and the system that the structure sustains.

The present work undertakes the exegesis of exegesis, for the Talmud of Babylonia, like its counterpart in the Land of Israel, is laid out as a commentary to the Mishnah. That obvious fact defined the character of my academic commentary, since we have already faced the reality that our Bavli-tractate is something other than a commentary, though it surely encompasses one. The problems that captured my attention derived from the deeper question of how people make connections and draw conclusions. To ask about how people make connections means that we identify a problem — otherwise we should not have to ask — and what precipitated the problem here has been how a composition or a composite fits into its context, when the context is defined by the tasks of Mishnah-commentary, and the composition or composite clearly does not comment on the Mishnah-passage that is subjected to comment.

The experience of analyzing the document with the question of cogency and coherence in mind therefore yields a simple recognition. Viewed whole, the tractate contains no gibberish but only completed units of thought, sentences formed into intelligible thought and self-contained in that we require no further information to understand those sentences, beginning to end. The tractate organizes these statements as commentary to the Mishnah. But large tracts of the writing do not comment on the Mishnah in the way in which other, still larger tracts do. Then how the former fit together with the latter frames the single most urgent question of structure and system that I can identify.

Since we have already examined enormous composites that find their cogency in an other than exegetical program, alongside composites that hold together by appeal to a common, prior, coherent statement — the Mishnah-sentences at hand — what justifies my insistence that an outline of the document, resting on the premise that we deal with a Mishnah-commentary, govern all further description? To begin with, the very possibility of outlining Babylonian Talmud tractate Shabbat derives from the simple fact that the framers have given to their document the form of a commentary to the Mishnah. It is in the structure of the Mishnah-tractate that they locate everything together that they wished to compile. We know that is the fact because the Mishnah-tractate defines the order of topics and the sequence of problems.

Relationships to the Mishnah are readily discerned; a paragraph stands at the head of a unit of thought; even without the full citation of the paragraph, we should find our way back to the Mishnah because at the head of numerous compositions, laid out in sequence one to the next, clauses of the Mishnah-paragraph are cited in so many words or alluded to in an unmistakable way. So without printing the entire Mishnah-paragraph at the head, we should know that the received code formed the fundamental structure because so many compositions cite and gloss sentences of the Mishnah-paragraph and are set forth in sequence dictated by the order of sentences of said Mishnah-paragraph. Internal evidence alone suffices, then, to demonstrate that the structure of the tractate rests upon the Mishnah-tractate cited and discussed here. Not only so, but the sentences of the Mishnah-

paragraphs of our tractate are discussed in no other place in the entire Talmud of Babylonia in the sequence and systematic exegetical framework in which they are set forth here; elsewhere we may find bits or pieces, but only here, the entirety of the tractate.

That statement requires one qualification, and that further leads us to the analytical task of our outline. While the entire Mishnah-tractate of Shabbat is cited in the Talmud, the framers of the Talmud by no means find themselves required to say something about every word, every sentence, every paragraph. On the contrary, they discuss only what they choose to discuss, and glide without comment by large stretches of the tractate. A process of selectivity, which requires description and analysis, has told the compilers of the Talmud's composites and the authors of its compositions* what demands attention, and what does not. Our outline has therefore to signal not only what passage of the Mishnah-tractate is discussed, but also what is not discussed, and we require a general theory to explain the principles of selection ("making connections, drawing conclusions" meaning, to begin with, making selections). For that purpose, in the outline, I reproduce the entirety of a Mishnah-paragraph that stands at the head of a Talmudic composite, and I underscore those sentences that are addressed, so highlighting also those that are not.

*This statement requires refinement. I do not know that all available compositions have been reproduced, and that the work of authors of compositions of Mishnah-exegesis intended for a talmud is fully exposed in the document as we have it. That is not only something we cannot demonstrate — we do not have compositions that were not used, only the ones that were — but something that we must regard as unlikely on the face of matters. All we may say is positive: the character of the compositions that address Mishnah-exegesis tells us about the concerns of the writers of those compositions, but we cannot claim to outline all of their concerns, on the one side, or to explain why they chose not to work on other Mishnah-sentences besides the ones treated here. But as to the program of the compositors, that is another matter: from the choices that they made (out of a corpus we cannot begin to imagine or invent for ourselves) we may describe with great accuracy the kinds of materials they wished to include and the shape and structure they set forth out of those materials. We know what they did, and that permits us to investigate why they did what they did. What we cannot know is what they did not do, or why they chose not to do what they did not do. People familiar with the character of speculation and criticism in Talmudic studies will understand why I have to spell out these rather commonplace observations. I lay out an argument based on evidence, not on the silences of evidence, or on the absence of evidence — that alone.

It follows that the same evidence that justifies identifying the Mishnah-tractate as the structure (therefore also the foundation of the system) of the Talmud-tractate before us also presents puzzles for considerable reflection. The exegesis of Mishnah-exegesis is only one of these. Another concerns the purpose of introducing into the document enormous compositions and composites that clearly hold together around a shared topic or proposition, e.g., my appendix on one theme or another, my elaborate footnote providing information that is not required but merely useful, and the like. My earlier characterization of composites as appendices and footnotes signalled the fact that the framers of the document chose a not-entirely satisfactory way of setting out the materials they wished to include here, for large components of the tractate do not contribute to Mishnah-exegesis in any way at all. If these intrusions of other-than-exegetical compositions were proportionately modest, or of topical composites negligible in size, we might dismiss them as appendages, not structural components that bear much of the weight of the edifice as a whole. Indeed, the language that I chose for identifying and defining these composites —

footnotes, appendices, and the like — bore the implication that what is not Mishnah-commentary also is extrinsic to the Talmud's structure and system.

But that language served only for the occasion. In fact, the outline before us will show that the compositions are large and ambitious, the composites formidable and defining. Any description of the tractate's structure that dismisses as mere accretions or intrusions so large a proportion of the whole misleads. Any notion that "footnotes" and "appendices" impede exposition and disrupt thought, contribute extraneous information or form tacked-on appendages — any such notion begs the question: then why fill up so much space with such purposeless information? The right way is to ask whether the document's topical composites play a role in the re-presentation of the Mishnah-tractate by the compilers of the Talmud. We have therefore to test two hypotheses:

1. the topical composites ("appendices," "footnotes") do belong and serve the compilers' purpose,

or

2. the topical composites do not participate in the re-presentation of the Mishnah-tractate by the Talmud and do not belong because they add nothing and change nothing.

The two hypotheses may be tested against the evidence framed in response to a single question: is this topical composite necessary? The answer to that question lies in our asking, what happens to the reading of the Mishnah-tractate in light of the topical composites that would not happen were we to read the same tractate without them? The outline that follows systematically raises that question, with results specified in due course. It suffices here to state the simple result of our reading of the tractate, start to finish: the question of structure, therefore also that of system, rests upon the position we identify for that massive component of the tractate that comprises not Mishnah-commentary but free-standing compositions and composites of compositions formed for a purpose other than Mishnah-commentary.

The principal rubrics are given in small caps. The outline takes as its principal rubrics two large-scale organizing principles.

The first is the divisions of the Mishnah-tractate to which the Talmud-tractate serves as a commentary. That simple fact validates the claim that the tractate exhibits a fully-articulated structure. But the outline must also underscore that the Mishnah-tractate provides both more and less than the paramount outline of the Talmud-tractate. It is more because sentences in the Mishnah-tractate are not analyzed at all. These untreated Mishnah-sentences are given in bold face lower case caps, like the rest of the Mishnah, but then are specified by underlining and enclosure in square brackets.

Second, it is less because the structure of the tractate accommodates large composites that address topics not defined by the Mishnah-tractate. That brings us to the second of the two large-scale modes of holding together both sustained analytical exercises and also large sets of compositions formed into cogent composites. These are treated also as major units and are indicated by Roman numerals, alongside the Mishnah-paragraphs themselves; they are also signified in small caps. But the principal rubrics that do not focus on Mishnah-commentary but on free-standing topics or propositions or problems are not given in boldface type. Consequently, for the purposes of a coherent outline we have to

identify as autonomous entries in our outline those important composites that treat themes or topics not contributed by the Mishnah-tractate.

I. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 1:1

A. ACTS OF TRANSPORTING OBJECTS FROM ONE DOMAIN TO ANOTHER WHICH VIOLATE THE SABBATH (1) ARE TWO:

1. I:1: We have learned in the Mishnah there: Oaths are of two sorts, which yield four subdivisions on account of each of which one may be liability on one count. Awareness of having sinned through uncleanness is of two sorts, which yield four subdivisions. Transportation of objects from one domain to the other on the Sabbath is of two sorts, which yield four subdivisions. The symptoms of the presence of the skin disease are of two sorts, which yield four subdivisions (M. **Shebu. 1:1A-D**). Now what differentiates the present passage, in which the formulation proceeds, are two, which indeed are four for one who is inside, and two which are four for one who is outside, from the counterpart passage, in which it is taught only, which yield four subdivisions, without further elaboration?

B. ...WHICH INDEED ARE FOUR FOR ONE WHO IS INSIDE, (2) AND TWO WHICH ARE FOUR FOR ONE WHO IS OUTSIDE.

1. II:1: Raba said, "The formulation of the Tannaite rule focuses upon domains, and domains for the purposes of the Sabbath are two." Said R. Mattenah to Abbayye, "Are there eight two, which indeed are four for one who is inside, and two which are four for one who is outside? There really are twelve."

C. HOW SO? IF ON THE SABBATH THE BEGGAR STANDS OUTSIDE AND THE HOUSEHOLDER INSIDE, AND THE BEGGAR STUCK HIS HAND INSIDE AND PUT A BEGGAR'S BOWL INTO THE HAND OF THE HOUSEHOLDER, OR IF HE TOOK SOMETHING FROM INSIDE IT AND BROUGHT IT OUT, THE BEGGAR IS LIABLE, THE HOUSEHOLDER IS EXEMPT.

1. III:1: But lo, between the two, a complete act of labor has been carried out! A single individual who performs a forbidden action is liable; two people who carry it out are exempt

2. III:2: Building on this distinction, Rab raised this question of Rabbi: "If a third party loaded a person with food and drink, and he then carried them outside, what is the law? Is the removal of one's body considered equivalent to the removal of the object from its place, in which case he is liable? Or perhaps that is not the case?"

3. III:3: Said Abbayye, "It is perfectly obvious to me that a man's hand is not classified as either private domain or public domain. It is not classified as public domain: As shown by the rules governing the poor man's hand if the beggar stuck his hand inside, and the householder took something from it, or if the householder put something in it and he the beggar removed it — both of them are exempt. It is not classified as private domain is shown by the case of the hand of the householder if the householder stuck his hand outside and put something into the hand of the beggar, or if he took something from it and brought it inside, the householder is liable. Abbayye raised this question: "As to the hand of a human

being, what is the rule as to treating it as equivalent to a neglected part of public domain. Did rabbis impose the penalty on him, that he not draw the hand back to himself, or did they not do so?"

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

I. III:5: Gloss of a detail of the foregoing.

D. IF ON THE SABBATH THE BEGGAR STANDS OUTSIDE AND THE HOUSEHOLDER INSIDE, AND THE BEGGAR STUCK HIS HAND INSIDE AND PUT A BEGGAR'S BOWL INTO THE HAND OF THE HOUSEHOLDER, OR IF HE TOOK SOMETHING FROM INSIDE IT AND BROUGHT IT OUT, THE BEGGAR IS LIABLE, THE HOUSEHOLDER IS EXEMPT:

IF THE HOUSEHOLDER STUCK HIS HAND OUTSIDE AND PUT SOMETHING INTO THE HAND OF THE BEGGAR, OR IF HE TOOK SOMETHING FROM IT AND BROUGHT IT INSIDE, THE HOUSEHOLDER IS LIABLE, AND THE BEGGAR IS EXEMPT. IF THE BEGGAR STUCK HIS HAND INSIDE, AND THE HOUSEHOLDER TOOK SOMETHING FROM IT, OR IF THE HOUSEHOLDER PUT SOMETHING IN IT AND HE THE BEGGAR REMOVED IT — BOTH OF THEM ARE EXEMPT. IF THE HOUSEHOLDER PUT HIS HAND OUTSIDE AND THE BEGGAR TOOK SOMETHING FROM IT, OR IF THE BEGGAR PUT SOMETHING INTO IT AND THE HOUSEHOLDER BROUGHT IT BACK INSIDE, BOTH OF THEM ARE EXEMPT.

1. IV:1: But why should he be liable, for lo, we require that the removing of the object and the depositing of the object must involve a space four by four handbreadths square, and that condition has not been met here?

a. IV:2: Secondary gloss on the foregoing. But is that to say that it is self-evident to Rabbah that an object that is intercepted by the air through which it passes is as though it has come to rest there? And that is so when it is within ten handbreadths of the ground? The space above ten handbreadths is not classified as public domain. But surely Rabbah raised a question on that very matter! For Rabbah raised the question

b. IV:3: Continuation of the foregoing.

c. IV:4: As above.

I. IV:5: Secondary extension.

A. IV:6: Tertiary expansion.

2. IV:7: Said R. Abin said R. Ilai said R. Yohanan, “If someone stood in place and caught an object, he is liable. If he moved from his place and caught it, he is exempt.”

3. IV:8: R. Yohanan raised this question: “If he himself tossed the object and moved from the spot and then came back and caught it on the same spot, what is the law?”

4. IV:9: Said R. Abin said R. Yohanan, “If one poked his hand into a courtyard of another party and received rain water and took it out, he is liable.”

a. IV:10: Source of a statement subordinate in the foregoing proposition.

l. IV:11: Secondary inquiry in continuation of the foregoing.

A. IV:12: Footnote to the foregoing.

5. IV:13: Said R. Abin said R. Ilai said R. Yohanan, “If someone on the Sabbath day was carrying food and drink, going in and coming out all day long from one domain to the other — he is liable only when he stands still.” He was laden in the first place to carry the stuff from one part of private domain to another, and if he goes out instead, it is not removal, since when the food was moved at first there was no intention of carrying from private to public domain.

6. IV:14: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: He who carries articles from a shop into the open space via a colonnade the shop is private domain, the open space public, the colonnade is classified as a neglected portion of public domain, not equivalent to public or private domain is liable. And Ben Azzai declares him exempt.

a. IV:15: Further refinement of the foregoing.

7. IV:16: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: There are four distinct domains for purposes of carrying objects on the Sabbath: Private domain, public domain, neglected parts of public domain, and a place totally exempt from all liability. What is the definition of private domain? The space of a trench ten handbreadths deep and four broad, and so, too, of a fence ten handbreadths high and four broad — that is private domain without qualification. What is the definition of public domain? A main road, a large piazza, and alleys open at both ends — that is public domain without qualification.

a. IV:17: Gloss of the foregoing.

b. IV:18: As above.

c. IV:19: Gloss of the extended Tannaite statement.

d. IV:20: Gloss of the extended Tannaite statement.

e. IV:21: Gloss of the extended Tannaite statement.

f. IV:22: Gloss of the extended Tannaite statement.

g. IV:23: Gloss of the extended Tannaite statement.

h. IV:24: Gloss of the extended Tannaite statement.

i. IV:25: Gloss of the extended Tannaite statement.

NOTE: THE ANALYSIS OF IV:16 RESUMES AT NO. 13.

8. IV:26: Said Rabbah bar Shila said R. Hisda, “With a brick standing upright in the public domain, if one threw an object and it stuck to its side, he is liable; if it landed on top, he is exempt.”

9. IV:27: Said Rabbah of the household of R. Shila, “When R. Dimi came, he said R. Yohanan said, ‘The dimensions of neglected public space cannot be less than four cubits square.’”

a. IV:28: Gloss of a subordinate detail of the foregoing.

l. IV:29: Secondary expansion of a detail of the foregoing.

A. IV:30: Gloss of a detail of the foregoing.

10. IV:31: Said Abbaye, “If one threw a hive into the public domain, ten handbreadths high but not six broad, he is liable; if it is six broad, he is exempt.” A round object with a diameter of six contains enough space for a square of four to be inscribed; since an object four square is a distinct domain, no liability is incurred for throwing one domain into another. Raba said, “Even if it is not six broad, he is exempt. How come? It is not possible for a piece of cane not to project ten handbreadths above the earth.” In order to incur liability, the whole of the article thrown must rest in public domain. Since it is ten handbreadths high, it is not possible that the top and bottom canes of the circumference shall be absolutely even and straight, so something must project above ten from ground level, which is a place of non-liability, not public domain.

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

a. IV:33: Secondary analysis of the foregoing proposition.

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

RESUMING THE ANALYSIS OF IV:16:

13. IV:35: Further analysis of IV.16’s extended Tannaite statement. The master has said: Someone standing on a threshold may take something from the householder or give it to him, may take something from a poor man or give it to him: As to this threshold, how is it to be defined? Should I say, it is a threshold leading out of the public domain into an alley? Then how can the language serve, may take something from the householder? Lo, it is a question of carrying the object out from public to private domain. But then, how can the language serve, may take something from a poor man, when he is carrying it from private to public domain? And if it is a threshold of neglected public domain, then how can you use the language, may take something from the householder or give it to him? That

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

14. IV:36: As above. The master has said: Someone standing on a threshold may take something from the householder or give it to him, may take something from a poor man or give it to him, on condition that he does not take something from the householder and give it to the poor man or take something from the poor man and give it to the householder so appearing to carry directly from domain to domain, but if one did so in just that way, all three of them are exempt: May we then say that this refutes the position of Raba? For said Raba, “He who moves an object from the beginning to the end of four full cubits in public domain, even though he carries it over himself through space that is more than ten handbreadths above the ground is liable”?

15. IV:37: As above. Others say, “The threshold serves both domains. When the door is open, it is classified as part of the inside of the house; when the door is locked, it is classified along with the outside of the house lying at the opening of a blind alley between the alley and the public domain: Is that the case even though it has no stake? A stake is put at the side of the opening, which is treated as though it formed a complete partition stretching right across; the threshold is excluded from the partitioning influence of a stake, which was fixed at the inner side of the threshold. And didn’t R. Hama bar Guria say Rab said, “That which lies within the opening of the gate has to have another stake to render the area permitted”? And if you say it is a case in which there is not an area of four by four cubits, hasn’t R. Hama bar Guria said Rab said, “What lies within the opening, even though it is not an area of four by four cubits, has to have another stake in order to render carrying in the area permitted”?

16. IV:38: But if the threshold itself was ten handbreadths high and four broad, lo, it constitutes a domain unto itself: That sustains the position of R. Isaac bar Abdimi, for said R. Isaac bar Abdimi, “R. Meir would say, ‘In any situation in which you find two domains, which form a single domain, for instance, a pillar in private domain that is ten handbreadths high and four broad, it is forbidden to adjust one’s load on it, as a precautionary decree on account of the possibility of one’s doing so on a hill of those dimensions that is located in public domain.’”

II. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 1:2

A. A MAN SHOULD NOT SIT DOWN BEFORE THE BARBER CLOSE TO THE AFTERNOON PRAYER, UNLESS HE HAS ALREADY PRAYED.

1. I:1: What is the meaning of close to the afternoon prayer? Should we say that it is near the principal afternoon prayer? But why not, since there will be ample time left in the day? But if it means, near the minor afternoon prayer, then what is the meaning of, But if they began, they do not break off what they were doing?

B. NOR AT THAT TIME SHOULD A MAN GO INTO A BATHHOUSE:

1. II:1: That is, for the entire schvitz, beginning to end.

C. OR INTO A TANNERY:

1. III:1: That means, tanning on a large scale.

D. NOR TO EAT:

1. IV:1: That means, a long meal.

E. NOR TO ENTER INTO JUDGMENT:

1. V:1: That means, the beginning of a trial.

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

3. V:3: At what point is the beginning of the bathing process after which one doesn't have to break off for the prayer?

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

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

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

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

a. V:8: Illustrative cases.

b. V:9: Illustrative cases.

c. V:10: Illustrative cases.

8. V:11: At what point is the beginning of a lawsuit? R. Jeremiah and R. Jonah — One said, "From the moment that the judges cloak themselves." And the other said, "From the time that the litigants commence laying out their cases."

a. V:12: Illustrative case.

b. V:13: As above.

9. V:14: How long are judges to sit in judgment? Said R. Sheshet, "To mealtime."

10. V:15: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: The first hour is the mealtime for gladiators; the second, for robbers; the third, for heirs; the fourth, for laborers; the fifth, for everybody else.

11. V:16: Said R. Adda bar Ahbah, “One may recite the Prayer in the bathhouse.” An objection was raised: When one who enters a bathhouse — if it is a place where people stand dressed, he may recite Scripture or the Prayer there the Shema or say the prayer there, and he obviously may greet his fellows there; he may don his phylacteries and obviously he need not remove them if he came in wearing them. If it is a place where people stand naked, he may not greet his fellows there, and obviously he may not recite Scripture or the Shema or the Prayer there, and he must remove his phylacteries, and obviously he may not put them on. If it is a place where people stand both naked and dressed, he may greet his fellows there, but he may not recite Scripture or the Shema or the Prayer there, and he need not remove his phylacteries, but he may not put them on there to begin with (T. Ber. 2:20)!

a. V:17: Gloss of the cited passage of the Tosefta.

F. COMPOSITE OF SAYINGS IN THE ATTRIBUTIVE, AND SAID RABA BAR MEHASAYYA SAID R. HAMA BAR GURIA SAID RAB

I. V:18: Further citation in the attributive formula used in the foregoing.

A. V:19: Expansion on the theme of the foregoing.

1. V:20: Further saying in the attributive formula used in the foregoing.

2. V:21: Further saying in the attributive formula used in the foregoing.

3. V:22: Further saying in the attributive formula used in the foregoing.

4. V:23: Further saying in the attributive formula used in the foregoing.

5. V:24: Further saying in the attributive formula used in the foregoing.

6. V:25: Further saying in the attributive formula used in the foregoing.

7. V:26: Further saying in the attributive formula used in the foregoing.

I. V:27: Story on the topic of the foregoing.

G. BUT IF THEY BEGAN, THEY DO NOT BREAK OFF WHAT THEY WERE DOING.

THEY DO BREAK OFF WHAT THEY WERE DOING TO PRONOUNCE THE RECITATION OF THE SHEMA. BUT THEY DO NOT BREAK OFF WHAT THEY WERE DOING TO SAY THE PRAYER.

1. VI:1: But the opening clause is explicit: They do not break off what they were doing!

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

III. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 1:3

A. A TAILOR SHOULD NOT GO OUT CARRYING HIS NEEDLE NEAR NIGHTFALL, LEST HE FORGET AND CROSS A BOUNDARY; NOR A SCRIBE WITH HIS PEN:

1. I:1: There was have learned in the Mishnah: A man should not stand in private domain and drink in public domain, in public domain and drink in private domain, unless he has poked his head and the greater part of his body into the same domain as that in which he drinks. And so in the case of a winepress. A man scoops up water out of a gutter less than ten handbreadths from the ground. And from a waterspout in any manner he may drink (M. **Er. 10: 6**). The question was raised: What is the rule in regard to neglected public domain? The exegesis of the cited Mishnah-passage intersects with the present Mishnah-passage.

2. I:2: One Tannaite formulation states: A person afflicted with flux should not go out with his pus bag, but if he goes out, he is not liable, though the act is forbidden. Another Tannaite formulation states: A person afflicted with flux should not go out with his pus bag, but if he goes out, he is liable to a sin-offering.

3. I:3: A Tannaite statement of the household of R. Ishmael: “A man may go out on the eve of the Sabbath at dusk wearing his phylacteries.”

4. I:4: It has been taught on Tannaite authority: Hanania says, “A person is obligated to examine his clothing on the eve of the Sabbath at dusk.”

B. AND ON THE SABBATH ONE SHOULD NOT SEARCH HIS CLOTHES FOR FLEAS:

1. II:1: the question was raised: “Does this mean that on the Sabbath day one should not search his clothes for fleas? Then it would stand for the position of R. Eliezer, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority: Said R. Eliezer, ‘He who kills a louse on the Sabbath is as though he killed a camel.’ And then the phrase or read by the light of a lamp would refer to the consideration that one may end up tilting the lamp? Or perhaps both actions are forbidden lest he tilt the lamp?”

2. II:2: Said R. Judah said Samuel, “It is forbidden even to distinguish by lamp light between one’s own clothing and one’s wife’s.”

3. II:3: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: In the public domain they do not search garments for lice, because of considerations of self-respect.

4. II:4: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: He who examines his clothing on the Sabbath may crush the louse and toss it away, so long as he doesn’t actually kill it.

a. II:5: Illustrative stories.

5. II:6: It has been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Simeon b. Eleazar says, “‘They don’t kill vermin on the Sabbath,’ the words of the House of Shammai. And the House of Hillel permit.”

6. II:7: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: He who on the Sabbath comes to visit a sick person says, “Today it’s the Sabbath, so one can’t cry out, but recovery will come soon.” And R. Meir says, “One may say, ‘May the Sabbath show compassion.’”

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

a. II:9: Story.

C. OR READ BY THE LIGHT OF A LAMP:

1. III:1: Said Raba, “That is the rule even if the lamp is located at a height twice a man’s stature or two ox goads up, even ten rooms on top of one another.”

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

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

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

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

a. III:6: Story.

D. NONETHELESS THEY STATE: ON THE SABBATH A TEACHER SEES BY THE LIGHT OF A LAMP WHERE THE CHILDREN ARE READING, BUT HE DOES NOT READ.

1. IV:1: But didn’t you say in the first clause, a teacher sees? Isn’t that so as to read? What can the phrase, **but he does not read**, possibly mean?

E. SIMILARLY: A MALE ZAB SHOULD NOT EAT A MEAL WITH A FEMALE ZAB, BECAUSE IT LEADS TO TRANSGRESSION.

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

a. V:2: So if he does associate with him, what difference does it make? But rather, read it as follows: Lest he feed him unclean things.

2. V:3: The question was raised: What is the law concerning a menstruating woman’s sleeping with her husband, she in her garment, he in his?

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

a. V:5: Illustrative story.

b. V:6: As above.

IV. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 1:4

A. THESE ARE SOME OF THE LAWS WHICH THEY STATED IN THE UPPER ROOM OF HANANIAH B. HEZEKIAH B. GURION WHEN THEY WENT UP TO VISIT HIM. THEY TOOK A VOTE, AND THE HOUSE OF SHAMMAI OUTNUMBERED THE HOUSE OF HILLEL:

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

2. I:2: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: Who wrote the Scroll That Lists Days on Which It Is Forbidden to Fast? It was Hananiah b. Hezekiah and his colleagues, who valued the days on which they were released from troubles.

a. I:3: Secondary gloss of the foregoing: Said Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel, “We, too, value the days on which they were released from troubles. But what can we do? For if we were to come to write them down, we couldn’t do it” since every day marks the release from some trouble.

4. I:4: Said R. Judah said Rab, “That man is to be remembered for good, by name of Hanina b. Hezekiah, for if it were not for his efforts, the book of Ezekiel would have been hidden away, for what he says contradicts the teachings of the Torah. What did he do to save the situation? He took up three hundred barrels of oil with him to an upper room and stayed there until he had ironed out all the problems.”

B. AND EIGHTEEN RULES DID THEY DECREE ON THAT VERY DAY:

1. II:1: What are the eighteen rules? It is in line with what we have learned in the Mishnah: These render heave-offering unfit: He who eats food unclean in the first remove; and he who eats food unclean in the second remove; and he who drinks unclean liquid; he whose head and the greater part of whose body enters drawn water; and one who was clean on whose head and the greater part of whose body three logs of drawn water fall; and a scroll, and hands, and a person who has completed his rites of purification and awaits sunset to be completely clean a tebul yom; and food and utensils which have been made unclean by unclean liquids (M. **Zab. 5:12**).

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

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

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

I. II:5: Gloss of a detail of the foregoing.

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

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

e. II:8: And hands: How come rabbis decreed uncleanness in that case?

I. II:9: Which of them did rabbis decree to begin with?

f. II:10: And the tebul yom: But the uncleanness of the one who has immersed on the selfsame day derives from the Torah, for it is written, “And when the sun is down, he shall be clean, and afterwards he shall eat Holy Things” (Lev. 22: 7)!

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

h. II:12: And utensils which have been made unclean by unclean liquids: What kind of unclean liquid? Should we say it was liquid deriving from a person afflicted by flux? But that derives from the Torah, as it is written, “And if the person unclean with flux spit upon a clean person, he shall wash his clothes and bathe himself in water” (Lev. 15: 8) — what is in the hand of a clean person I have declared unclean for you.

i. II:13: And hands: Well, then, did the disciples of Shammai and Hillel make that decree? Shammai and Hillel themselves made that decree, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority: Yosé b. Yoezer of Seridah and Yosé b. Yohanan of Jerusalem decreed uncleanness on the land of the gentiles and on glassware. Simeon b. Shatah ordained the requirement of a marriage settlement for a wife and made a decree concerning uncleanness for metal utensils. Shammai and Hillel decreed uncleanness on the hands. And should you say that the meaning is, Shammai and his party and Hillel and his party, didn't R. Judah say Samuel said, “Eighteen matters did they issue as decrees, and concerning eighteen matters they differed,” but Hillel and Shammai differed in only three passages. For said R. Huna, “In three passages they differed, and no more.” And should you propose, on account of their rule, they made a decree to suspend the status of things touched by the hands, and on account of the decree of their disciples, they made the decree to burn such food, hasn't Ilfa said, “To begin with, the decree involving hands meant that food touched by them was to be burned”?

I. II:14: Gloss of foregoing.

II. II:15: Gloss of foregoing.

III. II:16: Gloss of foregoing.

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

k. II:18: “Simeon b. Shatah ordained the requirement of a marriage settlement for a wife and made a decree concerning uncleanness for metal utensils.”

2. II:19: Any more enactments among the eighteen?

3. II:20: Any more enactments among the eighteen?

4. II:21: Any more enactments among the eighteen?

5. II:22: Any more enactments among the eighteen?

6. II:23: Any more enactments among the eighteen?

7. II:24: Any more enactments among the eighteen?

a. II:25: Gloss of foregoing.

V. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 1:5-9

A. THE HOUSE OF SHAMMAI SAY, “THEY DO NOT ON FRIDAY AFTERNOON SOAK INK, DYESTUFFS, OR VETCHES, UNLESS THERE IS SUFFICIENT TIME FOR THEM TO BE FULLY SOAKED WHILE IT IS STILL DAY.” AND THE HOUSE OF HILLEL PERMIT.

1. I:1: What Tannaite authority holds that putting water into ink is regarded as steeping it? The passage does not speak about kneading the ingredients, so merely pouring must be regarded as a labor forbidden on the Sabbath, otherwise there would be no controversy in respect to Friday.

2. I:2: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: They open the irrigation channel for a vegetable patch on the eve of the Sabbath at dusk, and the patch may continue to absorb water through the Sabbath day. They put a perfume brazier under clothing, which continues to absorb the perfume all day long. They put sulphur under silver dishes on the eve of the Sabbath at dusk, and they continue to be sulphured on the Sabbath. They put eye salve on the eye or a poultice on a sore on the eve of the Sabbath at dusk, and these continue to provide healing throughout the entire Sabbath day. But they don’t put wheat into the water driven wheels unless there is sufficient time for the wheat to be ground into flour while it is still day (T. **Shab. 1:23**).

a. I:3: Gloss of foregoing.

l. I:4: Secondary expansion of the foregoing.

A. I:5: Continuation of the foregoing.

B. I:6: As above.

B. THE HOUSE OF SHAMMAI SAY, “THEY DO NOT PUT BUNDLES OF WET FLAX INTO THE OVEN, UNLESS THERE IS TIME FOR THEM TO STEAM OFF WHILE IT IS STILL DAY. AND THEY DO NOT PUT WOOL INTO THE CAULDRON, UNLESS THERE IS SUFFICIENT TIME FOR IT TO ABSORB THE COLOR WHILE IT IS STILL DAY.” AND THE HOUSE OF HILLEL PERMIT. THE HOUSE OF SHAMMAI SAY, “THEY DO NOT SPREAD OUT NETS FOR WILD BEASTS, FOWL, OR FISH, UNLESS THERE IS SUFFICIENT

TIME FOR THEM TO BE CAUGHT WHILE IT IS STILL DAY.” AND THE HOUSE OF HILLEL PERMIT.

THE HOUSE OF SHAMMAI SAY, “THEY DO NOT SELL ANYTHING TO A GENTILE OR BEAR A BURDEN WITH HIM, AND THEY DO NOT LIFT UP A BURDEN ONTO HIS BACK, UNLESS THERE IS SUFFICIENT TIME FOR HIM TO REACH A NEARBY PLACE WHILE IT IS STILL DAY.” AND THE HOUSE OF HILLEL PERMIT.

1. II:1: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: The House of Shammai say, “On the eve of the Sabbath someone should not sell an article to a gentile nor lend it to him nor lend him money nor give him a gift unless there is sufficient time for him to reach home while it is still day.” And the House of Hillel say, “Sufficient time for him to reach the house nearest the city wall.

2. II:2: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: The House of Shammai say, “A person should not sell his leaven to a gentile unless he knows that it will be used up prior to the Passover,” the words of the House of Shammai sic. And the House of Hillel say, “So long as it is permitted for an Israelite to eat it, it is permitted to sell it to a gentile.”

3. II:3: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: They put out food in the courtyard for the dog. If he took the food and went out of the courtyard, people are not obligated in that regard e.g., to keep the dog from carrying the food into public domain.

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

4. II:5: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: A person should not rent out utensils to a gentile on the eve of the Sabbath, but he may do so on Wednesday or Thursday. Along these same lines, they do not send letters with a gentile on Friday, but on Wednesday or on Thursday it is permitted to do so.

5. II:6: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: They do not send letters with a gentile on Friday unless a fee is stipulated in which case the gentile is working for himself, not for the Israelite. The House of Shammai say, “There must be sufficient time for the letter to get to the address’s house prior to the Sabbath.” The House of Hillel say, “Sufficient to reach the house nearest the wall of the town.”

a. II:7: Gloss of the foregoing.

b. II:8: Gloss of the foregoing.

6. II:9: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: They don’t start a journey by ship less than three days prior to the Sabbath. Under what circumstances? For an optional trip. But as to a religious duty, that is acceptable.

7. II:10: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: They do not undertake a siege of gentile cities less than three days prior to the Sabbath, but if they began a siege, they don’t lift it.

C. THE HOUSE OF SHAMMAI SAY, “THEY DO NOT GIVE HIDES TO A GENTILE TANNER, OR CLOTHING TO A GENTILE LAUNDRYMAN, UNLESS THERE IS SUFFICIENT

TIME FOR THEM TO BE DONE WHILE IT IS STILL DAY.” AND IN THE CASE OF ALL OF THEM, THE HOUSE OF HILLEL PERMIT, WHILE THE SUN IS STILL SHINING.

SAID RABBAN SIMEON B. GAMALIEL, “THE HOUSEHOLD OF FATHER HAD THE HABIT OF GIVING WHITE CLOTHES TO A GENTILE LAUNDRYMAN THREE DAYS BEFORE THE SABBATH.”

1. III:1: It has been taught on Tannaite authority: Said R. Sadoq, “This was the custom of the household of Rabban Gamaliel: They would give white garments to the laundryman three days prior to the Sabbath, but colored ones even on Friday. And from their actions we have learned that it is harder to launder white ones than dyed ones” (T. **Shab. 1:22E-G**).

a. III:2: Case.

b. III:3: As above.

D. AND THESE AND THOSE CONCUR THAT THEY LAY DOWN OLIVE PRESS BEAMS AND WINE PRESS ROLLERS.

1. IV:1: What distinguishes all these other acts, in that the House of Shammai forbids them, and those pertaining to the beam of the olive press and the roller of the wine press, in which the House of Shammai don’t decree against laying them down prior to the Sabbath and leaving them in place?

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

3. IV:3: As to the remnants of oil that belongs to pressers and oil gathered in the mats of pressers used for covering the olives that belonged to the workers who pressed the olives, Rab forbade handling it on the Sabbath, and Samuel permitted doing so. The issue is whether or not this is designated prior to the Sabbath for use on the Sabbath; if not, then it may not be handled on the Sabbath.

a. IV:4: Case.

b. IV:5: Case.

VI. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 1:10-11

A. THEY DO NOT ROAST MEAT, ONIONS, AND EGGS, UNLESS THERE IS TIME FOR THEM TO BE ROASTED WHILE IT IS STILL DAY.

1. I:1: So how much must the meat be roasted before the Sabbath?

B. THEY DO NOT PUT BREAD INTO AN OVEN AT DUSK, NOR CAKES ON THE COALS, UNLESS THERE IS TIME FOR THEM TO FORM A CRUST EVEN ON THE TOP SURFACE WHILE IT IS STILL DAY. R. ELIEZER SAYS, “SUFFICIENT TIME FOR ITS BOTTOM SURFACE ONLY TO FORM A CRUST.”

1. II:1: The question was raised: Is the meaning of bottom the one by the oven, or perhaps bottom means, the one by the fire?

C. THEY LOWER THE PASSOVER-OFFERING INTO AN OVEN AT DUSK WHEN THE FOURTEENTH OF NISAN FALLS ON A FRIDAY.

1. III:1: How come? Because members of the association signed up to share this offering for their Passover are meticulous. The members of the association are not going to rake the coals on the Sabbath, because if one forgets, another will remind him

D. AND THEY LIGHT THE FIRE IN THE FIREPLACE OF THE HOUSE OF THE HEARTH.

1. IV:1: What is the scriptural basis for this ruling?

E. BUT IN THE PROVINCES, THEY DO SO ONLY IF THERE IS SUFFICIENT TIME FOR THE FLAME TO CATCH OVER THE LARGER PART OF THE WOOD. R. JUDAH SAYS, “IN THE CASE OF CHARCOAL ONE MAY LIGHT THE FIRE IF THERE IS TIME FOR THE FIRE TO CATCH ANY QUANTITY OF CHARCOAL WHATSOEVER.”

1. V:1: What is the definition of “the greater part”?

2. V:2: As to a single log — Rab said, “The greater part of its thickness.”

3. V:3: “And there was a fire burning in the brazier before him” (Jer. 36:22): What is the meaning of a brazier?

a. V:4: Gloss.

4. I:5: Said R. Huna, “As to canes, they do not have to be burning over their greater part, but if they are bound together, then they do have to be burning over their greater part prior to the Sabbath. Air has no access, and the fire may otherwise require attention. As to date pits, they do not have to be burning over their greater part, but if they are baled, then they do have to be burning over their greater part prior to the Sabbath.”

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

VI. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 2:1

A. WITH WHAT DO THEY KINDLE THE SABBATH LIGHT AND WITH WHAT DO THEY NOT KINDLE IT?

THEY DO NOT KINDLE WITH (1) CEDAR FIBER:

1. I:1: This is cedar bark

B. (2) UNCARDED FLAX:

1. II:1: Said R. Joseph, “This is the hatched flax.”

C. (3) RAW SILK:

1. III:1: Said Samuel, “I asked all the sailors, and they said that it’s cissaros blossom.”

D. (4) WICK OF BAST:

1. IV:1: That is willow bast.

a. IV:2: Story.

E. (5) WICK OF THE DESERT:

1. V:1: That’s mullein.

F. (6) OR SEAWEED:

1. VI:1: What's seaweed? Should we say, it's the black moss of pits? But that crumbles and can't yield a wick.

2. VI:2: A Tannaite statement: They added to the list wicks made of wool or hair.

G. OR WITH (1) PITCH:

1. VII:1: Pitch is what it says.

H. (2) WAX:

1. VIII:1: Wax is what it says.

2. VIII:2: A Tannaite statement: 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.

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

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

I. (3) CASTOR OIL:

1. IX:1: What is castor oil?

2. IX:2: R. Isaac b. R. Judah said, "It's cotton seed oil." R. Simeon b. Laqish said, "It's oil from the gourd of the kind that Jonah planted."

3. IX:3: 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" so one may trim the wick or tilt the lamp on the Sabbath; so they are not to be used.

4. IX:4: Abbaye 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?"

5. IX:5: 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)."

J. THE HANUKKAH LAMP. THE FESTIVAL OF HANUKKAH

1. IX:6: 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."

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

b. IX:8: As above.

2. IX:9: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: 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 — The House of Shammai say, “On the first day one lights eight candles, and from that time onward, diminishes them from day to day.” 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.”

a. IX:10: Analysis of the foregoing.

b. IX:11: As above.

3. IX:12: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: 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.

4. IX:13: 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.

5. IX:14: What’s the point of Hanukkah?

6. IX:15: 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**). 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.”

a. IX:16: Scriptural gloss joined by shared attributive formula.

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

8. IX:18: 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?’”

a. IX:19: Free standing problem utilizing the foregoing in its solution.

9. IX:20: It has been stated: Rab said, "In a Hanukkah candelabrum, one may not kindle one light from another light." And Samuel said, "In a Hanukkah candelabrum, one may kindle one light from another light."

10. IX:21: 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."

11. IX:22: Extension of the foregoing. So what's the upshot? 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."

12. IX:23: 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.

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

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

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

15. IX:27: 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. R. Jeremiah said, "He who sees the Hanukkah light has to say a blessing."

16. IX:28: Said R. Huna, "A courtyard that has two doorways has to have two lamps."

a. IX:29: Analysis of the principle implicit in the foregoing discussion.

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

18. IX:31: 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."

19. IX:32: 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."

a. IX:33: Story.

b. IX:34: As above.

c. IX:35: As above.

I. IX:36: 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.”

K. (4) OIL GIVEN TO A PRIEST AS HEAVE-OFFERING WHICH HAD BECOME UNCLEAN AND MUST THEREFORE BE BURNED:

1. X:1: What is the definition of oil given to a priest as heave-offering which had become unclean and must therefore be burned?

a. X:2: Tannaite complement to an Amoraite comment in the foregoing.

L. HANUKKAH IN THE LITURGY

1. X:3: 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?

2. X:4: 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?

3. X:5: 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?

4. X:6: 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” and the same applies to festivals that coincide with the Sabbath.

M. (5) GREASE FROM THE FAT TAIL, TALLOW. NAHUM THE MEDE SAYS , “THEY KINDLE THE SABBATH LAMP WITH MELTED TALLOW.” AND SAGES SAY, “ALL THE SAME IS THAT WHICH IS MELTED AND THAT WHICH IS NOT MELTED: THEY DO NOT KINDLE WITH IT.”

1. XII:1: Sages say the same thing as the opening Tannaite authority!

VII. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 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.

1. I:1: how come? Because they don’t burn Holy Things on the festival.

B. R. ISHMAEL SAYS, “THEY DO NOT KINDLE THE SABBATH LAMP WITH TAR, BECAUSE OF THE HONOR OWING TO THE SABBATH.” AND SAGES PERMIT ALL KINDS OF OILS: (1) SESAME OIL, (2) NUT OIL, (3) FISH OIL, (4) COLOCYNTH OIL, (5) TAR, AND (6) NAPHTHA. R. TARFON SAYS, “THEY KINDLE ONLY WITH OLIVE OIL.”

1. II:1: How come? Said Rabbah, “Since it stinks, that is a precautionary decree lest he leave it and go out of his house on that account.”

2. II:2: “And you have removed my soul far off from peace, I forgot prosperity” (Lam. 3:17): What is the meaning of “And you have removed my soul far off from peace”? Said R. Abbahu, “This refers to kindling the Sabbath light.”

a. II:3: Further exegesis of Lam. 3:17.

I. II:4: Tannaite definition of prosperity.

3. II:5: It has been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Simeon b. Eleazar says, “They don’t kindle the Sabbath light with balsam” (T. **Shab. 2:3A**).

a. II:6: Gloss of the foregoing.

I. II:7: Story about the character of balsam oil.

II. II:8: Statement about balsam oil.

4. II:9: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: 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. Along these same lines: On a weekday they do not kindle the lamp with white naphtha, and it goes without saying, on the Sabbath.

a. II:10: Gloss of foregoing.

6. II:11: Further discussion of II.9. 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**) — And so did R. Simeon b. Eleazar say, “Balsam is no more than a resin that exudes from the wood of the balsam tree.” R. Ishmael says, “With nothing that exudes from a tree do they kindle the Sabbath light.” R. Ishmael b. R. Yohanan b. Beroqa says, “They kindle only with what exudes from produce.” R. Tarfon says, “They kindle only with olive oil alone”. 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 Cappadocia 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**).

a. II:12: Gloss of foregoing.

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

- a. II:14: Gloss of II.13.
- b. II:15: Gloss of II.13.
 - I. II:16: Secondary gloss.
 - II. II:17: As above.
 - III. II:18: As above.

VIII. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 2:3A-B

A. WITH NOTHING WHICH EXUDES FROM A TREE DO THEY LIGHT THE SABBATH LIGHT, EXCEPT FOR FLAX:

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

B. AND NOTHING WHICH EXUDES FROM A TREE CONTRACTS UNCLEANNESS AS A TENT THROUGH OVERSHADOWING A CORPSE EXCEPT FOR FLAX:

- 1. II:1: How do we know this on the basis of Scripture?
 - a. II:2: Gloss of foregoing.
 - I. II:3: Proof of a proposition that figures in the foregoing.
 - II. II:4: Continuation of the foregoing.
 - A. II:5: Continuation of the foregoing.

IX. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 2:3C-E

A. A WICK MADE OF CLOTH WHICH ONE TWISTED BUT DID NOT SINGE — R. ELIEZER SAYS, “IT IS SUSCEPTIBLE TO UNCLEANNESS, AND THEY DO NOT KINDLE THE SABBATH LAMP WITH IT.” R. AQIBA SAYS, “IT IS INSUSCEPTIBLE TO UNCLEANNESS, AND THEY DO KINDLE THE SABBATH LAMP WITH IT.”

- 1. I:1: 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. 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?

- a. I:2: Continuation of the foregoing.
- b. I:3: Continuation of the foregoing.

- 2. I:4: 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. “‘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. “‘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.”

a. I:5: Gloss of foregoing. 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.

b. I:6: Secondary development of same. Now this ruling of Rab was not stated in so many words but was stated on the basis of inferential reasoning.

c. I:7: Secondary development of the foregoing. 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!”

3. I:8: R. Hamnuna 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. 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.’”

X. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 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, EVEN IF IT IS MADE OUT OF EARTHENWARE, AND R. JUDAH PERMITS DOING SO.

1. I:1: All three cases have to be spelled out, that is, the eggshell, the earthenware, and the dish.

B. BUT IF THE POTTER JOINED IT TO BEGIN WITH TO THE LAMP, IT IS PERMITTED, BECAUSE IT IS ONE UTENSIL. A PERSON MAY NOT FILL A DISH WITH OIL AND PUT IT BESIDE A LAMP AND PLACE THE HEAD OF THE WICK INTO IT, SO THAT IT WILL DRAW OIL FROM THE DISH OF OIL. AND R. JUDAH PERMITS DOING SO.

1. II:1: A Tannaite statement: If he joined it with plaster or potter's clay, it is permitted.

2. II:2: It has been taught on Tannaite authority: 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." They said to him, "Is there proof from that case (T. **Shab. 2: 5**)?"

a. II:3: Story.

b. II:4: As above.

XI. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 2:5

A. 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.

1. I:1: 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, it follows that it represents the position of R. Judah.

2. I:2: 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!

3. I:3: 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?" 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.'" "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.”

B. TOPICAL APPENDIX: THE STATUS OF THE BOOKS OF QOHELET AND PROVERBS

1. I:4: 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.

2. I:5: And how is it the case that statements in it contradict one another?

3. I:6: 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.”

a. I:7: Illustrative case.

C. ANSWER NOT A FOOL ACCORDING TO HIS FOLLY. THE IMPORTANCE OF HUMILITY

1. I:8: 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.’”

a. I:9: Continuation of the foregoing.

2. I:10: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: A person always should be humble, like Hillel the Elder, and not captious, like Shammai the Elder.

3. I:11: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: There was the incident of a certain gentile who came before Shammai. He said to him, “How many Torahs do you have?” 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. Convert me on condition that you will teach me only the Torah that is in writing.” He rebuked him and threw him out.

4. I:12: 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.

5. I:13: 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). He said to them, “All this honor — for whom is it designated?” They said to him, “It is for the high priest who stands and carries out the service at the altar.” That gentile said to himself, “I’m going to go and convert so that they’ll make me high priest.” 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.”

D. MISCELLANY: THE STUDY OF THE TORAH AND THE PRESENCE OF GOD

1. I:14: 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)? ‘Faith’: This refers to the Mishnah division of Seeds. ‘In

your times': This refers to the Mishnah division of Holy Seasons. 'Strength': This refers to the Mishnah division of Women. Salvation': This refers to the Mishnah division of Damages. Wisdom': This refers to the Mishnah division of Holy Things. 'And knowledge': This refers to the Mishnah division of Purities. Nonetheless: 'The fear of the Lord is his treasure' (Isa. 33: 6)."

2. I:15: 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."

a. I:16: Gloss of a detail of the foregoing.

3. I:17: Said Rabbah bar R. Huna, "Any man who has Torah but not 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?"

a. I:18: Story about relative value of several virtues.

4. I:19: 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

5. I:20: 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!'"

E. 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.

1. II:1: 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!

XII. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 2:6

A. ON ACCOUNT OF THREE TRANSGRESSIONS DO WOMEN DIE IN CHILDBIRTH: BECAUSE THEY ARE NOT METICULOUS IN THE LAWS OF (1) MENSTRUAL SEPARATION:

1. I:1: How come? Said R. Isaac, "She went wrong through the innermost chamber of her belly. Therefore she is smitten in the innermost chamber of her belly."

2. I:2: And why single out the moment of childbirth?

3. I:3: So, by contrast, as to males, when are they subject to the same dangerous examination when they are subject to punishment?

a. I:4: Illustrative story.

4. I:5: 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.’”

5. I:6: 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**).”

6. I:7: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: 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.” 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.

7. I:8: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: For three sins women die in childbirth. R. Eleazar says, “Women die young.”

8. I:9: It has been taught on Tannaite authority: 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.’”

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

10. I:11: It has been taught on Tannaite authority: Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel says, “The laws on consecrating objects as Holy Things, heave-offering, and tithe are the essentials of the Torah. They are handed over to the testimony of ordinary folk” (T. **Shab. 2:10C**).

11. I:12: It has been taught on Tannaite authority: 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).”

12. I:13: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: “On account of the sin of unfulfilled vows children die,” the words of R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon. R. Judah the Patriarch says, “It is on account of the sin of neglect of the Torah.”

a. I:14: 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. I:15: As above.

14. I:16: 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' (Zec. 8:23)."

15. I:17: It has been taught on Tannaite authority: 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."

B. (2) IN THOSE COVERING THE DOUGH-OFFERING;

AND (3) IN THOSE COVERING THE KINDLING OF A LAMP FOR THE SABBATH.

1. II:1: 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."

2. II:2: 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).

a. II:3: Gloss of foregoing.

3. II:4: 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" (Amos 4: 1).

4. II:5: 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).

5. II:6: 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.

6. II:7: 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.”

7. II:8: 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).

8. II:9: 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).

a. II:10: 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).”

9. II:11: 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).”

a. II:12: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: 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.

b. II:13: 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?”

c. II:14: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: 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.

d. II:15: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: Croup comes to the world on account of neglecting tithing. R. Eleazar b. R. Yosé says, “On account of gossip.”

I. II:16: Gloss of foregoing.

XIII. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 2:7

A. THREE THINGS MUST A MAN STATE IN HIS HOUSE ON THE EVE OF SABBATH AT DUSK: (1) “HAVE YOU TITHED?” (2) HAVE YOU PREPARED THE SYMBOLIC MEAL OF FUSION TO UNITE DISTINCT DOMAINS FOR PURPOSES OF CARRYING ON THE SABBATH?” THEN KINDLE THE LAMP FOR THE SABBATH.”

IF IT IS A MATTER OF DOUBT WHETHER OR NOT IT IS GETTING DARK, (1) THEY DO NOT TITHE THAT WHICH IS CERTAINLY UNTITHED, (2) AND THEY DO NOT IMMERSE UTENSILS, (3) AND THEY DO NOT KINDLE LAMPS. (1) BUT THEY DO TITHE THAT WHICH IS DOUBTFULLY TITHED PRODUCE, (2) AND THEY DO PREPARE THE SYMBOLIC MEAL OF FUSION TO UNITE DISTINCT DOMAINS FOR PURPOSES OF CARRYING ON THE SABBATH, (3) AND THEY DO COVER UP WHAT IS TO BE KEPT HOT.

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

2. I:2: 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.”

3. I:3: 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, 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!

4. I:4: 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.” 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.

5. I:5: 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.”

6. I:6: And said Raba, “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.”

7. I:7: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: 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.

a. I:8: Gloss of the foregoing.

I. I:9: Secondary gloss of I:7, 8.

A. I:10: Continuation of the foregoing.

B. I:11: Continuation of the foregoing.

II. I:12: Continuation of the foregoing discussion on twilight.

III. I:13: Continuation of the foregoing.

IV. I:14: Continuation of the foregoing.

A. I:15: Gloss.

B. I:16: Gloss.

8. I:17: 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.”

9. I:18: 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.”

10. I:19: 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.”

11. I:20: 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?”

a. I:21: Case.

11. I:22: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: “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. 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.”

a. I:23: Gloss.

12. I:24: 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.”

13. I:25: 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.”

XIV. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 3:1

A. A DOUBLE STOVE WHICH PEOPLE HAVE HEATED WITH STUBBLE OR STRAW — THEY PUT COOKED FOOD ON IT. BUT IF THEY HEATED IT WITH PEAT OR WITH WOOD, ONE MAY NOT PUT ANYTHING ON IT UNTIL HE HAS SWEEPED IT OUT, OR UNTIL HE HAS COVERED IT WITH ASHES.

1. I:1: But if they heated it with peat or with wood, one may not put anything on it until he has swept it out, or until he has covered it with ashes: The question was raised: Since the language used is, one may not put, does it mean, he may not put back, but it is permitted to keep it there, and that is the case even if the stove is not swept out or covered with ashes, in consequence of which the authority of the unassigned ruling must be Hananiah?

2. I:2: The question was raised: As to an oven that is not swept out or covered with ashes, what is the law on leaning a pot against it? As to putting it inside or on top, it is forbidden, but leaning against it would be permitted, or perhaps there’s no difference?

3. I:3: Said R. Isaac bar Nahmani said R. Oshayya, “If one covered up a stove with ashes but it blazed up again, one may keep on the stove hot water that had already been sufficiently heated, or a cooked dish that had already been sufficiently cooked.”

4. I:4: Said Rabbah bar bar Hannah said R. Yohanan, “If one covered the stove with ashes but it blazed up again, they may keep on the oven hot water that had been sufficiently heated or a cooked dish that had been sufficiently cooked, and even if they are broom coals” that keep their heat longer than other coals and don’t go out so quickly.

5. I:5: Said R. Sheshet said R. Yohanan, “On a stove that one heated with peat or wood one may keep hot water that had not been sufficiently heated or a cooked dish that had not been sufficiently cooked. If one removed these things, one may not put them back until he sweeps the oven or covers it with ashes.”

a. I:6: Said Raba, “We have learned for the Mishnah formulation both items, namely, with respect to keeping something on the stove, we have learned as a Tannaite statement: They do not put bread into an oven at dusk, nor cakes on the coals, unless there is time for them to form a crust even on the top surface while it is still day (M. **1:10B-C**). It follows then

that if there is time for them to form a crust, it is permitted to keep it there, even though the oven is not swept out.

6. I:7: Said R. Samuel bar Judah said R. Yohanan, "On a stove that one heated with peat or wood one may keep a cooked dish that has been cooked sufficiently, or hot water that has been heated"

7. I:8: Said Abbaye to R. Joseph, "What is the law as to keeping a pot on the stove if it is not swept out?"

a. I:9: Case.

8. I:10: They asked R. Hiyya bar Abba, "On the view forbidding the keeping of food on an unswept stove, if one forgot a dish on the stove and cooked on the Sabbath, what is the rule?"

a. I:11: Gloss of foregoing.

9. I:12: One statement of R. Meir's contradicts another statement of his, and one statement of R. Judah's contradicts another statement of his. Meir has forbidden a dish even if sufficiently cooked; here he permits it; Judah permits a dish sufficiently cooked; here he forbids it.

10. I:13: The question was raised: If one violated the law and left a dish on the stove, what is the rule? Did rabbis impose an extrajudicial penalty or is that not the case?

a. I:14: Secondary inference.

B. THE HOUSE OF SHAMMAI SAY, "HOT WATER BUT NOT COOKED FOOD MAY ONE PUT ON IT ON THE EVE OF THE SABBATH." AND THE HOUSE OF HILLEL SAY, "HOT WATER AND COOKED FOOD."

THE HOUSE OF SHAMMAI SAY, "ON THE SABBATH THEY TAKE OFF HOT WATER PLACED THEREON, BUT THEY DO NOT PUT IT BACK." AND THE HOUSE OF HILLEL SAY, "ALSO: THEY PUT IT BACK."

1. II:1: Said R. Sheshet, "From the perspective of him who says, 'They put it back,' that is so even on the Sabbath." And also R. Oshayya takes the view, "They put it back, that is so even on the Sabbath." For said R. Oshayya, "Once we were standing before R. Hiyya the Elder, and we brought up for him a kettle of hot water from the lower to the upper story, we mixed the cup for him, and then we put the water back, and he didn't say a word to us."

2. II:2: There was a dispute on this matter between R. Dimi and R. Samuel bar Judah, both of them speaking in the name of R. Eleazar. One of them said, "If the pot of water is still in hand, it is permitted to put it back on the stove; if it is on the ground, it is forbidden." And the other said, "If he put the pot of water on the ground, it is also permitted to put it back on the stove."

3. II:3: R. Jeremiah raised this question: "If one hung the pot up on a staff, what is the law? If he put the pot on a bed, what is the law?"

XV. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 3:2

A. AN OVEN WHICH PEOPLE HAVE HEATED WITH STUBBLE OR WITH STRAW — ONE SHOULD NOT PUT ANYTHING EITHER INTO IT OR ON TOP OF IT.

A SINGLE STOVE WHICH PEOPLE HAVE HEATED WITH STUBBLE OR WITH STRAW, LO, THIS IS EQUIVALENT TO A DOUBLE STOVE. IF THEY HEATED IT WITH PEAT OR WITH WOOD, LO, IT IS EQUIVALENT TO AN OVEN.

1. I:1: R. Joseph considered explaining, "...into it or on top of it are meant literally, but as to leaning a pot against it, that is acceptable."

a. I:2: Supplement.

2. I:3: Said R. Aha b. Raba to R. Ashi, "As to the stove that is treated here, what is it like? Is it comparable to a double stove, then even if it is heated with stubble or straw, too, use of it should be permitted, if it is swept out or covered with ashes, and if it is comparable to an oven, then it should not be permitted even if heated with stubble or raked out!"

4. I:4: What is the definition of a stove and what is the definition of a double stove?

XVI. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 3:3-4E

A. THEY DO NOT PUT AN EGG BESIDE A KETTLE ON THE SABBATH SO THAT IT WILL BE COOKED:

1. I:1: They do not put an egg beside a kettle on the Sabbath so that it will be cooked: The question was raised: If one roasted it, what is the rule? Said R. Joseph, "If one roasted it, he is liable to a sin-offering."

B. AND ONE SHOULD NOT CRACK IT INTO HOT WRAPPINGS. AND R. YOSÉ PERMITS:

1. II:1: And as to that which we have learned in the Mishnah: They put a cooked dish in a cistern so that it may be preserved, and a vessel containing fresh water into foul water to keep it cool, and cold water into the sun to warm it up (M. **Shab. 22:4A-C**), may we say that this represents the position of R. Yosé but not of rabbis?

C. AND ONE SHOULD NOT BURY IT IN SAND OR IN ROAD DIRT SO THAT IT WILL BE ROASTED.

1. III:1: Why shouldn't R. Yosé take a dissenting position here, too?

D. M'SH S: THE PEOPLE OF TIBERIAS BROUGHT A PIPE OF COLD WATER THROUGH A SPRING OF HOT WATER SAGES SAID TO THEM, "IF THIS WAS DONE ON THE SABBATH, THE WATER IS IN THE STATUS OF HOT WATER WHICH HAS BEEN HEATED ON THE SABBATH ITSELF. "IT IS PROHIBITED FOR USE IN WASHING AND IN DRINKING. IF THIS WAS DONE ON THE FESTIVAL DAY, THE WATER IS IN THE STATUS OF HOT WATER WHICH HAS BEEN HEATED ON THE FESTIVAL DAY. "IT IS PROHIBITED FOR USE IN WASHING, BUT PERMITTED FOR USE IN DRINKING."

1. IV:1: As to the prohibition of the water for use in washing, to what is reference made here? Should I say that it is to washing the entire body? But is it forbidden

to use in that connection only hot water heated on the Sabbath, though hot water heated on Friday would be permitted? But hasn't it been taught on Tannaite authority: As to hot water heated on Friday, on the next day one may wash with it one's hands, face, and feet, but not his entire body. So it must refer to washing one's hands, face and feet. Then I point to the concluding clause: If this was done on the festival day, the water is in the status of hot water which has been heated on the festival day. It is prohibited for use in washing, but permitted for use in drinking. So are we going to have to conclude that the unattributed Mishnah rule accords with the position of the House of Shammai which would be highly irregular? For we have learned in the Mishnah: The House of Shammai say, "On a festival day a person may not heat water for his feet, unless it is also suitable for drinking." But the House of Hillel permit (M. **Bes. 2:5A-C**)!

a. IV:2: Said Rabbah bar bar Hannah said R. Yohanan, "The decided law is in accord with R. Judah."

2. IV:3: It has been stated: As to hot water heated on Friday — Rab said, "On the next day one may use it for washing his entire body, limb by limb." Samuel said, "Sages have permitted washing with it only the face, hands, and feet."

a. IV:4: Said R. Joseph to Abbaye, "Did Rabbah act in line with Rab's ruling?"

3. IV:5: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: A bath the holes of which one stopped up on the eve of the Sabbath to preserve the steam — at the end of the Sabbath one may wash therein forthwith. If he stopped up the openings on the eve of the festival, one may go in on the festival itself and sweat, then go out and take a bath in cold water. Said R. Judah, "There was the case of the bathhouse of Bené Beraq, where they stopped up the holes on Friday. On the next day R. Eleazar b. Azariah and R. Aqiba went in and sweat, came out and rinsed off in cold water. But the hot water thereof was covered over with boards. When the matter came before sages, they said, 'Even if the hot water is not covered with boards it is permitted.' When transgressors became numerous, however, they went and prohibited the practice of taking schvitz baths on the Sabbath." They may stroll through the baths of large cities and have no scruple that one is suspect of going through in order to sweat (T. **Shab. 3:3A-H**).

a. IV:6: Gloss of foregoing.

b. IV:7: Gloss of foregoing.

c. IV:8: As above.

4. IV:9: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: A person may warm up at a big fire, go out and wash in cold water, on condition that he doesn't first rinse off in cold water and then warm himself at the fire, because if he does so, he also heats up the water that is on his body.

5. IV:10: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: One may warm a sheet and put it on his belly. But he may not put a hot water bottle on his belly on the Sabbath (T. **Shab. 3:7A-B**).

6. IV:11: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: One may bring a jug of water and put it near a bonfire, not to warm it up but to temper the cold. R. Judah

says, “A woman may bring an oil cruse and put it by a bonfire, not so as to boil it but so as to make it lukewarm.” Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel says, “A woman may smear some oil on her hand, warm it at a fire, and massage her baby with it, and need not scruple” (T. **Shab. 3: 5**).

a. IV:12: Gloss of foregoing.

8. IV:13: Said R. Judah said Samuel, “All the same are oil and water: If the hand shrinks back from touching it, it is forbidden to put them in front of a fire to reach that temperature, but if the hand doesn’t, it is permitted.”

9. IV:14: Said R. Isaac bar Abedimi, “Once I followed after Rabbi into the bathhouse, and I wanted to place a cruse of oil for him in the bath to heat it up for his use. But he said to me, ‘Take some water in a second utensil into which boiling liquid has been poured, but not a utensil containing the liquid directly heated by the fire and put the oil into that.’” There are three inferences to be drawn from that fact. The inference is to be drawn: Oil is subject to the prohibition of cooking. The inference is to be drawn: The use of a second utensil heated by a utensil heated by fire is not classified as an act of cooking. A secondary cause is not the same as a primary one. The inference is to be drawn: Heating up oil constitutes boiling it.

a. IV:15: Gloss.

b. IV:16: Story.

c. IV:17: As above.

d. IV:18: As above.

XVII. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 3:4F-G

A. A MILIARUM WHICH IS CLEARED OF ASHES — THEY DRINK FROM IT ON THE SABBATH.

1. I:1: What is the meaning of a miliarum which is cleared of ashes?

B. AN ANTIKHI BOILER, EVEN THOUGH IT IS CLEAR OF ASHES — THEY DO NOT DRINK FROM IT.

1. II: What is the meaning of an antikhi?

XVIII. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 3:5A-C

A. A KETTLE CONTAINING HOT WATER WHICH ONE REMOVED FROM THE STOVE — ONE SHOULD NOT PUT COLD WATER INTO IT SO THAT IT THE COLD WATER MAY GET WARM.

1. I:1: What’s the sense of this statement?

2. I:2: Said Rab, “This rule permits only tempering the water, but if the intent is to harden the metal, the act is forbidden.” And Samuel said, “It is even permitted to do so in order to harden the metal.”

B. BUT ONE MAY PUT ENOUGH COLD WATER INTO IT OR INTO A CUP SO THAT THE HOT WATER WILL COOL OFF.

1. II:1: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: “One may put hot water into cold water, but not cold water into hot water,” the words of the House of Shammai. And the House of Hillel, “Whether it is hot water into cold or cold water into hot, it is permitted to do so. Under what circumstances? In the case of a cup of water for drinking since one doesn’t want to heat it up to a high degree. But in the case of a bath, hot into cold is permitted, but not cold into hot.” And R. Simeon b. Menassayya forbids.

a. II:2: Gloss.

b. II:3: Continuation of the foregoing.

I. II:4: Illustrative case.

XIX. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 3:5D-G

A. THE PAN OR POT WHICH ONE HAS TAKEN OFF THE STOVE WHILE IT IS BOILING — ONE MAY NOT PUT SPICES INTO IT. BUT HE MAY PUT SPICES INTO HOT FOOD WHICH IS IN A PLATE OR A DISH. R. JUDAH SAYS, “INTO ANYTHING MAY ONE PUT SPICES, EXCEPT WHAT HAS VINEGAR OR FISH BRINE IN IT.”

1. I:1: The question was raised: Does R. Judah refer to the first clause, yielding a lenient ruling Spices may not be put into the original utensil, right off the flame; Judah permits, except if it has vinegar or brine, or to the second clause, yielding a strict ruling spices are permitted in a secondary utensil, no matter the contents; Judah excepts the specified items.

2. I:2: R. Joseph considered stating, “Salt is in the category of spices: It boils in the initial utensil but not in the second one that is, the utensil on the flame, not the one into which the broth is then poured.”

XX. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 3:6A-D

A. ON THE SABBATH THEY DO NOT PUT A UTENSIL UNDER A LAMP TO CATCH THE OIL. BUT IF ONE PUT IT THERE WHILE IT IS STILL DAY, IT IS PERMITTED:

1. I:1: Said R. Hisda, “Even though they have said, ‘They do not put a utensil under chickens to collect the eggs,’ nonetheless, one may turn a utensil over an egg so that it not break.”

2. I:2: It has been stated: A corpse lying in the sun — R. Judah said Samuel said, “One may turn it over from one bier to the next until it comes to shade.” R. Hanina bar Shelamayya said in the name of Rab, “One puts a loaf of bread or a child on it and carries it on account of carrying those items, which it is permissible to carry.”

B. BUT THEY DO NOT USE ANY OF THAT OIL ON THE SABBATH, SINCE IT IS NOT SOMETHING WHICH WAS PREPARED BEFORE THE SABBATH FOR USE ON THE SABBATH.

1. II:1: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: The leftovers of the oil in the lamp is forbidden. R. Simeon permits it.

XXI. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 3:6E-F

A. THEY CARRY A NEW LAMP, BUT NOT AN OLD ONE. R. SIMEON SAYS, “ON THE SABBATH ANY SORT OF LAMP DO THEY CARRY, EXCEPT FOR A LAMP THAT ACTUALLY IS BURNING.”

1. I:1: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: “They carry a new lamp but not an old one,” the words of R. Judah. R. Meir says, “On the Sabbath any sort of lamp do they carry, except for a lamp one actually lit on that very Sabbath.” R. Simeon says, “On the Sabbath any sort of lamp do they carry, except for a lamp that actually is burning. If he put it out, it is permitted to carry it.” But as to a cup, dish, or lantern which they extinguished — one should not move them from their place. And R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon says, “One may take a supply of oil from a lamp that is going out and a lamp that is dripping, and even at the moment that the lamp is burning” (T. **Shab. 3:13A-E, 3:14A**) .

a. I:2: Gloss of foregoing.

b. I:3: As above.

c. I:4: As above.

2. I:5: Said R. Judah said Rab, “A bed that was singled out for use for money may not be moved about on the Sabbath.” Mere designation renders it forbidden, even if money was not actually put on the bed.

3. I:6: R. Simeon b. Laqish asked R. Yohanan, “As to wheat that one sowed in the soil or eggs under a chicken, what is the law on taking them on the Sabbath for use, the wheat not having taken root, the egg not having added ? When R. Simeon rejects the prohibition is a case in which on one’s own action one has not rejected an object here, when one sows wheat in the ground or puts an egg under the fowl, he has rejected it for the interim , but in a case in which one has rejected the object through one’s own action, he will affirm that it is forbidden to handle such a self-designated, repulsive object on the Sabbath? Or maybe he makes no such distinction?”

4. I:7: Said R. Judah said Samuel, “So far as R. Simeon is concerned, the principle that on the Sabbath one may not touch what one may not use applies only to drying figs and grapes.” When they are spread out to dry, they cease to be fit for food until fully dried; hence they are certainly rejected as food, and even Simeon admits the prohibition here.

5. I:8: R. Simeon bar Rabbi asked Rabbi, “According to R. Simeon, what is the law whether or not on a festival day one may eat burst figs?” And, indicating that Rabbi does not require prior designation, Rabbi said to Simeon b. Rabbi , “R. Simeon requires that food be set aside for festival use only in the case of dried figs and raisins.” These foods were edible but now have been set aside for drying. The owner himself purposely imposed upon them the status of a non-edible. If he wishes to make them available for festival use, accordingly, prior to the holy day, he must indicate his intention to eat them. But in most other cases, Simeon does not require designation of food for festival use. The assumption is that Rabbi reports this perspective because it is his own opinion, not simply that of Simeon.

6. I:9: Said Rabbah bar bar Hannah said R. Yohanan, “They said: The law accords with R. Simeon.”

7. I:10: When R. Isaac bar Joseph came, he said, “R. Yohanan said, ‘The decided law is in accord with R. Judah.’ And R. Joshua b. Levi said, ‘The decided law is in accord with R. Simeon.’”

a. I:11: Story illustrative of a subordinate detail in the foregoing.

b. I:12: As above.

c. I:13: Further relevant ruling on the same detail.

d. I:14: Further story.

8. I:15: To Rabbah, Abbaye contrasted Tannaite rules, as follows: “It has been taught on Tannaite authority: The leftovers of the oil in the lamp is forbidden. R. Simeon permits it. Therefore R. Simeon rejects the principle that what is not suitable for use on the Sabbath also may not be touched. But it also has been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Simeon says, ‘Any firstling the blemish of which has not been discerned while it is still day before the festival — this is not deemed to be in the category of that which is ready for festival use’ (M. **Bes. 3:4C**). Therefore he accepts the principle that what is not available for use prior to the holy day, for example, by sunset, may not be handled on the holy day itself.”

9. I:16: Abbaye raised the following question to R. Joseph, “Did R. Simeon say, ‘If the lamp went out, it may be handled’? Then, only if it went out may it be handled, but not if it went out. Why not? Because we take the precaution, lest, through his handling it, it might go out and the Torah forbids putting out a fire. But, by contrast, we have heard as a tradition for R. Simeon, who has said, ‘If it is something that one does not wish to have happen, it is permitted.’ For it has been taught on Tannaite authority: 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.’”

10. I:17: Said R. Zira said R. Assi said R. Yohanan said R. Hanina said R. Romanus, “Rabbi permitted me to handle a pan with the ashes in it.” Ashes cannot be used so shouldn’t be handled, but it is assumed that he was permitted to move the ashes on account of the pan, a utensil.

11. I:18: Levi bar Samuel came across R. Abba and R. Huna bar Hiyya, who were standing at the doorway of the household of R. Huna. He said to them, “What is the law as to reassembling a weaver’s frame on the Sabbath?”

a. I:19: Illustrative story.

XXII. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 3:6H-I

A. THEY PUT A UTENSIL UNDER A LAMP TO CATCH THE SPARKS.

1. I:1: But by doing so, one nullifies the utensil’s status as a useful object ready for work by putting it under the lamp in this way !

B. BUT ON THE SABBATH ONE MAY NOT PUT WATER INTO IT, BECAUSE HE THEREBY PUTS OUT THE SPARKS.

1. II:1: May we say that what we have here taught without attribution accords with the view of R. Yosé, who has said, “What indirectly brings about extinguishing fire is forbidden”?

XXIII. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 4:1

A. WITH WHAT DO THEY COVER UP FOOD TO KEEP IT HOT , AND WITH WHAT DO THEY NOT COVER UP FOOD TO KEEP IT HOT ? THEY DO NOT COVER WITH (1) PEAT, (2) COMPOST, (3) SALT, (4) LIME, OR (5) SAND, WHETHER WET OR DRY:

1. I:1: The question was raised: Do we repeat the Mishnah rule as, peat of olives? In that case, it is all right to use sesame peat? Or perhaps it is that of sesame that we learn, in which case all the more so that of olives?

a. I:2: Story.

B. OR WITH (6) STRAW, (7) GRAPE SKINS, (8) FLOCKING RAGS , OR (9) GRASS:

1. II:1: R. Adda bar Mattenah asked Abbaye, “As to flocking in which one has stored food, what is the law as to handling them on the Sabbath?” Normally they may not be handled. The question is whether this use converts it into a utensil, which may be handled on the Sabbath.

a. II:2: Secondary analysis of foregoing.

b. II:3: As above.

c. II:4: As above.

5. II:5: And said R. Judah said Rab, “He who on the Sabbath day tears open the neck of a new piece of clothing unaware that it is the Sabbath is liable to present a sin-offering.”

6. II:6: R. Jeremiah pointed out to R. Zira the following contradiction: “We have learned in the Mishnah: The loose stitches of the laundrymen, or a bunch of keys, or a garment which is sewn with threads of mixed stuff — it is connected for purposes of the transmission to the remainder of the garment of uncleanness, until one will begin to take it apart (M. **Uqs. 2:6E-G**) . It follows that even not during the time of work when the pieces have to be sewn together are they regarded as connected. So long as one has not begun to untie them, they are treated as joined together. And by contrast: A staff which one made into a heft for an ax is a connector for uncleanness at the time of use (M. **Kel. 20:3A**) . It follows that only during the time of work when the pieces have to be sewn together are they regarded as connected, but not otherwise.”

a. II:7: Secondary exploration of the issue of connection.

B. II:8: As above.

C. OR WITH (6) STRAW, (7) GRAPE SKINS, (8) FLOCKING RAGS , OR (9) GRASS, WHEN WET. BUT THEY DO COVER UP FOOD TO KEEP IT HOT WITH THEM WHEN THEY ARE DRY.

1. III:1: The question was raised: Is this when they are naturally moist or perhaps when they are moist because of some other source of moisture? The former throws out more heat.

XXIV. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 4:1G-I

A. THEY COVER UP FOOD TO KEEP IT HOT WITH (1) CLOTH, (2) PRODUCE, (3) THE WINGS OF A DOVE:

1. I:1: The wings of a dove: Said R. Yannai, “As to wearing phylacteries, it is required that the body be clean, as in the case of Elisha, the man of wings.”

a. I:2: Gloss of the foregoing. And what’s the meaning of Elisha, the man of wings?

b. I:3: As above. And what differentiates the wings of a dove from all other birds?

B. (4) CARPENTERS’ SAWDUST: AND (5) SOFT HATCHELLED FLAX. R. JUDAH PROHIBITS IN THE CASE OF SOFT HATCHELLED FLAX AND PERMITS IN THE CASE OF COARSE HATCHELLED FLAX .

1. II:1: The question was raised: Does R. Judah refer in his prohibition to carpenters’ sawdust or to hatchelled flax?

XXV. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 4:2A-G

A. THEY COVER UP FOOD TO KEEP IT HOT WITH FRESH HIDES, AND THEY CARRY HANDLE THEM:

1. I:1: They cover up food to keep it hot with fresh hides, and they carry handle them: In session R. Jonathan b. Akinai and R. Jonathan b. Eleazar, and in session with them was R. Hanina bar Hama, and they were raising this question for themselves: “Have we learned in the Mishnah, fresh hides that belong to a private person, but not those of a craftsman, who would be particular about them and won’t spoil them, in which case they are not to be touched on the Sabbath, since they are not to be used for a permissible purpose? Or perhaps we learn in the Mishnah, fresh hides that belong to a craftsman, and all the more so those that belong to a private person?”

a. I:2: Tannaite complement.

b. I:3: Further question bearing the same attributive, no longer relevant to our Mishnah-paragraph.

l. I:4: Tannaite expansion on the foregoing.

B. ...WITH WOOL SHEARINGS, BUT THEY DO NOT CARRY THEM:

1. II:1: Said Raba, “That rule has been stated only in a case in which he had not stored food in them, but if on that Sabbath one had stored food in them, then it is permitted to handle them.”

2. II:2: Rabbah bar bar Hannah set forth the following Tannaite statement before Rab: “As to dry branches of a palm tree that one cut down for fuel, but then

changed his mind and decided to use them as a chair, he has to tie them together” before the Sabbath, to make them into a kind of chair; otherwise they are fuel and may not be handled on the Sabbath; a change of mind without an action is null.”

a. II:3: It has been stated: Rab said, “He has to tie them into a bundle.” And Samuel said, “It suffices for him to give thought to the matter.” And R. Assi said, “If he sat down on them, even though he didn’t tie them into a bundle or even intend to sit on them, there is no problem.”

b. II:4: Further gloss of II:2.

c. II:5: Said R. Judah, “A person may bring a basketful of earth into his home and on the festival may do with it whatever he pleases.” Appeals to foregoing for authority.

I. II:6: Gloss of foregoing. May we say that this matter follows the lines of the following Tannaite formulation: With any sort of substance may utensils be cleaned on the Sabbath, except for using white earth on silver utensils. So lo, it is permitted to make use of natron or sand. And by contrast, it has been taught on Tannaite authority: It is forbidden to make use of natron or sand.

3. II:7: Said R. Judah, “As to powdered brick, it is permitted for use in washing the face.” Said R. Joseph, “As to poppy pomade scented with jasmine, it is permitted for use as a lotion.”

4. II:8: They asked R. Sheshet, “What is the law on bruising olives on the Sabbath?”

a. II:9: Story.

C. WHAT DOES ONE DO? HE SIMPLY TAKES OFF THE COVER, AND THE WOOL SHEARINGS FALL OFF ON THEIR OWN.

R. ELEAZAR B. AZARIAH SAYS, “A BASKET HOLDING A POT AND SHEARINGS DOES HE TURN ONTO ITS SIDE, AND HE REMOVES THE FOOD, LEST HE SHOULD TAKE IT AND NOT BE ABLE TO PUT IT BACK.” AND SAGES SAY, “HE TAKES OUT THE FOOD AND PUTS IT BACK.”

1. III:1: Said R. Abba said R. Hiyya bar Ashi, “All concur that if the cavity was spoiled, its walls collapsing, it is forbidden to put the pot back.”

2. III:2: Said R. Huna, “As to a fragrant plant used after meals for a pleasant odor, which was removed from its pot, sniffed, and then put back, if one put it in, took it out, and put it in again so loosening the earth prior to the Sabbath then on the Sabbath it is permitted to handle it; but if not, it is forbidden.”

XXVI. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 4:2H-J

A. IF HE DID NOT COVER UP THE FOOD WHILE IT IS STILL DAY, HE SHOULD NOT COVER IT UP AFTER DARK. BUT IF HE COVERED IT UP AND IT BECAME UNCOVERED, IT IS PERMITTED TO COVER IT UP AGAIN. ONE FILLS A JUG ON THE SABBATH WITH COLD FOOD OR LIQUID AND PUTS IT UNDER A PILLOW OR A BLANKET TO KEEP IT COOL.

1. I:1: Said R. Judah said Samuel, “It is possible to put away cold things” to keep the sun from reaching and warming them on the Sabbath.

2. I:2: Said R. Huna said Rabbi, “It is forbidden to put away cold things.”

a. I:3: Case.

3. I:4: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: Even though they have said, they do not cover up hot food or water to begin with on the Sabbath once it has gotten dark, if one has come to add, he may indeed do so. How does he add objects to it? Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel says, “One removes the sheet and puts on a blanket, or removes a blanket and puts back a sheet.” And so did Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel say, “They prohibited covering up only a pot in which they had heated up the food on the eve of the Sabbath. But one pours out its contents into another kettle or into another pot and covers that one up” (T. **Shab. 3:20A-F**).

XXVII. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 5:1

A. WITH WHAT DOES A BEAST (EXO. 20:10) GO OUT ON THE SABBATH, AND WITH WHAT DOES IT NOT GO OUT? (1) A CAMEL GOES OUT WITH ITS CURB, (2) A FEMALE CAMEL WITH ITS NOSE RING,

1. I:1: What is the meaning of a female camel with its nose ring?

B. (3) A LIBYAN ASS WITH ITS BRIDLE:

1. II:1: Said R. Huna, “It is a Libyan ass with an iron halter.”

a. II:2: Story.

2. II:3: Said R. Judah said Samuel, “Changing the order of the items listed in the Mishnah for one another before Rabbi, what is the law if one animal went out with the equipment of another? There is no issue in respect to a dromedary and a bit, since it is not held in check thereby, it is simply a burden. But where there is a question, it concerns a camel with a nose ring. What is the law? Since it suffices with a bit, a nose ring is a mere burden. Or perhaps an additional means of controlling the beast is not classified as a burden?”

a. II:4: Tannaite formulation of the same problem.

l. II:5: Story.

3. II:6: A Tannaite statement of the household of Manassayya: A horn between the goats on which one made grooves — one may lead it out with a bit on the Sabbath that is fastened to the grooves; otherwise this may not be done because the bit may slip off the head and the owner may have to carry the bit in public domain

4. II:7: R. Joseph asked this question: “If one fastened it through the beard, what is the law? Since, if he pulls at it, it hurts him, he won’t pull on it, or maybe it may loosen and fall off, and the owner may turn out to carry it four cubits in the public domain?”

5. II:8: We have learned in the Mishnah there: Or with a strap between its horns. Said R. Jeremiah bar Abba, “Rab and Samuel differed on this matter. One said, ‘That is so whether it is for an ornament or for a guard, it is forbidden.’ The other said, ‘It is forbidden as an ornament, but as a guard it is permitted.’”

C. (4) AND A HORSE WITH ITS CHAIN. AND ALL BEASTS WHICH WEAR A CHAIN GO OUT WITH A CHAIN AND ARE LED BY A CHAIN:

1. III:1: With reference to the statement, And all beasts which wear a chain go out with a chain and are led by a chain what is the meaning of, go out, and what is the meaning of, are led?
2. III:2: Said R. Joseph, "I saw the calves of R. Huna's household going out with their cords wound around them on the Sabbath."
3. III:3: The question was raised: Is the language, "wound around them" or "led"?
- a. III:4: Gloss of foregoing.

D. AND THEY SPRINKLE ON THE CHAINS IF THEY BECOME UNCLEAN:

1. IV:1: Does that bear the implication that they receive uncleanness? But we have learned in the Mishnah: A ring of a man is unclean. A ring of a beast and of the utensils and all the rest of the rings are insusceptible to uncleanness (M. **Kel 12:1A-B**)!

E. AND IMMERSE THEM IN PLACE WITHOUT REMOVING THEM.

1. V:1: But what about interposition between the beast's body and the water, effected by the ornaments
- a. V:2: Secondary analysis of the foregoing.
2. V:3: A disciple from Upper Galilee asked R. Eliezer, "I have heard that they make distinctions among various kinds of rings." He said to him, "Perhaps the distinctions you have heard pertain only to the Sabbath, for so far as uncleanness is concerned, this and that form a single classification" (T. **Kel. B.M. 2:2Bff.**).
- a. V:4: Gloss of foregoing.
3. V:5: Continuation of V.3.
- a. V:6: Gloss thereon.

XXVIII. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 5:2

A. AN ASS GOES OUT WITH ITS SADDLE CLOTH WHEN IT IS TIED ON TO HIM.

1. I:1: An ass goes out with its saddle cloth when it is tied on to him: said Samuel, "But that is the case only if the saddle cloth was tied on him on the eve of the Sabbath."
2. I:2: So, too, it has been taught on Tannaite authority: An ass may go forth with its cushion if it was tied on on the eve of the Sabbath, but not with its saddle, even if it was tied on at the eve of the Sabbath. Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel says, "Also with respect to its saddle: If it was tied on on the eve of the Sabbath it may go forth on the Sabbath, on condition that he does not tie on its band, and on condition that he doesn't pass the strap under its tail" (T. **Shab. 4:2A-C**).
3. I:3: R. Assi bar Nathan addressed this question to R. Hiyya bar R. Ashi: "What is the law as to putting the cushion on an ass on the Sabbath just to keep it warm?"
4. I:4: Samuel said, "It is permitted to put on a cushion, it is forbidden to put on a fodder bag."

5. I:5: When R. Zira came up, he came across R. Benjamin bar Japheth, who was in session and stating the following in the name of R. Yohanan: “On the Sabbath it is permitted to put a cushion on an ass.”

a. I:6: Secondary analysis of the foregoing. Then it follows that all parties concur that it is permitted to put a cushion on the beast on the Sabbath, so how does the cushion differ from a saddle?

b. I:7: Continuation of the foregoing.

I. I:8: Gloss of a subordinated detail.

II. I:9: As above.

6. I:10: It has been taught on Tannaite authority: Said R. Judah, “There was a case of goats of the house of Antioch, which had large udders, and they made for them brassieres, so that their breasts should not be lacerated dragging on the ground.”

a. I:11: Formal companion to the foregoing. Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: There was the case of a man whose wife died, leaving him a suckling child, and he couldn’t afford the fee of a wet-nurse. So a miracle was done for him, and his breasts opened up like the two breasts of a woman, and he nursed his son.

b. I:12: Formal companion to the foregoing. Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: There was the case of a man who married a woman with a stumped hand, but he never realized it until the day of her death.

B. RAMS GO OUT STRAPPED UP AT THE MALE ORGAN.

1. II:1: What is the meaning of strapped up?

2. II:2: Ulla said, “This word speaks of the hide that they tie over their hearts so that wolves won’t fall on them.”

3. II:3: R. Nahman bar Isaac said, “It is a hide that is tied under their genitals to keep them from mounting the females. How so? Since the later clause states, And female sheep go forth strapped over their tails, and that means, with their tails tied back upwards so that the males may mount them. So the first clause refers to the male’s not copulating with the female, and the second, it is for the males to copulate.”

C. AND FEMALE SHEEP GO FORTH (1) STRAPPED OVER THEIR TAILS, (2) UNDER THEIR TAILS:

1. III:1: What is the meaning of strapped over their tails?

a. III:2: Gloss of foregoing.

D. AND FEMALE SHEEP GO FORTH...WEARING PROTECTIVE CLOTHS.

1. IV:1: What is the meaning of protective cloths?

E. AND GOATS GO FORTH WITH BOUND UDDERS. R. YOSÉ PROHIBITS IN THE CASE OF ALL OF THEM, EXCEPT FOR THE CASE OF EWES WEARING PROTECTIVE CLOTHS. R. JUDAH SAYS, “GOATS GO FORTH WITH BOUND UDDERS TO KEEP THEM DRY, BUT NOT TO COLLECT THE MILK.”

1. V:1: It has been stated: Rab said, “The decided law accords with R. Judah.” And Samuel said, “The decided law is in accord with R. Yosé.”

XXIX. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 5:3

A. AND WITH WHAT DOES A BEAST NOT GO OUT? (1) A CAMEL DOES NOT GO OUT WITH A PAD,

1. I:1: A Tannaite statement: A camel should not go out with a pad tied to its tail, but it may go out with a pad tied to its tail and its hump.

B. NOR (2) WITH FORELEGS BOUND TOGETHER OR: HIND LEGS BOUND TOGETHER OR (3) WITH A HOOF TIED BACK TO THE SHOULDER.

1. II:1: Said R. Judah, “The word ‘bound together’ means, tying hand and foot together, as in the case of Isaac, Abraham’s son; the word ‘tied back to the shoulder’ means, the forefoot must not be bent back onto the shoulder and tied.”

C. AND SO IS THE RULE FOR ALL OTHER BEASTS. ONE SHOULD NOT TIE CAMELS TO ONE ANOTHER AND LEAD THEM.

1. III:1: How come?

D. BUT ONE PUTS THE ROPES OF ALL OF THEM INTO HIS HAND AND LEADS THEM, SO LONG AS HE DOES NOT TWIST THE ROPES TOGETHER.

1. IV:1: Said R. Ashi, “This has been taught only in regard to mixed species.” The prohibition of twisting them together does not pertain to the Sabbath.

2. IV:2: Said Samuel, “It is also so long as he does not allow a handbreadth of a cord to hang out of his hand” which looks like a separate cord that he is carrying.

XXX. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 5:4

A. (1) AN ASS DOES NOT GO OUT WITH ITS SADDLE CLOTH WHEN IT IS NOT TIED TO HIM,

1. I:1: how come?

B. OR WITH A BELL, EVEN THOUGH IT IS PLUGGED,

1. II:1: Because it looks as though he’s going to a fair.

C. OR WITH THE LADDER YOKE AROUND ITS NECK,

1. III:1: Said R. Huna, “It is a bar under the jaw.”

D. OR WITH A STRAP ON ITS LEG.

1. IV:1: It serves him as a means of control keeping the legs from knocking.

E. AND (2) FOWL DO NOT GO FORTH WITH RIBBONS:

1. V:1: These are put on them as a marker so they won’t get confused with other people’s birds.

F. OR STRAPS ON THEIR LEGS.

1. VI:1: These are put on them to keep them from breaking utensils.

G. AND (3) RAMS DO NOT GO FORTH WITH A WAGON UNDER THEIR FAT TAIL.

1. VII:1: This is to keep their tails from knocking on the ground.

H. AND (4) EWES DO NOT GO FORTH PROTECTED WITH THE WOOD CHIP IN THEIR NOSE.

1. VIII:1: In session R. Aha bar Ulla before R. Hisda said, "From the time that they shear them, they saturate a compress in oil and put it on its forehead so that it not catch cold."

I. AND (15) A CALF DOES NOT GO OUT WITH ITS RUSH YOKE.

1. IX:1: What is the meaning of **a calf does not go out with its rush yoke**?

J. OR (6) A COW WITH A HEDGEHOG SKIN TIED AROUND THE UDDER,

1. X:1: It is made so as to keep hedgehogs from sucking it.

K. OR WITH A STRAP BETWEEN ITS HORNS.

1. XI:1: From the perspective of Rab, whether it is made as an ornament or as a protection, it is forbidden; from the perspective of Rab, if it is an ornament it is forbidden, if it is protection, it is permitted..

L. THE COW OF R. ELEAZAR B. AZARIAH WOULD GO OUT WITH A STRAP BETWEEN ITS HORNS, BUT THIS WAS NOT WITH THE APPROVAL OF THE SAGES.

1. XII:1: So did he have only one cow? And didn't Rab say, and some say, said R. Judah said Rab, "Thirteen thousand calves was the tithe given from R. Eleazar b. Azariah's herd each year." A Tannaite statement: The cow was not his personally. Rather, it belonged to his neighbor. But since he did not prevent her when she let it go out on the Sabbath wearing the strap, they called it his.

M. TAKING RESPONSIBILITY FOR WHAT HAPPENS IN THE COMMUNITY

1. XII:2: Whoever has the power to prevent his household from doing a certain improper deed but doesn't do so is held responsible for the sins of the members of his household. If he can stop his townsfolk, he is held responsible along with them; if he can stop the whole world, he is responsible for the whole world.

2. XII:3: Said R. Pappa, "The members of the household of the exilarch are seized on account of the whole world."

a. XII:4: Case. R. Judah was in session before Samuel. A woman came and cried out before him, but he didn't pay any attention to her. He said to him, "Doesn't the master concur, 'who stops his ears at the cry of the poor, he, too, shall cry but not be heard' (Pro. 21:13)?"

b. XII:5: As above. said R. Zira to R. Simon, "Let the master rebuke the members of the house of the exilarch." He said to him, "They won't take it from me." He said to him, "Even though they won't take it from you, yet the master should rebuke them. For said R. Aha bar Hanina, 'Never did a good ruling go forth from the mouth of the Holy One, blessed be He, on which he went back in favor of a bad one, except for this one thing, of which it is written, "And the Lord said to him, Go through the midst of the city, through the midst of Jerusalem, and set a mark on the foreheads of the men that sigh and cry for all the abominations that are committed in the midst thereof" (Eze. 9: 4).'"

I. XII:6: Exegesis of proof text cited in the foregoing. With reference to the verse, “And the Lord said to him, Go through the midst of the city, through the midst of Jerusalem, and set a mark on the foreheads of the men that sigh and cry for all the abominations that are committed in the midst thereof” (Eze. 9: 4)”: Said the Holy One, blessed be He, to Gabriel, “Go, make a mark on the foreheads of the righteous, a tav written in ink, so that the destructive angels won’t have power over them, and make a mark of a tav on the foreheads of the wicked, a tav written in blood, so that the destructive angels will have power over them.”

II. XII:7: As above.

III. XII:8: As above.

IV. XII:9: As above.

V. XII:10: As above. And why a letter tav? Said Rab, “Tav stands for ‘you shall live,’ tav stands for ‘you shall die.’” And Samuel said, “Tav is the first letter in the word for ‘exhausted,’ thus, the merit of the patriarchs is exhausted.”

A. XII:11: Gloss of a detail of the foregoing. At what point was the merit accruing from the patriarchs exhausted?

B. XII:12: Continuation of the foregoing. Said R. Ammi, “Death comes about only through sin, and suffering only through transgression. Death comes about only through sin: The soul that sins, it shall die; the son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son; the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him” (Eze. 18:20). And suffering only through transgression: ‘Then will I visit their transgression with the rod and their iniquity with stripes’ (Psa. 89:33).”

C. XII:13: As above. Said R. Samuel bar Nahmani said R. Jonathan, “Whoever says that Reuben sinned only errs, for it is said, ‘Now the sons of Jacob were twelve’ (Gen. 35:22) — this teaches that all of them were equal to one another.”

D. XII:14: As above.

E. XII:15: As above. Said R. Samuel bar Nahmani said R. Jonathan. “Whoever says that the sons of Eli sinned only errs: ‘And the two sons of Eli, Hophni and Phineas, priests to the Lord, were there’ (1Sa. 1: 3).”

1. XII:16: Gloss of a detail of the foregoing.

F. XII:17: Continuation of the discussion of XII:15. Said R. Samuel bar Nahmani said R. Jonathan, “Whoever says that the sons of Samuel sinned errs, for it is said, ‘And it happened that when

Samuel was old, his sons did not walk in his ways' (1Sa. 6: 1, 3). It was in his ways that they did not walk, but they also didn't sin!"

1. XII:18: Gloss of foregoing.

G. XII:19: Continuation of the discussion of XII:15. Said R. Samuel bar Nahmani said R. Jonathan, "Whoever says David sinned errs: 'And David behaved himself wisely in all his ways, and the Lord was with him' (1Sa. 18:14) — is it possible that even the opportunity to sin came his way and yet the Presence of God was with him?"

1. XII:20: Gloss of foregoing. Said Rab, "Rabbi, who comes from David, turns matters around to interpret the verse in his behalf. For of the verse, 'Wherefore have you despised the word of the Lord, to do that which is evil in his sight?' Rabbi says, 'This 'evil' was different from all other references to evil in the Torah. For of all other references to evil in the Torah it is written, 'and he did,' but here it is written, 'to do,' in that that's what he wanted to do, but he didn't do it.'"

2. XII:21: Continuation of foregoing. "You have smitten Uriah the Hittite with the sword" (2Sa. 12: 9) — you should have judged him in the sanhedrin, but you didn't judge him.

3. XII:22: Continuation of foregoing. "And you have taken his wife to be your wife" (2Sa. 12: 9) — you have marriage rights in her. For said R. Samuel bar Nahmani said R. Jonathan, "Whoever went out to do battle for the house of David provides a writ of divorce for his wife in advance to make sure she is free to remarry if he is lost in battle, his body not being recovered, in line with this verse: 'And to your brothers you shall bring greetings and take your pledge' (1Sa. 17:18)."

4. XII:23: Continuation of foregoing. "And you have slain him with the sword of the children of Ammon" (2Sa. 12: 9): Just as on account of the sword of the children of Ammon you are not punished, so for Uriah the Hittite's death you are not punishable.

5. XII:24: Continuation of foregoing. Said Rab, "When you look into the case of David, you find nothing against him except the matter of Uriah, for it is written, 'except only in the matter of Uriah the Hittite' (1Ki. 15: 5)."

a. XII:25: Gloss of foregoing. Reverting to the body of the foregoing: Rab said, “David paid attention to slander, as it is written, ‘And the king said to him, Where is he? And Ziba said to the king, Behold, he is in the house of Machir the son of Ammiel, but while Mephibosheth makes disloyal accusations against him, David found that there was nothing to it’ (2Sa. 9: 5). And it is written, ‘Then David sent and brought him out of the house of Machir the son of Ammiel from “there was nothing to it.”’ When he looked into the matter, he found he was a liar.”

b. XII:26: As above.

c. XII:27: As above. Said R. Judah said Rab, “Had David not accepted slander, the kingdom of the house of David would not have been divided, and the Israelites would not have worshipped idols, and we should never have been exiled from our land.”

H. XII:28: Said R. Samuel bar Nahmani said R. Jonathan, “Whoever says Solomon sinned errs, for it is said, ‘And his heart was not perfect with the Lord his God as was the heart of David his father’ (1Ki. 11: 4) — it was like the heart of David his father that it was not the same, but he also never sinned!”

1. XII:29: As above. Said R. Judah said Samuel, “It would have been better for that righteous man had he served ‘something else’ but that Scripture should not say of him, ‘And Solomon did that which was evil in the sight of the Lord’ (1Ki. 11: 6).”

2. XII:30: As above.

3. XII:31: As above.

4. XII:32: As above.

XXXI. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 6:1

A. WITH WHAT DOES A WOMAN GO OUT, AND WITH WHAT DOES SHE NOT GO OUT? A WOMAN SHOULD NOT GO OUT WITH (1) WOOLEN RIBBONS, (2) FLAXEN RIBBONS, OR (3) WITH BANDS AROUND HER HEAD, AND SHE SHOULD NOT IMMERSE WHEN DRESSED IN THEM UNLESS SHE LOOSENS THEM:

1. I:1: And she should not immerse when dressed in them unless she loosens them: Who in the world ever raised the subject of immersion?

2. I:2: R. Kahana asked Rab, “What is the rule on openwork bands?” He said to him, “You raise the topic of what is woven: As to whatever is woven, rabbis have made no such decree in regard to the Sabbath, since one may immerse wearing what is woven.”

a. I:3: Secondary expansion of foregoing.

b. I:4: As above: There we have learned in the Mishnah: These interpose on man: Threads of wool, and threads of flax, and the ribbons which are on the heads of girls. R. Judah says, “Those of wool and those of hair do not interpose, because the water enters into them” M. Miq. 9:1. Said R. Huna, “We repeat all of these rules with reference to the heads of girls.”

c. I:5: Continuation of the analysis of the foregoing.

B. A WOMAN SHOULD NOT GO OUT WITH (1) FRONTLETS, (2) FLAXEN RIBBONS, OR (3) WITH BANDS AROUND HER HEAD...

1. II:1: What is the definition of frontlets?

C. (4) OR WITH A HEADBAND, (5) HEAD BANGLES, WHEN THEY ARE NOT SEWN ON, (6) OR WITH A HAIR-NET, INTO THE PUBLIC DOMAIN.

1. III:1: Said R. Yannai, “As to the definition of a hair-net, I don’t know what it is, specifically: Whether we have learned in the Mishnah the rule governing a slave’s chain, so a wool hair-net is permitted, or perhaps we have learned in the Mishnah the rule governing a wool hair-net, and how much the more so is a slave’s neck chain permitted!”

2. III:2: What is the definition of a clasp?

3. III:3: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: Three rules were stated with reference to a clasp: It is not subject to the prohibition governing mixed species. It does not contract uncleanness as a fabric in line with Lev. 14. They do not go forth in it to public domain. In the name of R. Simeon they have said, “Also it is not prohibited in the category of tiaras which may not be worn so as to show a sign of mourning for the destruction of the Temple (T. **4:7A-C**).

4. III:4: And Samuel said, “We have learned the rule with reference to a slave’s neck chain.”

a. III:5: Gloss of foregoing.

I. III:6: As above. Gloss of a statement in the foregoing.

II. III:7: As above.

A. III:8: As above.

III. III:9: As above.

D. NOR SHOULD SHE GO OUT (1) WITH A TIARA IN THE FORM OF A GOLDEN CITY:

1. IV:1: What is the meaning of a golden city?

2. IV:2: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: “A woman should not go out in public domain wearing a golden tiara, and if she went out, she is liable to a sin-offering,” the words of R. Meir. And sages say, “She may not go out, but if she did, she is exempt.” R. Eliezer says, “A woman may go out to begin with wearing a golden tiara” (T. **Shab. 4:6A-D**).

a. IV:3: Gloss of foregoing.

3. IV:4: As to a coronet: Rab forbade. Samuel permitted.

4. IV:5: They said to Rab, “An eminent authority has come to Nehardea, who is lame; and he expounded concerning a wreath that it is permitted to wear one on the Sabbath.”

5. IV:6: Levi expounded in Nehardea, “A coronet is permitted.”

6. IV:7: R. Judah said Samuel said, “A girdle is permitted for wearing on the Sabbath in public domain.”

E. (2) A NECKLACE:

1. V:1: What is the definition of a necklace?

F. (3) NOSE RINGS:

1. VI:1: This refers to nose rings.

G. (4) A RING LACKING A SEAL:

1. VII:1: But then, if it has a seal, a woman would be liable — therefore it is not classified as ornamental. But by contrast: All metal ornaments of women are unclean: And what are these? the golden city tiara, necklace, ear rings and finger rings; and a ring, whether it has a seal, or whether it does not have a seal; and rings of the nose (M. **Kel. 11:8C**)!

a. VII:2: Gloss of foregoing.

H. OR (5) A NEEDLE LACKING A HOLE. BUT IF SHE WENT OUT WEARING ANY ONE OF THESE SHE IS NOT LIABLE FOR A SIN-OFFERING.

1. VIII:1: What good is it that it is regarded as ornamental?

XXXII. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 6:2

A. A MAN SHOULD NOT GO OUT WITH (1) A NAIL-STUDDED SANDAL:

1. I:1: A nail-studded sandal: How come? Said Samuel, “It was at the end of the time of the repression, and they were hiding in a cave, and they said, ‘Any who wants to come in, let him come in, but as to someone who wants to go out, let him not go out.’ One of them was turned around, so they thought that one of them had gone out and been spied upon by the enemy, who would now come against them. They crowded against one another and crushed one another to death, killing more of them than the enemies had.”

2. I:2: Said R. Judah said Samuel, “They have stated that rule only in connection with nails that are added to strengthen the sandal, but if the nails are for ornament, it is permitted to wear the sandal on the Sabbath.”

a. I:3: Secondary clarification of the foregoing.

b. I:4: As above.

c. I:5: As above.

3. I:6: Said R. Sheshet, “If one covered the whole of the sole with nails underneath so that the ground won’t wear out the sole, it is permitted to wear such a thing on the Sabbath.”

a. I:7: Gloss of a detail of the foregoing.

b. I:8: As above.

c. I:9: As above.

l. I:10: As above.

B. (2) A SINGLE SANDAL IF HE HAS NO WOUND ON HIS FOOT:

1. II:1: So if he has a wound on his foot, he may go out. Then with which of them does he go out that is, on which foot does he wear the sandal?

a. II:2: Illustration of the inferences of the foregoing.

l. II:3: As above.

2. II:4: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: When one puts on his shoes, he puts on the one for the right foot, then he ties on the one for the left, and when he takes them off, he takes off the left shoe first, then the right. When he washes his hands, he washes the right hand first and then the left, and when he puts on soap, he puts the soap on the right hand and then the left. And someone who wants to soap up his whole body soaps up the head first, since it is king over all the limbs.

C. (3) TEFILLIN:

1. III:1: Said R. Safra, "Don't suppose that this rule is formulated only within the view that the Sabbath is not the time for wearing phylacteries, but even from the perspective of him who says that the Sabbath also is a time for wearing phylacteries, one should not go out in them to the public domain. It may be that he will have to turn out to carry them in public domain."

D. (4) AN AMULET WHEN IT IS NOT BY AN EXPERT:

1. IV:1: Said R. Pappa, "Don't imagine that the sense is, the man who made it has to be an expert at making them, and the amulet also must be proved to be effective; but if the man who made it was an expert even though the amulet is not proved, it is still the case. You may note that a close reading of the language yields that conclusion, namely, nor with an amulet when it is not by an expert. But it does not say, and not with an amulet when it is not proven effective."

2. IV:2: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: What is the definition of an amulet that has been proven effective? It is any that has served to bring healing and done so a second and a third time. All the same are an amulet written down and one made of roots; they go out wearing either sort. And all the same are a person who is suffering from a life threatening ailment and one who is not threatened by a life threatening ailment. And it is permitted not only for a person who already has had an epileptic fit but even to ward one off of someone who has never had such a fit. And one may even tie and untie it in the street, on condition that one should not tie it on with a ring or a bracelet and go out onto the street, and that is for the sake of appearance (T. **Shab. 4:9A-G**).

3. IV:3: Said R. Pappa, "It is obvious to me that if three amulets work for three individuals, each for three times, then both the one who made the amulet and the amulet itself are validated. If three amulets work for three people, each once, the maker of the amulet is validated, but not the amulet. If one serves for three persons simultaneously, the amulet is validated but not the one who made it."

4. IV:4: The question was raised: Is the writing in amulets regarded as subject to the rules of sanctity, or perhaps is that writing not subject to the rules of sanctity?

E. (5) A BREASTPLATE:

1. V:1: It is a coat of mail.

F. (6) A HELMET:

1. VI:1: Said Rab, "It is a polished metal helmet."

G. OR (7) WITH GREAVES.

BUT IF HE WENT OUT WEARING ANY ONE OF THESE, HE IS NOT LIABLE TO A SIN-OFFERING.

1. VII:1: Said Rab, "These are what we call greaves in Aramaic."

XXXIII. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 6:3

A. A WOMAN SHOULD NOT GO OUT WITH (1) A NEEDLE WHICH HAS A HOLE:

1. I:1: **with a ring which has a seal:** Said Ulla, "And it is the opposite for men." If a man's ring has a signet, he is exempt from punishment; if it doesn't, he is liable. Therefore Ulla takes the view that anything that is suitable for a man is unsuitable for a woman, and whatever is suitable for a woman is not suitable for a man.\

B. A WOMAN SHOULD NOT GO OUT...(2) WITH A RING WHICH HAS A SEAL:

1. II:1: But lo, does carrying out qualify as doing so in a backhanded or unusual manner? Why is a woman culpable for going out wearing a signet ring, since this is not the usual manner for carrying such an object?

C. (3) WITH A COCHLAE BROOCH:

1. III:1: What is the definition of a cochlae brooch?

D. (4) WITH A SPICE BOX OR (5) WITH A PERFUME FLASK:

"AND IF SHE WENT OUT, SHE IS LIABLE TO A SIN-OFFERING," THE WORDS OF R. MEIR. AND SAGES DECLARE HER EXEMPT IN THE CASE OF A SPICE BOX AND A PERFUME FLASK.

1. IV:1: What is the definition of such a box?

2. IV:2: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: "A woman may not go out wearing a charm bead containing phyllon, and if she did so, she is liable to a sin-offering," the words of R. Meir. And sages say, "While she may not go out wearing such a thing, if she did, she is exempt." R. Eliezer says, "To begin with a woman may go out wearing a charm bead containing phyllon" (cf. T. **Shab. 4:11A-C**).

a. IV:3: Further discussion of foregoing. What is at issue here?

b. IV:4: As above.

l. IV:5: Inference drawn from the foregoing. Said R. Adda bar Ahbah, "That is to say, he who on the Sabbath carries out into public domain in a utensil foods that are of less than the requisite

measure to incur liability, he is nonetheless liable. For when the flask doesn't contain perfume, it is comparable to a case of a utensil with less than the requisite volume of food carried out in a utensil, and yet the Tannaite rule is that she is culpable."

E. TOPICAL COMPOSITE ON THE THEME OF WOMEN WHO INDULGE THEMSELVES IN LUXURY

1. IV:6: "And anoint themselves with the chief ointments" (Amo. 6: 6): Said R. Judah said Samuel, "This refers to spikenard oil."

2. IV:7: "That lie on beds of ivory and stretch themselves on their couches" (Amo. 6: 9): Said R. Yosé bar Hanina, "This refers to men who piss naked in front of their beds."

a. IV:8: Said R. Abbahu, and some say, in a Tannaite formulation it is repeated: "Three things impoverish a person: pissing in front of his bed naked, neglecting the washing of hands, and being cursed by one's wife right to his face."

3. IV:9: Expounded Raba b. R. Ilai, "What is the meaning of the verse, 'Moreover the Lord said, because the daughters of Zion are haughty' (Isa. 3:16)? It means that they walked along with haughty bearing. 'And walk with outstretched necks' (Isa. 3:16)? They walked heel by toe mincingly. 'And wanton eyes' (Isa. 3:16)? They filled their eyes with eye paint and gestured to men. 'Walking and mincing'? They would walk placing a tall woman by a short one.

4. IV:10: "Therefore the Lord shall smite with a scab the crown of the head of the daughters of Zion" (Isa. 3:17): Said R. Yosé R. Hanina, "This teaches that the skin ailment of Lev. 13-14 broke out on them. Here it is written, 'with a scab,' and elsewhere: 'This is the law for all manner of plagues of leprosy...and for a rising and for a scab' (Lev. 14:56)."

5. IV:11: "And the Lord will lay bare their secret parts" (Isa. 3:17): Rab and Samuel — One said, "This means they were poured out like a pitcher." The other said, "This means that their orifices were turned into a forest."

6. IV:12: Said R. Judah said Rab, "The men of Jerusalem were vulgar. A man would say to his buddy, 'So what'd ya' "eat" today? A good piece or a not so good piece of "bread"? White "wine" or dark "wine"? A wide "couch" or a narrow "couch"? With a good buddy or all by yourself?"

7. IV:13: Said Rabbah said R. Judah, "The fuel logs of Jerusalem were cinnamon, and when they burned, their fragrance floated throughout the whole of the Land of Israel. But when Jerusalem was destroyed, they were put away, and only a barley grain of them was left, and it is now found in the queen's collection of curiosities."

XXXIV. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 6:4

A. A MAN SHOULD NOT GO OUT WITH (1) A SWORD, (2) BOW, (3) SHIELD, (4) CLUB, OR (5) SPEAR. AND IF HE WENT OUT, HE IS LIABLE TO A SIN-OFFERING.

1. I:1: What is a club? It is a lance.

B. R. ELIEZER SAYS, “THEY ARE ORNAMENTS FOR HIM.” AND SAGES SAY, “THEY ARE NOTHING BUT UGLY, SINCE IT IS SAID, ‘AND THEY SHALL BEAT THEIR SWORDS INTO PLOWSHARES AND THEIR SPEARS INTO PRUNING HOOKS; NATION SHALL NOT LIFT UP SWORD AGAINST NATION, NEITHER SHALL THEY LEARN WAR ANY MORE’ (ISA. 2: 4).”

1. II:1: It has been taught on Tannaite authority: They said to R. Eliezer, “So if they’re ornaments for a man, how come they are going to cease in the days of the Messiah?” He said to them, “Because then they won’t be needed: ‘Nation shall not lift up sword against nation’ (Isa. 2: 4).”

a. II:2: Further comment on the foregoing.

b. II:3: Further comment on the foregoing.

c. II:4: Further comment on the foregoing. What is the scriptural basis for R. Eliezer’s position in holding that they’re just ornaments for a man?

C. DISCIPLES OF SAGES; TORAH STUDY AND ITS VALUE

1. II:5: Said R. Jeremiah said R. Eleazar, “Two disciples of sages sharpen one another in law. The Holy One, blessed be He, gives them success: ‘And in your majesty be successful’ (Psa. 45: 5) — read the letters for ‘in your majesty’ as though they yielded, ‘your sharpening.’”

2. II:6: Said R. Jeremiah said R. Simeon b. Laqish, “To disciples of sages who are gentle with one another in the law — the Holy One, blessed be He, pays close attention to them: ‘Then they that feared the Lord spoke with one another, and the Lord listened and heard’ (Mal. 3:16) — the sense of ‘spoke’ is only, gently, as in the usage, ‘He shall subdue the peoples under us’ (Psa. 47: 3) where the same word occurs.”

a. II:7: Further on Mal. 3:16.

3. II:8: Said R. Hinena bar Idi, “Anyone who carries out a religious duty as instructed — they never tell him bad news: ‘Whoever keeps the commandment shall know no evil thing’ (Qoh. 8: 5).”

4. II:9: Said R. Abba said R. Simeon b. Laqish, “Two disciples of sages who pay close attention to one another in law — the Holy One, blessed be He, listens to what they say: ‘You that dwell in the gardens, the companions hear your voice, cause me to hear it’ (Son. 8:13). But if they don’t do so, they make the Presence of God remove from Israel: ‘Flee my beloved...’ (Son. 8:14).”

5. II:10: Said R. Abba said R. Simeon b. Laqish, “Two disciples of sage who compete with one another for a banner position eminence in the law — the Holy One, blessed be He, loves them: ‘And his banner over me was love’ (Son. 2: 4).”

6. II:11: Said R. Abba said R. Simeon b. Laqish, “Greater is the action of one who makes an interest-free loan than one who gives to charity, but greater than both is one who accords to the other a share in a partnership for a poor person to trade with one’s own capital.”

7. II:12: And said R. Abba said R. Simeon b. Laqish, “If a disciple of a sage is persistent and insistent like a snake, gird him to your loins stay close to him. But even if an unlettered person is a pious, don’t live in his neighborhood.”

8. II:13: Said R. Kahana said R. Simeon b. Laqish, and some say, said R. Assi said R. Simeon b. Laqish, and some say, said R. Abba said R. Simeon b. Laqish, “Whoever keeps a vicious dog in his house keeps loving kindness out of his house: ‘To him that is ready to faint kindness should be showed from his friend’ (Job. 6:14), and in Greek, the word for dog is the same as the Hebrew word for ‘ready to faint.’”

a. II:14: Story.

9. II:15: Said R. Huna, “What is the meaning of this verse: ‘Rejoice, young man, in your youth, and let your heart cheer you in the days of your youth and walk in the ways of your heart and in the sight of your eyes, but know you, that for all these things, God will bring you into judgment’ (Qoh. 11: 9)? Up to this point is the statement of the impulse to do evil; from this point is the statement of the impulse to do good.”

D. A GARTER IS INSUSCEPTIBLE TO UNCLEANNESS, AND THEY GO OUT IN IT ON THE SABBATH. ANKLE CHAINS ARE SUSCEPTIBLE TO UNCLEANNESS, AND THEY DO NOT GO OUT IN THEM ON THE SABBATH.

1. III:1: Said R. Judah, “A garter is the same as a bracelet for the hand.”

2. III:2: Rabin stated, “A garter would be used on one leg, but an ankle chain would be used on two.”

E. THE SUSCEPTIBILITY TO UNCLEANNESS OF WOVEN MATERIAL

1. III:3: When R. Dimi came, he said R. Yohanan, “How on the basis do we know that woven material of any size at all, however small, is susceptible to uncleanness? It derives from the head plate worn by the high priest which was very tiny, but which counted as a piece of clothing and so was susceptible to uncleanness.”

2. III:4: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: Woven material of any size at all is susceptible to uncleanness, and an ornament of any size at all, however small, is susceptible to uncleanness, and an object that is partly woven and partly ornament of any size at all is susceptible to uncleanness. Sacking exceeds a garment, in that, as woven material in any size at all is susceptible to uncleanness.

3. III:5: Said Raba, “‘Woven material of any size at all is susceptible to uncleanness’: That derives from the phrase, ‘or raiment’ (Lev. 11:32) of any size at all. ‘And an ornament of any size at all, however small, is susceptible to uncleanness’: That derives from the case of the head plate. ‘And an object that is partly woven and partly ornament of any size at all is susceptible to uncleanness’: That derives from the phrase, ‘every utensil that is useful’ (Num. 31:51).”

4. III:6: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: “Sack” (Lev. 11:32): I know that subject to the law is only sack. How do I know that lattice-work fabric and a band are susceptible to the uncleanness of a dead swarming thing? Scripture says, “or sack.” Might one suppose that subject to uncleanness are ropes and pulleys? Scripture says, “sack.” The indicative trait of sacking is that it is made of spun and woven material, so subject to uncleanness is only fabric that is made of spun and woven material.

F. “AND WE HAVE BROUGHT THE LORD’S OFFERING, WHAT EACH MAN HAS GOTTEN OF JEWELS OF GOLD, ANKLE CHAINS, AND BRACELETS, SIGNET RINGS AND EAR RINGS AND ARMLETS” (NUM. 31:50)

5. III:7: Said R. Eleazar, “The word given as ear rings really means a cast of a breast of a woman, and the word translated as armlets really means, a cast of the womb.”

6. III:8: “And Moses was angry with the officers of the host” (Num. 31:14): Said R. Nahman said Rabbah bar Abbuha, “Said Moses to Israel, ‘Is it possible that you’ve gone back to your original corruption?’ They said to him, ‘There does not lack one man of us’ (Num. 31:49). He said to them, ‘If so, what need is there for atonement?’ They said to him, ‘If we have avoided actual transgression.’ Forthwith: ‘And we have brought the Lord’s offering, what each man has gotten of jewels of gold, ankle chains, and bracelets, signet rings and ear rings and armlets’ (Num. 31:50).”

7. III:9: A Tannaite authority of the household of R. Ishmael: “How come the Israelites of that generation required atonement? Because they fornicated with their eyes.”

8. III:10: Said R. Sheshet, “How come Scripture counts ornaments that show with the ones that don’t? To teach you: Whoever stares at a woman’s little finger is as though he stared at her vagina.”

XXXV. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 6:5

A. A WOMAN GOES OUT IN HAIR RIBBONS, WHETHER MADE OF HER OWN HAIR OR OF THE HAIR OF ANOTHER WOMAN OR OF A BEAST; AND WITH (1) HEADBAND, (2) HEAD BANGLES SEWN ON THE HEADDRESS,

1. I:1: Whether made of her own hair or of the hair of another woman or of a beast: It was necessary to make reference to all of these cases. For had we been informed only of the rule governing ribbons made of her own hair, I might have thought that that is because they are not repulsive, but as to those made of other women’s hair, which are ugly, I might have thought that that is not allowed. And if we were informed about the rule governing ribbons of someone else’s hair, I might have thought that that is because it is of her own species, but as to an animal’s, which is not of her own species, I might have thought that that is not permitted. So all of the specified items have to be listed.

2. I:2: A Tannaite statement: But that is on condition that a young woman doesn’t go out with the hair of an old woman, or an old woman with the hair of a young woman.

B. (3) A HAIR-NET, AND (4) WIG, IN THE COURTYARD:

1. II:1: Said Rab, “Anything that sages have prohibited one’s wearing in public domain is forbidden for carrying about a courtyard, except for a hair-net, and wig.” R. Anani bar Sasson in the name of R. Ishmael b. R. Yosé said, “It is all in the category of a hair-net.”

2. II:2: Said R. Judah said Rab, “Anything that sages have forbidden for appearances’ sake is forbidden even in one’s most private rooms.”

3. II:3: We have learned in the Mishnah: Or with a bell, even though it is plugged (M. 5:4B), but in that connection it has also been taught on Tannaite authority: And the bell at the neck must be stopped up. And it may wander about with it in the courtyard T. **Shab. 4:5A-K!**

C. (1) WITH WOOL IN HER EAR:

1. III:1: R. Ammi bar Ezekiel repeated as a Tannaite statement: “But that is so only if it is tied to her ear.”

D. (2) WOOL IN HER SANDALS:

1. IV:1: R. Ammi bar Ezekiel repeated as a Tannaite statement: “But that is so only if it is tied to her sandals.”

E. (3) WOOL SHE HAS USED FOR A NAPKIN FOR HER MENSTRUAL FLOW:

1. V:1: R. Ammi bar Hama considered ruling, “But that is so only if it is tied between her thighs.”

2. V:2: R. Jeremiah asked R. Abba, “If she made a handle for it, what is the rule?”

a. V:3: Examples of sages’ conduct.

F. (1) PEPPER:

1. VI:1: For halitosis.

G. (2) A LUMP OF SALT:

1. VII:1: For the gums.

H. AND (3) ANYTHING SHE PUTS INTO HER MOUTH, ON CONDITION THAT SHE NOT FIRST PUT IT THERE ON THE SABBATH. AND IF IT FELL OUT, SHE MAY NOT PUT IT BACK:

1. VIII:1: Ginger or cinnamon.

I. A FALSE TOOTH AND A GOLD TOOTH — RABBI PERMITS. AND SAGES PROHIBIT.

1. IX:1: Said R. Zira, “They taught this dispute only of a gold one, but as to one of silver, all parties concur that it is permitted.”

2. IX:2: Said Abbaye, “Rabbi, R. Eliezer, and R. Simeon b. Eleazar all take the view that whatever detracts from a person’s good looks is something one will not end up showing off.”

XXXVI. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 6:6-7

A. SHE GOES OUT WITH A SELA COIN ON A BUNION.

1. I:1: What is the definition of a bunion? A growth made by dirt. Why a sela coin in particular

B. LITTLE GIRLS GO OUT WITH THREADS AND EVEN SHIPS IN THEIR EARS.

1. II:1: The father of Samuel didn’t let his daughters go out with threads or sleep together; and Samuel’s father made for his daughters immersion pools in Nisan.

C. ARABIAN WOMEN GO OUT VEILED. MEDIAN WOMEN GO OUT WITH CLOAKS LOOPED UP OVER THEIR SHOULDERS. AND SO IS THE RULE FOR ANY PERSON, BUT SAGES SPOKE CONCERNING PREVAILING CONDITIONS.

SHE WEIGHTS HER CLOAK WITH A STONE, A NUT, OR A COIN, ON CONDITION THAT SHE NOT ATTACH THE WEIGHT FIRST ON THE SABBATH.

1. III:1: First you say, She weights, then you say, she not attach the weight!

2. III:2: Asked Abbaye, “What about a woman’s evading the rule by weighing her cloak on the Sabbath with a nut so as to carry it out to her baby?”

XXXVII. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 6:8

A. “A CRIPPLE LACKING A LEG GOES FORTH WITH HIS WOODEN STUMP,” THE WORDS OF R. MEIR. AND R. YOSÉ PROHIBITS IT:

1. I:1: “A cripple lacking a leg goes forth with his wooden stump,” the words of R. Meir. And R. Yosé prohibits it: Said Raba to R. Nahman, “How are we to memorize this rule of the Mishnah?”

2. I:2: It has been stated: Said Samuel, “A cripple does not go forth with his wooden stump.” And so said R. Huna, “A cripple does not go forth with his wooden stump.”

a. I:3: Gloss of foregoing.

B. AND IF IT HAS A RECEPTACLE FOR PADS, IT IS SUSCEPTIBLE TO UNCLEANNESS:

1. II:1: Said Abbaye, “It is susceptible to corpse uncleanness as a receptacle but it is not susceptible to pressure uncleanness as something used for sitting or lying.” Raba said, “It is also susceptible to pressure uncleanness.”

C. HIS KNEE PADS (1) ARE SUSCEPTIBLE TO UNCLEANNESS IMPARTED BY PRESSURE TO SOMETHING UPON WHICH A ZAB MAY LIE OR SIT, (2) THEY GO FORTH WITH THEM ON THE SABBATH, AND (3) THEY GO INTO A COURTYARD WITH THEM. HIS CHAIR AND ITS PADS (1) ARE SUSCEPTIBLE TO UNCLEANNESS IMPARTED BY PRESSURE, (2) THEY DO NOT GO OUT WITH THEM ON THE SABBATH, AND (3) THEY DO NOT GO IN WITH THEM INTO A COURTYARD.

1. III:1: A Tannaite authority recited before R. Yohanan: They go in with them into the Temple courtyard.

D. AN ARTIFICIAL ARM IS INSUSCEPTIBLE TO UNCLEANNESS, AND THEY DO NOT GO OUT IN IT.

1. IV:1: What is an artificial arm?

XXXVIII. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 6:9

A. BOYS GO OUT IN GARLANDS:

1. I:1: Boys go out in garlands: What are garlands? Said Adda Mari said R. Nahman bar Barukh said R. Ashi bar Abin said R. Judah, “Garlands of madder.”

a. I:2: Inserted gloss. Said Abbaye, “Mother told me, ‘Three things stop an illness, five things cure it, seven work even against witchcraft.’”

2. I:3: Well, then, why boys in particular? Even girls, too, should be permitted to wear garlands? And why minors in particular, even adults should be permitted as well! Rather: What are garlands?

B. WHAT IS BAD, GOOD FOR HEALTH

a. I:4: Various practices that are injurious to health. Said Abin bar Huna said R. Hama bar Guria, "Putting a hot cup on the belly button on the Sabbath is all right."

b. I:5: As above. And said Abin bar Huna said R. Hama bar Guria, "It is permitted to use oil and salt for anointing on the Sabbath."

c. I:6: Various practices that are good for health. And said Abin bar Huna said R. Hama bar Guria, "It is permitted to reset a laryngeal muscle on the Sabbath."

d. I:7: And said Abin bar Huna said R. Hama bar Guria, "It's o.k. to swaddle a baby on the Sabbath."

e. I:8: Said Abbaye, "Mother told me, 'All incantations repeated several times have to have the name of the mother of the patient, and all knots must be on the left hand.'"

f. I:9: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: People may go out on the Sabbath with a stone that preserves the foetus. In the name of R. Meir they said, "Also with a counterweight of a stone that preserves the foetus."

A. I:10: Gloss.

g. I:11: Said Abbaye, "Mother also told me, 'For a daily fever a quotidian whose paroxysms recur every day, someone should take a white zuz, go to a salt deposit, take the weight of the zuz in salt, tie the salt up in the nape of the neck with a white twisted cord. Or, if not that, then let him sit at the crossroads, and when he sees a big ant carrying a load, let him take it and throw it into a brass tube and close the end with lead and seal it with sixty seals. Let him shake it, lift it up and say to it, "Your burden be on me and mine on you."'"

h. I:12: Said R. Huna, "For a tertian fever, bring seven barbs from seven palm trees, seven chips from seven beams, seven pegs from seven bridges, seven piles of ashes from seven ovens, seven piles of dirt from under seven door sockets, seven bits of pitch from seven ships, seven handfuls of cumin, seven hairs from the beard of an old dog; tie then in the nape of the neck with a white twisted thread."

i. I:13: Said R. Yohanan, "For an inflammatory fever, take a knife that is all of iron, go where thorn hedges are found and tie a white twisted thread to the knife. On the first day, notch it slightly and say, 'and the angel of the Lord appeared to him' (Exo. 3: 2). The next day he makes a small notch and says, 'And when the Lord saw that he turned aside to see' (Exo. 3: 4)."

j. I:14: For an abscess, say this: "So let it be cut down, so let it be healed, so let it be overthrown, Sharlai and Amarlai are the angels sent from the

land of Sodom to heal boils and aches; basak, bazik, bisbazik, mismasik, kamun, kamit; your color be within you, your color be within you; your seat be within you, your seat be like a barren animal, like a mule that is not fruitful and doesn't increase; so you be fruitless and don't increase, in the body of Mr. So-and-so."

k. I:15: For ulcers say this: "A drawn sword, a ready sling, its name is not-Joheb, sickness and pains."

l. I:16: For a demon say this: "You were closed up, closed up were you; cursed, broken, destroyed be Bar Tit, Bar Tami, Bar Tina, as Shamgez Mezigaz and Istamai."

m. I:17: For a toilet demon say: "On the head of a lion and on the nose of a lioness we found the demon Bar Sherika Panda; with a bed of leeks I threw him down and with the jawbone of an ass I hit him."

C. AND PRINCES WITH BELLS. AND SO IS THE RULE FOR ANY PERSON, BUT SAGES SPOKE CONCERNING PREVAILING CONDITIONS.

1. II:1: Who is the authority behind this statement?

XXXIX. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 6:10

A. "THEY GO OUT WITH (1) A LOCUST'S EGG:

1. I:1: That is done for an ear ache.

B. (2) A FOX'S TOOTH:

1. II:1: That is done for sleep disorders. A living fox's tooth is the remedy for sleeping too much, a dead fox's tooth for insomnia.

C. (3) A NAIL FROM NAIL FROM A CRUCIFIXION:

1. III:1: That's put on an inflammation.

D. FOR PURPOSES OF HEALING," THE WORDS OF R. MEIR. AND SAGES SAY, "EVEN ON A WEEKDAY IT IS PROHIBITED TO GO FORTH WITH SUCH OBJECTS:

1. IV:1: Both Abbaye and Raba say, "Anything that possesses the power of healing is not forbidden on the count of 'the ways of the Amorites.'"

E. BECAUSE OF THE 'WAYS OF THE AMORITE' WHICH ISRAELITES ARE NOT TO ADOPT:

1. V:1: A Tannaite memorizer recited the chapters of the Tosefta on Amorite practices before R. Hiyya bar Abin. He said to him, "All of them are forbidden as Amorite practices, except for the following: He who has a bone stuck in his throat brings a bone of that sort and puts it on his forehead and says, 'One by one, go down, swallow, swallow, go down one by one,' and that is not forbidden under the rubric or the ways of the Amorite. For a fish bone, he says this: 'You are stuck in like a pink, you are locked up as within a cuirass, go down, go down.'"

2. V:2: He who says, "Be lucky, my luck, and don't get tired day or night" — that is forbidden on the count of the ways of the Amorites. R. Judah says, "The word

‘gad’ itself is no other than a term of idolatry: ‘you that prepare a table for Gad’ (Isa. 65:11)” (cf. T. **Shab. 7:1-2**).

3. V:3: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: It is permitted to put a lump of salt in a lamp to make it burn brightly, and mud and clay under a lamp to make it burn slowly.

4. V:4: R. Zutra said, “He who covers an oil lamp or uncovers a naphtha lamp violates the prohibition against sheer wanton waste.

5. V:5: “Wine and health to the mouth of our teachers” — is not subject to having done one of the Amorite practices. There is the incident that R. Aqiba made a banquet for his son, and over every glass of wine that he brought, he proclaimed, “Wine and health to the mouth of our teachers, health and wine to the mouths of our teachers and their disciples” (T. **7: 9**).

XL. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 7:1

A. A GOVERNING PRINCIPLE DID THEY STATE CONCERNING THE SABBATH:

1. I:1: How come the Tannaite framer of the passage has used the phrase, A governing principle did they state concerning the Sabbath? Should I say that, since he wishes to use the language for his Tannaite statement, And a further governing rule did they state, he has used the language here, A governing principle? And so, too, in the context of the rules of the Seventh Year, since he wanted to use the language, And a further governing rule did they state, he used the formulation also, A governing principle did they state concerning the Sabbath (M. **Sheb. 5:5, 7: 1**)? Then what about the matter of tithing, in which tractate we find the language, This is the governing principle (M. **Ma. 2:7L**), but the language, “governing principle” is not used!

B. WHOEVER FORGETS THE BASIC PRINCIPLE OF THE SABBATH AND PERFORMS MANY ACTS OF LABOR ON MANY DIFFERENT SABBATH DAYS IS LIABLE ONLY FOR A SINGLE SIN-OFFERING:

1. II:1: Both Rab and Samuel say, “Our Mishnah paragraph speaks of a child who was kidnapped by gentiles or a proselyte who converted while living among gentiles, but if one originally knew about the Sabbath but in the end forgot about it, one is liable for violation of each and every Sabbath.” But R. Yohanan and R. Simeon b. Laqish both say, “It is particularly in the case of one who knew and ultimately forgot who would be liable, but in the case of a child who was kidnapped by gentiles or a proselyte who converted while living among gentiles, he would be exempt.”

a. II:2: Scriptural basis for a subordinated statement in the forgoing.

b. II:3: As above.

c. II:4: Further analysis of II.1.

I. II:5: As above. Secondary analysis of II.2.

II. I:6: As above.

III. II:7: As above.

2. II:8: Said R. Huna, “If someone was going along the way or in the wilderness and doesn’t know which day is the Sabbath, he counts six days and then observes one day.” Hiyya bar Rab says “He observes one day and then counts six days.”

3. II:9: Said Raba, “Every day he prepares enough food for that day, except on that day which is the Sabbath by his reckoning.”

4. II:10: Said Raba, “If on the day that he discovered he has forgotten when it is the Sabbath, he nonetheless remembers how many days it is since he set out he recognizes the temporal relationship to the day he departed, he may work the whole of that day on the seventh day after he set out, without any restrictions, since he certainly didn’t commence his journey on the Sabbath.”

C. WHOEVER FORGETS THE BASIC PRINCIPLE OF THE SABBATH AND PERFORMS MANY ACTS OF LABOR ON MANY DIFFERENT SABBATH DAYS IS LIABLE ONLY FOR A SINGLE SIN-OFFERING:

1. III:1: How on the basis of Scripture do we know this fact?

D. HE WHO KNOWS THE PRINCIPLE OF THE SABBATH AND PERFORMS MANY ACTS OF LABOR ON MANY DIFFERENT SABBATHS...:

1. IV:1: How does the first clause differ from the second?

E. ...IS LIABLE FOR THE VIOLATION OF EACH AND EVERY SABBATH.

HE WHO KNOWS THAT IT IS THE SABBATH AND PERFORMS MANY ACTS OF LABOR ON MANY DIFFERENT SABBATHS IS LIABLE FOR THE VIOLATION OF EACH AND EVERY GENERATIVE CATEGORY OF LABOR. HE WHO PERFORMS MANY ACTS OF LABOR OF A SINGLE TYPE IS LIABLE ONLY FOR A SINGLE SIN-OFFERING.

1. V:1: How on the basis of Scripture do we know that various types of labor are treated as distinct categories for the present purpose?

a. V:2: But one can just as well derive the fact that various types of labor are treated as distinct categories for the present purpose from the passage from which R. Nathan derives it.

b. V:3: But one can just as well derive the fact that various types of labor are treated as distinct categories for the present purpose from the passage from which R. Yosé derives it.

2. V:4: Asked Raba of R. Nahman, “If one is responsible for forgetting the principle of both the Sabbath as a day on which labor is prohibited, and also that the given act of labor is prohibited on the Sabbath, what is the law?”

a. V:5: Secondary analysis of foregoing problem.

3. V:6: Said Raba, “If one reaped and ground grain to the volume of a dried fig, in a spell of unawareness of the Sabbath but of awareness as to the forbidden acts of labor and is liable on a single count, and he again reaped and ground grain to the volume of a dried fig knowing that it was the Sabbath but unaware of the prohibition as to the various acts of labor, and then he was informed of the reaping and grinding performed when aware of the Sabbath but unaware in regard to the labors, the atonement for the first act of reaping involves atonement for the second, and atonement for the first act of grinding involves atonement for the second. But if he was first informed about the reaping performed when he was

aware of the Sabbath but unaware of the forbidden labor, then atonement for this second reaping involves atonement for the first reaping and its accompanying grinding. But the corresponding grinding the second one stands as before. “Abbayye said, “Atonement for the first act of grinding involves atonement for the second as well; the classification, grinding, remains one and the same.”

a. V:7: Extension of the foregoing: A matter that was self-evident to Abbayye and Raba was found a problem by R. Zira. For R. Zira raised this question of R. Assi, and some say, R. Jeremiah asked R. Zira, “If one reaped or ground grain of the quantity of half a dried fig in unawareness of the Sabbath but full awareness of the prohibition of labor, and again reaped and ground grain of the same volume in awareness of the prohibition of the Sabbath but unaware of the prohibition of these particular acts of labor, can they be combined?” The requisite volume is made up only if we combine the two quite distinct classes of action.

5. V:8: It has been stated: If one ate two olive’s bulks of forbidden fat in a single spell of inadvertence, and he became aware of the first and then again he became aware of the second — R. Yohanan said, “He is liable on two counts.” R. Simeon b. Laqish said, “He is liable on only one count.”

a. V:9: Secondary development of foregoing: Said Rabina to R. Ashi, “Here are two possibilities of what is at issue. The first is, they disagree in a case in which the eating of the second piece became known to the sinner before he had designated an animal for a sin-offering for the first. In that case, this is what is at issue: The one authority maintains, spells of inadvertence may be subdivided. The knowledge first obtained concerning one piece divides this piece from the second, necessitating an offering for each, and the other holds, only the distinctions between the designations for particular purposes of animals for sin-offerings themselves are made. But as to the situation prevailing after the designation of an animal as a sin-offering for the first of the two actions in inadvertence, R. Simeon b. Laqish would concede to R. Yohanan that he is liable for two animal-offerings. Or perhaps, this is what is at issue: They differ where the facts of the matter became known to the sinner after the act of designating a beast as a sin-offering had taken place. This is then what is at issue between them: The one master holds, the designation of beasts for offerings is subject to division, while the other maintains, only the acts of atonement are subject to division. But if the sinner had learned about eating the second piece in what had been a spell of inadvertence before he had set apart an animal as a sacrifice on account of the first piece, R. Yohanan would concede to R. Simeon b. Laqish that he is liable for only a single animal-offering. Or perhaps they differ in both cases?”

I. V:10: Tertiary development: Said Ulla, “From the perspective of him who has said, ‘The obligation to present a guilt-offering for certainly having incurred guilt does not require that one have known about the sin that he has committed at the outset of the action but only at the end of the process of sinning,’ it would follow that, if one had sexual relations five times with a betrothed

handmaid, doing so unwittingly not knowing her status in violation of Lev. 19:21, which imposes the requirement of a guilt-offering in such a situation, the woman being betrothed to someone else, and between each action, he was informed of his prior offense, but he forgot and went and did it again, he would be obligated to present only a single guilt-offering.”

A. V:11: Gloss of foregoing: When Rabin came, he said, “All parties concur in the case of the betrothed bondmaid in one matter, and all parties concur in the case of the betrothed bondmaid in yet another matter. But there is a dispute concerning the betrothed bondmaid in yet a third matter.”

6. V:12: It has been stated: If one intended to raise up what was plucked from the ground but instead cut what was attached to the ground, he is exempt. What is the operative consideration? It is because lo, he did not have the intention of cutting anything at all. If, however, he intended to cut what was detached from the ground but instead cut what was attached to the ground, Abbaye said, “He is liable.” Raba said, “He is exempt, for lo, he had no intention of cutting that which was forbidden to be cut.”

a. V:13: Gloss of a secondary statement in the foregoing.

7. V:14: It has been stated: If the man intended to throw the stone two cubits and it fell four cubits away — Raba said, “He is exempt.” Abbaye said, “He is liable.”

8. V:15: If he thought it was private domain but it turned out to be public domain, Raba said, “He is exempt.” Abbaye said, “He is liable.”

a. V:16: And it was necessary to give us the three disputes these two plus the one we have just analyzed.

b. V:17: Extension of the disputes of V.12, 14, 15.

XLI. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 7:2

A. THE GENERATIVE CATEGORIES OF ACTS OF LABOR PROHIBITED ON THE SABBATH ARE FORTY LESS ONE:

1. I:1: What’s the point of the enumeration? Said R. Yohanan, “To teach that if someone does them all in a single spell of inadvertence, he still is liable on each count separately.”

B. (1) HE WHO SOWS:

1. II:1: So let’s examine the matter: Since ploughing is done before sowing, why shouldn’t the Tannaite framer of the passage first make reference to ploughing, then to sowing?

2. II:2: A Tannaite statement: Sowing, pruning, planting, bending a shoot, and drafting all form a single classification of labor.

3. II:3: Said R. Abba said R. Hiyya bar Ashi said R. Ammi, "He who prunes is liable on the count of planting, and he who plants, bends the vine, or grafts is liable on the count of sowing."

4. II:4: Said R. Kahana, "If one pruned his tree but requires the wood for fuel, he is liable on two counts, one on the count of planting, the other on the count of harvesting."

5. II:5: Said R. Joseph, "One who cuts hay is liable on two counts, one for reaping, the other for planting."

6. II:6: Said Abbaye, "One who trims beets in the earth is liable on two counts: reaping and planting."

C. (2) PLOUGHS:

1. III:1: A Tannaite statement: Ploughing, digging, and trench-making form a single classification of work.

2. III:2: Said R. Sheshet, "If someone had a mound of dirt and removes it, if he does this in the house, he is liable on the count of building; if he does this in the field, he is liable on the count of ploughing."

3. III:3: Said R. Abba, "He who digs a hole on the Sabbath and needs only the dirt is exempt on that account. And even according to R. Judah, who said, 'One is liable for doing an act of labor that is not needed for its own purpose,' that is the case only if he brings about an improvement, but in this case, he is doing damage."

D. (3) REAPS,

1. IV:1: A Tannaite statement: Reaping, vintaging, date gathering, olive collecting, fig gathering all form a single classification of labor.

2. IV:2: Said R. Pappa, "One who throws a piece of dirt at a palm tree to bring down dates is liable on two counts: detaching and stripping."

E. (4) BINDS SHEAVES:

1. V:1: Said Raba, "One who collects salt from a salt pan is liable on the count of binding sheaves."

F. (5) THRESHES:

1. VI:1: A Tannaite statement: Threshing, beating flax in the stalks, beating cotton all form a single classification of labor.

G. (6) WINNOWS, (7) SELECTS FIT FROM UNFIT PRODUCE OR CROPS:

1. VII:1: But the acts of winnowing, selecting, and sifting are all the same thing anyhow! How can one be liable on each count?

2. VII:2: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: With reference to the forms of labor, winnows, selects fit from unfit produce or crops: If before a person were various kinds of foods, he selects and eats what he wants, selects and leaves what he wants, but he must not make a selection and if he does, he is liable to present a sin-offering.

a. VII:3: What in the world can that possibly mean?

3. VII:4: If before a person were two kinds of food, and he selects and eats or selects and leaves over — R. Ashi repeated, “He is exempt.” R. Jeremiah of Difti repeated, “He is liable.”

a. VII:5: Story.

4. VII:6: Hezekiah said, “He who picks lupines out of their husks is liable.”

H. (8) GRINDS, (9) SIFTS:

1. VIII:1: Said R. Pappa, “One who cuts up beets very fine is liable on the count of grinding.”

I. (10) KNEADS, (11) BAKES:

1. IX:1: Said R. Pappa, “The Tannaite before us has neglected the boiling of ingredients for dyeing for example, for hangings and curtains, even though this took place in building the tabernacle, but treats nonetheless of baking which didn’t!”

2. IX:2: Said R. Aha bar R. Avira, “Someone who throws a tent peg into a stove for drying is liable on the count of cooking.”

3. IX:3: Said Rabbah bar R. Huna, “One who boils pitch is liable on the count of cooking.”

4. IX:4: Said Raba, “One who makes an earthenware barrel is liable on seven counts to bring seven sin-offerings. He who makes an oven is liable on eight counts.”

J. (12) HE WHO SHEARS WOOL, (13) WASHES IT, (14) BEATS IT, (15) DYES IT; (16) SPINS, (17) WEAVES, (18) MAKES TWO LOOPS, (19) WEAVES TWO THREADS, (20) SEPARATES TWO THREADS;

1. X:1: Said Rabbah bar bar Hannah said, R. Yohanan, “He who on the Sabbath spins wool from an animal’s back is liable on three counts: One because of shearing, the second because of hackling, and the third because of spinning.”

2. X:2: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: He who pulls a wing from a bird, trims it, and plucks the down, is liable for sin-offerings on three counts (T. **Shab. 9:20A**).

K. (21) TIES, (22) UNTIES:

1. XI:1: So where was there the need for tying in the building of the tabernacle? Said Raba, “They tied the tent pegs.” But that was tying with the intent of untying later on! Rather, said Abbayye, “When a thread broke, the weavers of the curtains tied it up.”

L. (23) SEWS TWO STITCHES:

1. XII:1: But these wouldn’t last two stitches by themselves will come out of the cloth, and work that does not produce a permanent result isn’t punished.

M. (24) TEARS IN ORDER TO SEW TWO STITCHES;

1. XIII:1: So where was there the need for tearing in the building of the tabernacle?

2. XIII:2: Said R. Zutra bar Tobiah said Rab, “He who pulls the thread of a seam on the Sabbath is liable to a sin-offering, and he who learns anything at all from a Magus is liable to the death penalty, and he who knows how to calculate the seasons and planets but doesn’t do so — it is forbidden to talk to him.”

a. XIII:3: As to the Magi — Rab and Samuel — One said, “It is pure sorcery.” The other said, “It is blasphemy.”

l. XIII:4: Said R. Simeon b. Pazzi said R. Joshua b. Levi in the name of Bar Qappara, “Whoever knows how to calculate the seasons and planets but doesn’t do so — concerning him Scripture says, ‘But they regard not the work of the Lord, neither have they considered the works of his hands’ (Isa. 5:12).”

N. (25) HE WHO TRAPS A DEER,

1. XIV:1: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: He who hunts purple fish and splits it open is liable on only a single count. R. Judah says, “He is liable on two counts” (cf. T. **Shab. 8:2C**).

a. XIV:2: Said Raba, “What is the theory behind rabbis’ ruling?

b. XIV:3: Well, anyhow, let him be held liable on the count of taking a life?

O. (26) SLAUGHTERS IT:

1. XV:1 On what count is one who slaughters liable in respect to the Sabbath? Rab said, “On the count of dyeing” for the blood of the cut throat dyes the flesh. And Samuel said, “Because of the taking of life.”

P. (27) FLAYS IT, (28) SALTS IT, (29) CURES ITS HIDE,

1. XVI:1: Yeah, but salting and curing the hide are one and the same thing!

2. XVI:2: Said Rabbah bar R. Huna, “One who salts meat is liable on the count of tanning.”

Q. (30) SCRAPES IT, AND (31) CUTS IT UP;

1. XVII:1: Said R. Aha bar Hanina, “He who on the Sabbath smooths the ground between columns is liable on the count of scraping.”

2. XVII:2: Said R. Hiyya bar Abba, “Three things did R. Assi tell me in the name of R. Joshua b. Levi: ‘He who on the Sabbath planes the tops of beams is liable on the count of cutting to measure. He who puts a poultice evenly over a sore is liable on the count of scraping. He who chisels around a stone on the Sabbath is liable on the count of striking with a hammer.’”

R. (32) HE WHO WRITES TWO LETTERS, (33) ERASES TWO LETTERS IN ORDER TO WRITE TWO LETTERS;

1. XVIII:1: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: If one wrote a very large letter and the space of the letter is sufficient to write two ordinary letters, he is exempt from penalty on this count. If he erased one large letter and there is room on the spot for writing two ordinary letters, he is liable. Said R. Menahem b. R. Yosé, “The rule covering erasing is more strict than the rule covering writing” (T. **Shab. 11:9-11**).

S. (34) HE WHO BUILDS:

(35) TEARS DOWN;(36) HE WHO PUTS OUT A FIRE, (37) KINDLES A FIRE; (38) HE WHO HITS WITH A HAMMER; (39) HE WHO TRANSPORTS AN OBJECT FROM ONE DOMAIN TO ANOTHER —

1. XIX:1: Rabbah and R. Zira both say, “Any action that involves completing the process of manufacturing an object is liable on the count of hitting with a hammer.”

T. LO, THESE ARE THE FORTY GENERATIVE ACTS OF LABOR:

1. XX:1: These... serves to exclude the position of R. Eleazar, who imposes liability for derivative classes of forbidden action when performed along with a generative class of action.

U. LESS ONE.

1. XXI:1: Less one... serves to exclude the position of R. Judah, as has been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Judah adds to the list of generative classes of action one who closes up a web and beats on the woof to even it out.

XLII. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 7:3

A. AND A FURTHER GOVERNING RULE DID THEY STATE: WHATEVER IS SUITABLE FOR STORAGE, WHICH PEOPLE GENERALLY STORE IN SUCH QUANTITY AS ONE HAS TAKEN OUT ON THE SABBATH — HE IS LIABLE TO A SIN-OFFERING ON ITS ACCOUNT:

1. I:1: Whatever is suitable for storage, which people generally store in such quantity as one has taken out on the Sabbath: What class of things is excluded by the language, Whatever is suitable for storage?

2. I:2: Said R. Yosé bar Hanina, “This rule is not in accord with R. Simeon. For were it in accord with R. Simeon, hasn’t he said, ‘All of these rules have been stated only relative to the condition of those who are storing things’” so that there is no fixed rule deriving from general practice, but we assess each situation in terms of the intent of him who is doing the storing; a rich person would store more, a poor person, less, each valuing things in his own terms.

B. AND WHATEVER IS NOT SUITABLE FOR STORAGE, WHICH PEOPLE GENERALLY DO NOT STORE IN SUCH QUANTITY AS ONE HAS TAKEN OUT ON THE SABBATH — ONLY HE IS LIABLE ON ITS ACCOUNT WHO STORES IT AWAY AND WHO THEN TAKES IT OUT.

1. II:1: Said R. Eleazar, “This does not accord with R. Simeon b. Eleazar, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority: A governing principle did R. Simeon b. Eleazar state, ‘In the case of anything that is not regarded as suitable for storage, the like of which in general people do not store away, but which a given individual has deemed fit for storage and has stored away, and which another party has come along and removed from storage and taken from one domain to another on the Sabbath — the party who moved the object across the line that separated the two domains has become liable by reason of the intentionality of the party who stored away this thing that is not ordinarily stored.’”

XLIII. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 7:4A-D

A. HE WHO TAKES OUT A QUANTITY OF (1) STRAW SUFFICIENT FOR A COW'S MOUTHFUL; (2) PEA STALKS SUFFICIENT FOR A CAMEL'S MOUTHFUL:

1. I:1: What is the definition of pea stalks?

2. I:2: When R. Dimi came, he said, "He who carries out a cow's mouthful of straw for a camel — "R. Yohanan said, 'He is liable.' R. Simeon b. Laqish said, 'He is exempt.'"

B. (3) EARS OF GRAIN SUFFICIENT FOR A LAMB'S MOUTHFUL: (4) GRASS SUFFICIENT FOR A KID'S MOUTHFUL:

1. II:1: But hasn't it been taught on Tannaite authority: as much as a dried fig?

C. (5) GARLIC OR ONION LEAVES, (IF FRESH, A DRIED FIG'S BULK), AND IF DRY, SUFFICIENT FOR A KID'S MOUTHFUL — HE IS LIABLE, AND THEY DO NOT JOIN TOGETHER WITH ONE ANOTHER TO FORM A QUANTITY SUFFICIENT FOR CULPABILITY, BECAUSE THEY ARE NOT SUBJECT TO EQUIVALENT MEASURES.

1. III:1: Said R. Yosé bar Hanina, "and they do not join together with one another to form a quantity sufficient for culpability in the case of a strict result, but they do do so in the case of a lenient result." The commodity whose standard is greater does not combine with that whose standard is lesser to make up that lesser quantity, but the latter does combine with the former to make up the greater quantity; that which requires a lesser quantity is naturally more stringent.

XLIV. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 7:4E-I

A. HE WHO TAKES OUT FOODSTUFFS FOR A HUMAN BEING IN THE VOLUME OF A DRIED FIG IS LIABLE. AND THEY DO JOIN TOGETHER WITH ONE ANOTHER TO FORM A QUANTITY SUFFICIENT FOR CULPABILITY, BECAUSE THEY ARE SUBJECT TO EQUIVALENT MEASURES EXCEPT FOR THEIR (1) HUSKS, (2) KERNELS, (3) STALKS, (4) COARSE BRAN, AND (5) FINE BRAN

1. I:1: Except for their (1) husks, (2) kernels, (3) stalks, (4) coarse bran, and (5) fine bran: But don't the husks and coarse bran join together with grain or flour? Haven't we learned in the Mishnah: Five-fourths qab of flour is subject to dough-offering once made into dough. If it i.e., the flour and its leaven, fine bran, and coarse bran together comprise five-fourths qab, the whole is subject to dough-offering once made into dough (M. [Hal. 2:6A-B](#))?

B. R. JUDAH SAYS, "EXCEPT FOR THE HUSKS OF LENTILS, WHICH ARE COOKED WITH THEM."

1. II:1: Lentils, not beans?! And hasn't it been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Judah says, "Excluding the shells of beans and of lentils"?

XLV. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 8:1

A. HE WHO TAKES OUT (1) WINE — ENOUGH TO MIX A CUP:

1. I:1: He who takes out wine — enough to mix a cup: A Tannaite statement: enough to mix a generous cup.

2. I:2: Said R. Nahman said Rabbah bar Abbuha, “The cup used for the blessing =Grace after Meals has to have a quarter of a quarter-log of raw wine, so that it may be mixed and add up to a quarter-log in all full to the brim.”

3. I:3: Tannaite statement: “As to congealed wine, the requisite volume is an olive’s bulk,” the words of R. Nathan (T. **Shab. 8:10C**).

a. I:4: Augmentation of the foregoing.

B. (2) MILK — ENOUGH FOR A GULP:

1. II:1: The question was raised: Is the correct spelling of the word “gulp” with an alef or an ayin?

a. II:2: Same question, different word.

b. II:3: Same question, different word.

c. II:4: Same question, different word.

2. II:5: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: He who carries out cow’s milk — the minimum volume to incur liability is enough for a gulp.

a. II:6: Asked R. Ashi, “Is that as much as is needed for dissolving, or for holding and dissolving part remaining on the fingers?”

C. (3) HONEY — ENOUGH TO PUT ON A SORE:

1. III:1: A Tannaite statement: enough to put on the opening of a sore.

a. III:2: Asked R. Ashi, “... enough to put on the opening of a sore — is that the whole opening of the sore, or just on the top of the sore, excluding enough to go around the whole sore, which isn’t necessary as part of the requisite volume?”

D. COMPOSITE ON ANTIDOTES AND REMEDIES

1. III:3: Said R. Judah said Rab, “Of whatever the Holy One, blessed be He, has created in his world, he has created nothing for nothing. He created the snail as a remedy for a scab, the fly as antidote to the hornet, the mosquito as antidote for a serpent’s bite, a serpent as the antidote for an eruption, a crushed spider as the antidote to a scorpion’s bite.”

a. III:4: Gloss.

2. III:5: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: There are five cases in which the weak frighten the strong: the fear cast by the Ethiopian gnat over the lion, the fear cast by the mosquito over the elephant, the fear cast by the spider over the scorpion, the fear cast by the swallow over the eagle, the fear cast by the stickleback fish over the Leviathan.

3. III:6: R. Zira happened by R. Judah, standing at the door of his father-in-law’s household, and observed that he was in a rollicking frame of mind, so that, if he asked him any of the secrets of the universe, he would reveal them to him. He said to him, “How come the goats go at the head of the flock, then the sheep?”

4. III:7: Continuing the foregoing.

5. III:8: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: There are three who get stronger as they get older, a fish, a snake, and a pig.

E. (4) OIL — ENOUGH TO ANOINT A SMALL LIMB:

1. IV:1: Said the household of R. Yannai, “Oil — enough to anoint a small limb of a day-old baby.”

a. IV:2: Secondary extension.

F. (5) WATER — ENOUGH TO RUB OFF AN EYE SALVE:

1. V:1: Said Abbayye, “Note that in any case in which there is a commonplace use and an uncommon use, rabbis followed the standards required for the common use of that thing, even when it produces a lenient decision. Where something may be routinely used for two common purposes, the rabbis followed the standards required for the common use so that it would produce a strict decision. In the case of wine, for instance, drinking it is common, using it for a remedy is not common. So rabbis followed the measure of wine sufficient for drinking, the more common use, and that yielded a lenient decision. In the case of milk, which it is common to eat and not common to use for a remedy, rabbis followed the measure that would be required for an act of eating, which also produced a lenient ruling. When it comes to honey, which it is common to eat and also common to use for healing, rabbis followed the measure that would be required for use for healing, which is smaller than the other and which therefore produces a strict decision. As to water, in which case it is common to drink it but uncommon to use it for healing, how come rabbis followed the measure sufficient to use water for healing, so producing a strict ruling?”

G. AND (6) OF ALL OTHER LIQUIDS, A QUARTER-LOG: (7) AND OF ALL SLOPS REFUSE, A QUARTER-LOG. R. SIMEON SAYS, “ALL OF THEM ARE SUBJECT TO THE MEASURE OF A QUARTER-LOG. AND THEY HAVE STATED ALL THESE MEASURES ONLY WITH REFERENCE TO THOSE WHO STORE THEM AWAY.”

1. VI:1: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: As to blood and all other liquids, the requisite measure for incurring liability by transporting such liquids on the Sabbath is a quarter-log. R. Simeon b. Eleazar says, “As to blood, it must be sufficient for painting one eye, for that is how a cataract of the eye is painted” (T. **Shab. 8:10H-J**).

a. VI:2: Gloss of a detail of the foregoing.

b. VI:3: Gloss of a detail of the foregoing.

XLVI. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 8:2-4

A. HE WHO TAKES OUT (1) ROPE — ENOUGH TO MAKE A HANDLE FOR A BASKET; (2) REED CORD — ENOUGH TO MAKE A HANGER FOR A SIFTER OR A SIEVE — R. JUDAH SAYS, “ENOUGH TO USE IT TO TAKE THE MEASURE OF A SHOE FOR A CHILD” —

1. I:1: He who takes out rope — enough to make a handle for a basket: For a cord, too, one should be liable if he carries out so much as is needed to make a hanger for a sieve or a basket sieve?

2. I:2: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: As for palm leaves, the requisite volume is enough to make a handle for a basket made of twigs. As for bast — others say, “Enough to put on the opening of a small funnel for straining wine.”

B. (3) PAPER — ENOUGH TO WRITE ON IT A RECEIPT FOR A TAX COLLECTOR.

1. II:1: A Tannaite statement: How big is a tax collector’s receipt? Enough paper for writing two letters.

2. II:2: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: He who takes out a receipt of a tax collector, before he has shown it to the tax collector, is liable; after he has shown it to the tax collector, he is exempt. R. Judah says, “Even if he brings it out after he has shown it to the tax collector, he is liable, because he still needs it to show it to the tax collector if he tries to collect a second time” (T. **Shab. 8:11A-C**).

a. II:3: So what’s at issue between these two positions?

3. II:4: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: He who takes out a bond — if this is before it has been collected, he is liable. If it is after it has been collected, he is exempt. R. Judah says, “Also one who takes out an already collected bond is liable, since he needs the document” (T. **Shab. 8:12A-C**).

a. II:5: So what’s at issue between these two positions?

4. II:6:

C. AND HE WHO TAKES OUT (1) A RECEIPT FOR A TAX COLLECTOR IS LIABLE; (2) USED PAPER — ENOUGH TO WRAP AROUND A SMALL PERFUME BOTTLE. (3) LEATHER — ENOUGH TO MAKE AN AMULET;

1. III:1: Raba raised this question of R. Nahman: “He who carries out from private to public domain a piece of hide — for how small a piece would liability be incurred?”

D. (4) PARCHMENT — ENOUGH TO WRITE ON IT A SMALL PERICOPHE OF THE TEFILLIN, WHICH IS “HEAR O ISRAEL”;

1. IV:1: By contrast: **parchment and inferior parchment — enough to write a mezuzah thereon** (T. **Shab. 8:13B**).

a. IV:2: What is the definition of mezuzah in this context?

b. IV:3: Continuation of the foregoing.

3. IV:4: Said Rab, “Inferior parchment — lo, it is classified as parchment. Just as on parchment the phylacteries may be written, so on inferior parchment, the phylacteries may be written.”

a. IV:5: R. Pappa said, “Rab made his statement in accord with the position of the Tannaite authority of the household of Manasseh. For the Tannaite authority of the household of Manasseh stated: If one wrote it on paper or a rag, it is unfit; on parchment, parchment treated with gallnut, or inferior parchment, it is fit.”

b. IV:6: Continuation of the foregoing.

E. (5) INK — ENOUGH TO WRITE TWO LETTERS:

1. V:1: A Tannaite statement: Two letters — written in ink, two letters — written by pen, or two letters — in an inkstand.

2. V:2: Raba raised this question: “What is the law if it was sufficient ink for One letter — written in ink, one letter — written by pen, or one letter — in an inkstand?”

3. V:3: Said Raba, “If one took out enough ink to write two letters and wrote them while he was walking along, he is liable, because the act of writing is equivalent to the act of putting the thing down.”

4. V:4: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: If one carried out from private to public domain a half-fig and then went and carried out another half-fig in a single spell of unawareness, he is liable. If it was in two spells of unawareness, he is exempt. R. Yosé says, “If it was in a single spell of unawareness in a single domain, he is liable; if it was in two domains, he is exempt.”

F. (6) EYE SHADOW — ENOUGH TO SHADOW ONE EYE.

1. VI:1: One eye?! But lo, people don’t shadow only one eye!

G. (7) LIME — ENOUGH TO PUT ON THE HEAD OF A LIME TWIG; (8) PITCH OR SULPHUR — ENOUGH FOR MAKING A SMALL HOLE:

1. VII:1: A Tannaite statement: enough to put on the head of a lime twig of a hunter’s rod.

H. (9) WAX — ENOUGH TO PUT OVER A SMALL HOLE:

1. VIII:1: A Tannaite statement: enough to put on the small hole for wine.

I. (10) CLAY — ENOUGH TO MAKE THE BELLOW’S HOLE OF THE CRUCIBLE OF A GOLDSMITH. R. JUDAH SAYS, “ENOUGH TO MAKE A PROP.”

1. IX:1: Does that bear the implication that the requisite measure as defined by R. Judah is larger? But we know as fact that rabbis’ requisite measure is larger, for we have learned in the Mishnah: R. Judah says, “Enough to use it to take the measure of a shoe for a child” (M. **8:2B**)!

2. IX:2: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: He who carries out hair — the minimal volume for culpability is enough to knead clay with it. Clay — enough to make the bellow’s hole of the crucible of a goldsmith (T. **Shab. 8:15, 8:16A**).

J. (11) BRAN — ENOUGH TO PUT ON THE MOUTH OF THE CRUCIBLE OF A GOLDSMITH; (12) QUICKLIME — ENOUGH TO SMEAR THE LITTLE FINGER OF A GIRL:

1. X:1: A Tannaite statement: enough to smear the little finger of girls.

2. X:2: “Six months with oil of myrrh” (Est. 2:12): What is oil of myrrh?

3. X:3: It has been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Judah says, “Olives for olive oil from a manured field refers to olives that are not a third grown. And why is it used for smearing? Because it serves as a depilatory and skin softener.”

a. X:4: R. Bibi had a daughter with dark skin, on which he put that ointment limb by limb, and this produced for her a husband who had four hundred zuz.

K. R. JUDAH SAYS, “ENOUGH TO TAKE OFF THE HAIR ON THE TEMPLES.” R. NEHEMIAH SAYS, “ENOUGH TO TAKE OFF THE HAIR ON THE FOREHEAD.”

1. XI:1: What is the definition of hair on the temples, and what is the definition of hair on the forehead?

a. XI:2: Secondary development of foregoing.

b. XI:3: Secondary development of foregoing.

XLVII. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 8:5

A. (1) “EARTH FOR CLAY — ENOUGH TO MAKE A SEAL FOR A LARGE SACK,” THE WORDS OF R. AQIBA. AND SAGES SAY, “A SEAL FOR A LETTER.” “(2) MANURE OR (3) FINE SAND — ENOUGH TO MANURE A CABBAGE STALK,” THE WORDS OF R. AQIBA. AND SAGES SAY, “ENOUGH TO MANURE A LEEK.” (4) COARSE SAND — ENOUGH TO COVER A PLASTERER’S TROWEL;

1. I:1: A Tannaite statement: enough to put on the top of a plasterer’s trowel.

2. I:2: Who is the Tannaite authority who maintains that sand improves plaster?

B. (5) REED — ENOUGH TO MAKE A PEN.

1. I:1: A Tannaite statement: A pen that reaches the finger joints (T. Shab. 8:21A-B).

a. I:2: R. Ashi raised this question: “Does that mean the upper or the lower joint?”

C. AND IF IT WAS THICK OR BROKEN — ENOUGH TO MAKE A FIRE TO COOK THE SMALLEST SORT OF EGG, MIXED WITH OIL AND PUT IN A PAN.

1. III:1: A Tannaite statement: beaten up with oil and put in a stew pot.

2. III:2: Said Mar b. Rabina to his son, “Have you heard what ‘the smallest sort of egg’ is?”

XLVIII. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 8:6

A. (1) BONE — ENOUGH TO MAKE A SPOON. R. JUDAH SAYS, “ENOUGH TO MAKE A TOOTH OF A KEY WITH IT.”

1. I:1: Does that bear the implication that the requisite definition of R. Judah is larger than that of rabbis? But lo, we have it as an established fact that the requisite measure defined by rabbis is larger!

2. I:2: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: The wards of a lock are insusceptible to uncleanness. If one fixed them into the lock, they are susceptible to uncleanness. But if the lock serves a revolving door, even when fixed to the door and nailed on with nails, the wards are insusceptible, because whatever is attached to the soil is classified as is the soil insusceptible to uncleanness.

B. (2) GLASS — ENOUGH TO SCRAPE THE END OF A SHUTTLE:

1. II:1: A Tannaite statement: glass — enough to break across two threads at once.

C. (3) PEBBLE OR STONE — ENOUGH TO THROW AT A BIRD. R. ELIEZER B. R. JACOB SAYS, “ENOUGH TO THROW AT A BEAST.”

1. III:1: Said R. Jacob said R. Yohanan, “But that is the case only if the stone is big enough for the animal to feel it.”

D. UTILIZATION OF STONES TO CLEAN UP AFTER DEFECATING

1. III:2: Zonin went into the house of study. He said to them, “My lords, what is the requisite size of stones used in the toilet for removing shit?” They said to him, “The size of an olive, a nut, and an egg.” He said to him, “So are we going to have to take into the toilet a balance to know the proper volume of the stones?” They took a vote and decided that the requisite measure was simply a handful.

a. III:3: Tannaite complement to the foregoing.

2. III:4: It has been taught on Tannaite authority: On the Sabbath it is permitted to take along three rounded pebbles into the privy. Such a privy has no walls, and ordinarily one could not carry an object into it.

a. III:5: Gloss.

3. III:6: Said R. Judah, “But not with a brittle stone.”

4. III:7: Said Raba, “On the Sabbath it is forbidden to utilize a chip as a suppository in the way in which one does so on weekdays.”

5. III:8: Said R. Yannai, “If the privy has a fixed location, one may bring in a handful of stones; if not, only a stone the size of the leg of a small spice mortar may be brought in.”

a. III:9: Gloss of a detail of the foregoing: Said Abbaye to R. Joseph, “If rain fell on it and the stain was washed away, what’s the law?”

6. III:10: Rabbah bar R. Shila asked R. Hisda, “What is the law as to bringing up stones after himself to the roof?” He said to him, “The honor owing to human beings is so considerable that it overrides the negatives of the Torah.” One may do so.

7. III:11: Said R. Huna, “It is forbidden on the Sabbath to take a shit in a ploughed field.”

a. III:12: Gloss of foregoing.

l. III:13: Extension of foregoing.

8. III:14: Said R. Yohanan, “On the Sabbath it is forbidden to wipe oneself with a sherd.”

a. III:15: Amplification of foregoing.

l. III:16: Extension of foregoing.

A. III:17: Why these are religious matters.

9. III:18: If before someone were a pebble and a sherd — R. Huna said, “He wipes himself with the pebble and he doesn’t dry himself with the sherd.” And R. Hisda said, “He wipes himself with the sherd and he doesn’t dry himself with a pebble.”

10. III:19: If before someone were a pebble and grass — R. Hisda and R. Hamnuna — One said, “One wipes himself with a pebble and doesn’t wipe himself with grass.” The other said, “He wipes himself with grass and doesn’t wipe himself with a pebble.”

11. III:20: He who has to take a shit but doesn’t do it — R. Hisda and Rabina — One said, “He smells like a fart.” The other said, “He smells like shit.”

12. III:21: He who has to take a shit but can’t — Said R. Hisda, “Let him stand up and sit down again, stand up and sit down again.” R. Hanan of Nehardea said, “Let him shift from side to side.” R. Hamnuna said, “Let him fiddle around with a pebble on the anus.”

13. III:22: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: He who comes into a house to take a regular meal should first walk ten lengths of four cubits — others say, four of ten — and take a shit and then go in and sit in his regular place.

XLIX. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 8:7

A. “POTSHERD — ENOUGH TO PUT BETWEEN ONE BOARD AND ANOTHER,” THE WORDS OF R. JUDAH. R. MEIR SAYS, “ENOUGH TO SCOOP UP FIRE.” R. YOSÉ SAYS, “ENOUGH TO HOLD A QUARTER-LOG OF LIQUID.” SAID R. MEIR, “EVEN THOUGH THERE IS NO PROOF FOR THE PROPOSITION, THERE IS AT LEAST A HINT FOR IT: ‘AND THERE SHALL NOT BE FOUND AMONG THE PIECES OF IT A SHERD TO TAKE FIRE FROM THE EARTH’ (ISA. 30:14).”

1. I:1: The question was raised: Is the requisite measure defined by R. Meir greater, or is the requisite measure defined by R. Yosé greater?

B. SAID TO HIM R. YOSÉ, “FROM THAT SAME VERSE THERE IS PROOF FOR MY PROPOSITION: ‘OR TO SCOOP UP WATER WITHAL OUT OF THE CISTERN.’”

1. II:1: Didn’t R. Yosé give a good answer to R. Meir?

L. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 9:1

A. SAID R. AQIBA, “HOW DO WE KNOW OF AN IDOL THAT IT IMPARTS UNCLEANNESS WHEN IT IS CARRIED IN THE SAME WAY THAT A MENSTRUATING WOMAN WHEN SHE IS CARRIED, IMPARTS UNCLEANNESS TO THE ONE WHO CARRIES HER? SINCE IT IS SAID, ‘YOU SHALL CAST THEM AWAY LIKE A MENSTRUAL THING, YOU SHALL SAY TO IT, GET THEE HENCE’ (ISA. 30:22) — JUST AS THE MENSTRUATING WOMAN IMPARTS UNCLEANNESS WHEN SHE IS CARRIED SO AN IDOL IMPARTS UNCLEANNESS WHEN IT IS CARRIED.”

1. I:1: There we have learned in the Mishnah: He the wall of whose house was adjacent to and also served as the wall of the temple of an idol, and whose house fell down — it is forbidden to rebuild it. What should he then do? He pulls back within four cubits inside his own property and then rebuilds his house. 82B If there was a wall belonging both to him and to the temple of an idol, it is judged to be divided half and half. The stones, wood, and mortar deriving from it impart uncleanness in the status of a dead creeping thing, for it is said, “You will utterly detest it” (Deu. 7:26). R. Aqiba says, “In the status of a menstruant’s uncleanness,

as it is said, ‘You shall cast them away as a menstrual thing; you shall say unto it, Get you hence’ (Isa. 30:22). Just as a menstruating woman imparts uncleanness to one who carries her or objects that she carries, so also an idol imparts uncleanness to one who carries it” (M. **A.Z. 3: 6**).

a. I:2: Secondary development of the foregoing. Said Rabbah, “As to the word ‘you shall cast them away’ that Scripture uses, the consonants of the word yield the sense, ‘you shall treat them as alien to you as a stranger.’ ‘You shall say unto it, Get you hence’ — but you shall not say to it, ‘come on in.’”

b. I:3: Secondary development of the foregoing. And R. Eleazar said, “With respect to an exceptionally heavy stone, all parties concur that uncleanness is not transferred from the top to objects that bear the weight underneath under the present circumstances. Where they differ, it concerns the issue of whether or not the idol conveys uncleanness to one who carries it. R. Aqiba takes the view that it is comparable to a menstruating woman: Just as the menstruating woman conveys uncleanness to the one that carries her, so an idol conveys uncleanness to the one who carries it. And sages maintain that it is comparable to a dead creeping thing: Just as a dead creeping thing does not convey uncleanness to one who carries it, so an idol doesn’t convey uncleanness to one who carries it.”

c. I:4: Secondary development of the foregoing. An objection was raised: An idol is comparable to a dead creeping thing, and the utensils that are necessary to utilize it are likewise unclean like a dead creeping thing. R. Aqiba says, “An idol is unclean like a menstruating woman, but the utensils that are necessary to use the idol are unclean like a dead creeping thing.” Now from R. Eleazar’s perspective, that poses no problem. But from the viewpoint of Rabbah, it is a problem.

d. I:5: Secondary development of the foregoing. An objection was raised: A gentile male or female, an idol and utensils that are used with it are unclean, but shifting them does not convey uncleanness. R. Aqiba says, “Both they and also shifting them convey uncleanness.” Now from R. Eleazar’s perspective, that poses no problem. But from the viewpoint of Rabbah, it is a problem.

I. I:6: Secondary development of the foregoing.

e. I:7: Secondary development of the foregoing. In accord with what authority is the following, which has been taught on Tannaite authority: All unclean things that move clean things — the clean things remain clean, except for the movement of a person afflicted with flux. For we don’t find a parallel in the entire Torah to that rule? May we say that it is not in accord with R. Aqiba, for were it in accord with R. Aqiba, then from his perspective there also is the case of an idol!

2. I:8: R. Hama bar Guria asked: “As to an idol, does that status affect its limbs or not? In a case in which an unskilled laborer can restore the limbs, that is no question, since in that case, these are treated as though they were still attached. Where it is a question, it is a case in which an unskilled laborer can’t put the limbs

back. Now what is the rule? Since an unskilled laborer can't put the limbs back, it is as though it were broken, or maybe in such a case it's not lacking anything anyhow?"

3. I:9: R. Ahadeboy bar Ammi raised this question: "What is the rule governing an idol of the volume of less than an olive?"

a. I:10: And from the perspective of rabbis, what's the practical consequence of this ruling that it is comparable to a dead creeping thing? It is that it won't convey uncleanness if it is carried. And what's the practical consequence of comparing it to a menstruating woman? That it does not retain uncleanness in the limbs that have been cut off. And of the comparison to the corpse? That it doesn't impart uncleanness in so small a volume as that of a lentil.

II. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 9:2A-B

A. "HOW DO WE KNOW OF A BOAT THAT IT IS INSUSCEPTIBLE TO UNCLEANNESS? SINCE IT SAYS, 'THE WAY OF A SHIP IN THE MIDST OF THE SEA' (PRO. 30:19)."

1. I:1: Well, it's pretty obvious that the way of the ship is in the midst of the sea. Here we are informed of the comparison to the sea: Just as the sea is insusceptible to uncleanness, so the ship is insusceptible to uncleanness. It has been taught on Tannaite authority: Hananiah says, "We may draw the clarifying analogy from the case of sacking only wooden utensils that are like sacking can be unclean, in line with Lev. 11:32 — just as sacking can be carried whether empty or filled, so anything that can be carried empty or filled is in its status, excluding a boat, which can be carried empty but not filled.

a. I:2: Said R. Judah said Rab, "A person should never refrain from going to the schoolhouse, even for a single moment, for lo, how many years has this Mishnah paragraph been repeated in the house of study, but the reason for it was never set forth, until R. Hanina b. Aqabayya came along and explained it."

b. I:3: Same sentiment, different case.

2. I:4: Continuation of I:1: Said Raba, "And from the perspective of Hanania, carrying by means of oxen is classified as carrying since only oxen can carry Jordan boats. For we have learned in the Mishnah: There are three classifications of wagons: One built like an arm chair is susceptible to uncleanness from pressure such as is exerted by a menstruating woman, one made as if a bed is susceptible to uncleanness deriving from a corpse; one made of stone is susceptible to no form of uncleanness (M. **Kel. 24: 2**). And said R. Yohanan, 'But if it has a receptacle that can hold pomegranates, it is susceptible to corpse uncleanness.' There are three classifications of chest: A chest with an opening at the side is usable as a bench and so is susceptible to pressure uncleanness like a chair or a bed; one with a hole at the top is susceptible to corpse uncleanness, and a very large one is susceptible to no form of uncleanness (M. **Kel. 24: 3**)."

3. I:5: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: Pressure uncleanness inflicted on an earthenware utensil is null. If a person afflicted with flux

uncleanness or a menstruant sits on an earthenware utensil, but does not enter the contained airspace of the utensil, he or she does not transfer pressure uncleanness to the utensil merely by exerting pressure through sitting on it.

a. I:6: What's the sense of his statement?

b. I:7: How on the basis of Scripture do we know the fact that pressure uncleanness inflicted on an earthenware utensil is null?

c. I:8: Raba said, "The fact that pressure uncleanness inflicted on an earthenware utensil is null derives from the following verse: 'And every open vessel, which has no covering tightly sealed upon it, is unclean' (Num. 19:15). Then if it has a seal tightly closing it, it is clean. The uncleanness must affect the contained air space of the utensil. Aren't we dealing with a utensil that one had assigned to serve as a seat for his wife, who is menstruating, and the All-Merciful has said that it is nonetheless unaffected by use as a chair and so insusceptible to pressure uncleanness."

LII. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 9:2C-E

A. "HOW DO WE KNOW OF A GARDEN BED, SIX HANDBREADTHS SQUARE, THAT FIVE DIFFERENT KINDS OF SEED MAY BE SOWN IN IT, FOUR ON THE SIDES AND ONE IN THE MIDDLE M. KIL. 3:1? SINCE IT SAYS, 'FOR AS THE EARTH BRINGS FORTH HER BUD AND AS THE GARDEN CAUSES SEEDS SOWN IN IT TO SPRING FORTH' (ISA. 61:11) — 'ITS SEED' IS NOT SAID, BUT 'ITS SEEDS.'"

1. I:1: What is the implication of the cited verse that yields this result?

a. I:2: Gloss of a detail of the foregoing.

B. ...SIX HANDBREADTHS SQUARE:

1. II:1: Said R. Assi, "The internal area of the seed bed must be six handbreadths square, not counting the borders."

2. II:2: And how much must its borders be?

3. II:3: Said Rab, "We have learned the rule of the Mishnah to pertain to a seed bed in a waste plot."

4. II:4: Said Ulla, "In the West they raised this question: What is the law if someone drew one furrow across the whole?"

5. II:5: Said R. Kahana said R. Yohanan, "He who wants to fill up his entire patch with vegetables makes it into beds six handbreadths square, describing in each a circle of a diameter of five handbreadths, filling the corner with whatever he wants" which arrangement demonstrates for all to see that there is no planting of mixed seeds.

LIII. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 9:3-4

A. "HOW DO WE KNOW OF HER WHO EMITS SEMEN ON THE THIRD DAY AFTER HAVING HAD SEXUAL RELATIONS THAT SHE IS UNCLEAR? SINCE IT SAYS, 'AND BE READY AGAINST THE THIRD DAY, COME NOT NEAR A WOMAN' (EXO. 19:15):"

1. I:1: As will be seen in materials set forth presently, with reference to the allegation that How do we know of her who emits semen on the third day after having had sexual relations that she is unclean? the first clause is not in accord with the principle of R. Eleazar b. Azariah, but the second is in accord with R. Eleazar b. Azariah, for in regards R. Eleazar b. Azariah, we have heard the tradition that she is clean. One who does not care to assign the Mishnah rule to a conflict of Tannaite authorities repeats the first clause as clean, and assigns the whole of the passage to accord with R. Eleazar b. Azariah, but one who does care to assign the passage to a conflict of Tannaite opinion will attribute the first clause to rabbis and the second to R. Eleazar b. Azariah. Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: “She who discharges semen on the third day after having intercourse is clean,” the words of R. Eleazar b. Azariah. If she has sexual relations on Thursday and discharges on the Sabbath, she is clean, no matter at which part of the two days sexual relations and discharge took place. R. Ishmael says, “Sometimes they are four periods, sometimes they are five, sometimes they are six.”

a. I:2: Secondary expansion of the foregoing. When rabbis made this statement before R. Pappa, and some say, R. Pappa to Raba, he replied, “Well, there’s no problem in respect to the views of R. Eleazar b. Azariah. He concurs with rabbis, who take the view that on Thursday, there was an abstention from sexual relations. And R. Ishmael concurs with R. Yosé, who said, ‘It was on Wednesday prior to the giving of the law that they abstained from sexual relations.’ But in accord with what position does R. Aqiba take the view that he does?”

b. I:3: Continuation of the foregoing. Lo, one way or the other, they were in the status of those who had immersed but had to await sunset for the completion of their rite of purification!

c. I:4: Continuation of the foregoing. Well, anyhow, why couldn’t they have immersed at twilight and received the Torah at twilight?

d. I:5: Continuation of the foregoing.

e. I:6: Continuation of the foregoing.

I. I:7: R. Pappa raised this question: “What is the rule governing Israelite semen in a Samaritan belly? Is it that, because Israelites are anxious about keeping the religious duties, their bodies heat up and ruin the semen in three days but that is not true of gentiles, who are not anxious about keeping the religious duties? Or do we say that, just as they eat dead creeping things, so their bodies, too, are overheated? And should you say, just as they eat dead creeping things, their bodies are overheated and ruin the semen in three days, what about Israelite semen in a beast’s belly? Do we say, a woman, who has a fore-uterus, makes the semen stink, but an animal doesn’t, having none? Or perhaps it makes no difference?”

2. I:8 Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: On the sixth of the month of Sivan the Ten Commandments were given to Israel. R. Yosé says, “On the seventh of that month.” The relevance of this item emerges in the secondary expansion that follows.

a. I:9: Said Raba, “All parties concur that they reached the Wilderness of Sinai on the first of the month. For here it is written, ‘on this day they came into the wilderness of Sinai’ (Exo. 19: 1), and further, ‘This month shall be unto you the beginning of months’ (Exo. 12: 2). Just as here, the intention is to refer to the first of the month, so there, too, the first of the month is what is meant. Further, all parties concur that the Torah was given to Israel on the Sabbath. Here it is written, ‘Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy’ (Exo. 20: 8) and elsewhere, ‘And Moses said to the people, Remember this day’ (Exo. 13: 3). Just as there he spoke on that very day to which he referred, so here, too, he spoke on the very day to which he referred. Where there is a dispute, it concerns the fixing of the New Moon for that month. R. Yosé takes the view that the New Moon was fixed on Sunday, and on that day, Moses said nothing to them, because they were tired from their trip. On Monday he said to them, ‘and you shall be to me a kingdom of priests’ (Exo. 19: 6). On Tuesday he told them the religious duty of setting boundaries around the mountain; on Wednesday they separated themselves from sexual relations with their wives. Rabbis maintain that on Monday the New Moon was fixed, and on that day, Moses said nothing to them, because they were tired from their trip. On Tuesday he said to them, ‘and you shall be to me a kingdom of priests’ (Exo. 19: 6). On Wednesday he told them the religious duty of setting borders around the mountain, on Thursday the abstinence from sexual relations was accomplished.”

I. I:10: “And adding one day to the period of sanctification prior to revelation (Exo. 19:10, 19:15)”: What was the exposition of Scripture that he set forth?

II. I:11: Going celibate even without having had a daughter”: What was the exposition of Scripture that he set forth?

III. I:12: “Breaking the tables”: What was the exposition of Scripture that he set forth?

b. I:13: Come and take note: “And be ready against the third day” — that’s a challenge to the position of R. Yosé!

c. I:14: Come and take note: “The third, the third day of the month, the third day of the week” — that’s a challenge to the position of rabbis!

I. I:15: Gloss of foregoing.

d. I:16: Come and take note: “The sixth, the sixth day of the month, the sixth day of the week” — that’s a challenge to the position of rabbis!

I. I:17: .Gloss of foregoing

e. I:18: Come and take note: As to the Nisan in which the Israelites left Egypt, on the fourteenth of the month, they slaughtered their Passover-offerings; on the fifteenth they went out; that evening the firstborn were smitten.

f. I:19: Come and take note: They did not make it a full thirty days, but only twenty-nine days: As to the Nisan in which the Israelites left Egypt, on

the fourteenth they slaughtered their Passover-offerings; on the fifteenth they went forth; that evening the firstborn were smitten.

g. I:20: Said R. Pappa, “Come and take note: ‘And they took their journey from Elim, and all the congregation of the children of Israel came into the wilderness of Sin on the fifteenth day of the second month’ (Exo. 16: 1) — now that day was a Sabbath, for it is written, ‘and in the morning, then you shall see the glory of the Lord’ (Exo. 16: 7), and it is written, ‘Six days you shall gather it’ (Exo. 16:26). The manna first fell on the day after they arrived at Sin, and since they could gather it for six days, that must have been a Sunday, the prior day, a Sabbath. But since the fifteenth of Iyyar coincided with the Sabbath, the first of Sivan had to have fallen on a Sunday. And that’s a problem for rabbis.”

h. I:21: Said R. Assi of Khuzistan to R. Ashi, “Come and take note: ‘And it came to pass in the first month of the second year, on the first day of the month, that the tabernacle was erected’ (Exo. 40:17).” And a Tannaite statement thereon is as follows: That day received ten crowns of distinction: It was the first day of Creation, the first day of the princes’ offerings for the dedication of the tabernacle, the first day for the priesthood, the first day for public offerings, the first day for the fall of fire from Heaven, the first day for the priests’ eating of Holy Things, the first day for the presence of God in Israel, the first day for the priestly blessing of Israel, the first day on which the high places were forbidden, the first day for the reckoning of months. Now since the first of Nisan that year was on a Sunday, then the first of Nisan of the previous year has to have been on a Wednesday. For it has been taught on Tannaite authority: Others say, “Between one Feast of Weeks and the next, or between one New Year and the next, there can be a difference of only four days of the week, or, in an intercalated year bearing an extra month, five. (T. Ar. 1:11) So the first of Iyyar had to have come on a Friday, and the first of Sivan on a Sabbath — a problem to both R. Yosé and rabbis!”

i. I:22: Come and take note: For it has been taught on Tannaite authority in the compilation, Seder Olam: The Nisan in which the Israelites left Egypt, the Nisan in which the Israelites went forth from Egypt — on the fourteenth they slaughtered their Passover-offerings, on the fifteenth they went forth, and that day was a Friday. Now, since the first of Nisan was on the Sabbath eve or Friday, the first of Iyyar was on a Sunday, the first of Sivan on a Monday — yielding a problem for R. Yosé!

j. I:23: Come and take note: R. Yosé says, “On Monday Moses went up the mountain and came down, on Tuesday Moses went up and came down, on Wednesday he went up but didn’t come down again. Now, since he didn’t come down on Wednesday, whence did he come down again? So it must be, on Wednesday he went up and came down, on Thursday he built the altar and made an offering, on Friday he had no more time.” Wasn’t that because of the Torah? This supports rabbis, that the Torah was given on the sixth of the month.

I. I:24: Supplement to the foregoing.

B. TOPICAL APPENDIX ON THE REVELATION AT SINAI

1. I:25: “And they stood under the mount” (Exo. 19:17): Actually underneath the mountain.

2. I:26: Said Hezekiah, “What is the meaning of the verse, ‘You caused sentence to be heard from Heaven, the earth feared and was tranquil’ (Psa. 76: 9)? If it feared, why was it tranquil, and if it was tranquil, why did it fear? But to begin with there was fear, but at the end, tranquillity.”

3. I:27: Expounded R. Simai, “At the moment that the Israelites first said, ‘we shall do,’ and then, ‘we shall listen,’ six hundred thousand ministering angels came to each Israelite and tied on to each of them two crowns, one for the ‘we shall do’ and the other for the ‘we shall listen.’ When the Israelites sinned, however, a million two hundred thousand angels of destruction came down and took them away: ‘and the children of Israel stripped themselves of their ornaments from Mount Horeb’ (Exo. 33: 6).”

4. I:28: Said R. Eliezer, ““At the moment that the Israelites first said, ‘we shall do,’ and then, ‘we shall listen,’ an echo came forth and proclaimed to them, ‘Who has told my children this secret, which the ministering angels take advantage of: ‘bless the Lord, you angels of his, you mighty in strength who fulfil his word, who hearken to the voice of his word’ (Psa. 103: 2) — first they do, then they hear.”

5. I:29: Said R. Hama b. R. Hanina, “What is the meaning of the verse of Scripture, ‘As the apple tree among trees of the wood, so is my beloved among the sons’ (Son. 2: 3)? Why are the Israelites compared to an apple? To tell you, just as an apple — its fruit appears before the leaves, so the Israelites gave precedence to ‘we shall do’ over ‘we shall hearken.”

a. I:30: Story.

6. I:31: Said R. Samuel bar Nahmani said R. Jonathan, “What is the meaning of the verse of Scripture, ‘You have ravished my heart, my sister, my bride, you have ravished my heart with one of your eyes’ (Son. 4: 9)? To begin with, with one of your eyes, but when you carry out the Torah, with both of your eyes.”

7. I:32: Said Ulla, “Shameless is the bride who fornicates in her own bridal canopy.” Said R. Mari son of Samuel’s daughter, “What is the pertinent verse of Scripture? ‘While the king sat at his table, my spikenard gave up its fragrance’ (Son. 1:12).”

8. I:33: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: Of those who are humiliated but don’t humiliate others, hear themselves reviled but don’t answer, act out of love and accept suffering with joy Scripture says, ‘But those who love him are as the sun when he goes forth in his might’ (Jud. 5:30).”

9. I:34: Said R. Yohanan, “What is the meaning of this verse of Scripture: ‘The Lord gives the word, they who publish the good news are a great host’ (Psa. 68:12)? Every act of speech that came forth from the mouth of the Almighty was divided into seventy languages.”

10. I:35: A Tannaite statement of the household of R. Ishmael: “‘And like a hammer that breaks the rock into pieces’ (Jer. 23:29) — just as a hammer yields ever so many sparks, so every work that came forth from the mouth of the Holy One, blessed be He, was divided into seventy languages.”

11. I:36: Said R. Hananel bar Pappa, “What is the meaning of the following verse of Scripture: ‘Hear, for I will speak princely things’ (Pro. 8: 6)? Why are the teachings of Torah compared to a prince? To tell you: Just as a prince has the power to kill or grant life, so teachings of the Torah have the power to kill or to grant life.”

12. I:37: Said R. Joshua b. Levi, “What is the meaning of that which is stated in Scripture, ‘My beloved is to me as a bundle of myrrh, that lies between my breasts’ (Son. 1:13)? Said the community of Israel before the Holy One, blessed be He, ‘Lord of the world, even though my life is distressed and embittered, yet my love lies between my breasts.’ ‘My beloved is to me as a cluster of henna flowers in the vineyards of En Gedi’ (Son. 1:14): He to whom all things belong will atone for me for the sin of the kid that I stored up for myself.”

13. I:38: And said R. Joshua b. Levi, “What is the meaning of the following verse of Scripture: ‘His cheeks are as a bed of spices’ (Son. 5:13)? From every word that came forth from the mouth of the Holy One, blessed be He, the world was filled with spices. But since, by the first word, the world was filled, where did the fragrance of the second go? The Holy One, blessed be He, brought forth wind from his treasury and made each pass on in sequence: ‘His lips are as lilies dripping myrrh that passes on’ (Son. 5:13) — read the word for lilies as though it yielded the sense ‘that lead step by step.’”

14. I:39: And said R. Joshua b. Levi, “At every word that came forth from the mouth of the Holy One, blessed be He, the souls of the Israelites went forth, as it is said, ‘My soul went forth when he spoke’ (Son. 5: 6). But since their souls departed at the first word, how could they receive the next? He brought down dew, with which he will resurrect the dead, and brought them back to life: ‘Your God sent a plentiful rain, you confirmed your inheritance when it was weary’ (Psa. 68:10).”

15. I:40: And said R. Joshua b. Levi, “At every word that came forth from the mouth of the Holy One, blessed be He, the Israelites retreated for twelve miles, but the ministering angels led them back: ‘The hosts of angels march, they march’ (Psa. 68:13) — read the word as though its consonants yielded ‘they lead.’”

16. I:41: And said R. Joshua b. Levi, “When Moses came up on high, the ministering angels said before the Holy One, blessed be He, ‘Lord of the world, what is one born of woman doing among us?’ He said to them, ‘He has come to receive the Torah.’”

17. I:42: And said R. Joshua b. Levi, “When Moses came down from before the Holy One, blessed be He, Satan came and said before him, ‘Lord of the world, where is the Torah?’”

18. I:43: And said R. Joshua b. Levi, “At the time that Moses went up on high, he found the Holy One in session, affixing crowns to the letters of the words of the

Torah. He said to him, ‘Moses, don’t people greet each other “peace” where you come from?’”

19. I:44: And said R. Joshua b. Levi, “What is the meaning of the statement, ‘And when the people saw that Moses delayed coming down from the mountain’ (Exo. 32: 1)? Read the word for delay as though its consonants yielded the word ‘the sixth hour has come.’”

20. I:45: Said one of the rabbis to R. Kahana, “Have you heard the meaning of the words ‘Mount Sinai’?” He said to him, “The mountain on which miracles nissim were done for Israel.”

a. I:46: Secondary supplement.

C. “HOW DO WE KNOW THAT THEY BATHE A CHILD ON THE THIRD DAY AFTER CIRCUMCISION, EVEN IF THIS COINCIDES WITH THE SABBATH? SINCE IT SAYS, ‘AND IT CAME TO PASS ON THE THIRD DAY WHEN THEY WERE SORE’ (GEN. 34: 25).

“HOW DO WE KNOW THAT THEY TIE A RED THREAD ON THE HEAD OF THE SCAPEGOAT WHICH IS SENT FORTH? SINCE IT SAYS, ‘THOUGH YOUR SINS BE AS SCARLET, THEY SHALL BE WHITE AS SNOW’ (ISA. 1:18).

“HOW DO WE KNOW THAT ON THE DAY OF ATONEMENT ANOINTING IS TANTAMOUNT TO DRINKING? “EVEN THOUGH THERE IS NO DIRECT PROOF OF THE PROPOSITION, THERE IS A HINT AT THAT PROPOSITION, SINCE IT SAYS, ‘AND IT CAME INTO HIS INWARD PARTS LIKE WATER AND LIKE OIL INTO HIS BONES’ (PSA. 109: 18).”

1. II:1: Rather than “like scarlet threads,” what is needed is “like a scarlet thread”!

2. II:2: Raba expounded, “What is the meaning of this verse of Scripture: ‘Go now and let us reason together, shall the Lord say’ (Isa. 1:18)? Instead of ‘go’ what is required is ‘come.’”

a. II:3: Said R. Samuel bar Nahmani said R. Jonathan, “What is the meaning of the verse of Scripture: ‘For you are our father, though Abraham doesn’t know us, and Israel doesn’t acknowledge us, you Lord are our father, our redeemer, from everlasting is your name’ (Isa. 63:16)? In the time to come the Holy One, blessed be He, will say to Abraham, ‘Your children have sinned against me.’ He will answer him, ‘Lord of the world, let them be wiped out for the sake of the sanctification of your name.’”

I. II:4: Said R. Hiyya bar Abba said R. Yohanan, “It was quite appropriate for our father Abraham to go down to Egypt in iron chains, but the accumulated heavenly favor saved him from such a fate: ‘I drew them with the cords of a man, with bands of love, and I was to them as they that take off the yoke on their jaws and I laid meat before them’ (Hos. 11: 4).”

LIV. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 9:5

A. HE WHO BRINGS OUT WOOD — IS LIABLE IF HE CARRIES OUT ENOUGH TO COOK A SMALL EGG:

1. I:1: We've already learned the same as a Tannaite statement: Reed — enough to make a pen. And if it was thick or broken, — enough to make a fire to cook the smallest sort of egg, mixed with oil and put in a pan.

B. SPICES — ENOUGH TO SPICE A SMALL EGG, AND THEY JOIN TOGETHER WITH ONE ANOTHER TO MAKE UP THE REQUISITE QUANTITY TO IMPOSE LIABILITY.

1. II:1: By way of contradiction: As regards spices — If two or three different types of prohibitions pertain to one kind of spice, or to three distinct kinds of spices — it is forbidden, for the spices join together to render forbidden that which they flavor. R. Simeon says, "Two or three different types of prohibitions which pertain to one kind of spice, or two different kinds of spices subject to one type of prohibition do not join together to render forbidden the food which they flavor" (M. [Orl. 2:10A-E](#)). And said Hezekiah, "Here we deal with several types of sweeteners; since all of them are suitable for sweetening what is in the pot, they join together as specified." So the operative criterion is that they are fit for sweetening a dish, but otherwise not?

C. (1) NUTSHELLS, (2) POMEGRANATE SHELLS, (3) WOAD, AND (4) DYER'S MADDER — ENOUGH TO DYE A GARMENT AS SMALL AS A HAIR-NET:

1. III:1: By way of contradiction: As to dyes that have been dissolved, the requisite measure is the amount needed to dye a sample of wool.

D. (5) URINE:

1. IV:1: For forty days.

E. (6) SODA:

1. V:1: A Tannaite statement: This refers to Alexandrian, not Antipatrian soda.

F. (7) SOAP:

1. VI:1: Said R. Judah, "This is ahala."

G. (8) CIMOLIAN EARTH:

1. VII:1: Said R. Judah, "This is 'pull-out-stick-in.'"

H. OR (9) LION'S LEAF — ENOUGH TO LAUNDER A GARMENT AS SMALL AS A HAIR-NET. R. JUDAH SAYS, "ENOUGH TO SPREAD OVER A BLOODSTAIN."

1. VIII:1: Said Samuel, "I asked those who go down to the sea, and they told me, 'It is called ashлага, and it is found between the cracks of pearls and is extracted with an iron nail.'"

LV. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 9:6

A. (1) PEPPER IN ANY QUANTITY AT ALL:

1. I:1: In any quantity at all? What's it good for?

B. (2) TAR IN ANY QUANTITY AT ALL:

1. II:1: What's it good for?

C. (3) VARIOUS SORTS OF SPICES:

1. III:1: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: He who carries out a perfume with a bad smell — in any quantity at all; if it is good oil — in any quantity at all; if it is crimson — any quantity at all; if it is a closed rose — one will do it.

D. AND METAL TOOLS IN ANY QUANTITY AT ALL:

1. IV:1: What's it good for?

2. IV:2: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: He who says, "Lo, I pledge myself to bring iron": Some say, "He must present not less than a cubit square of iron."

3. IV:3: He who says, "Lo, I pledge myself to bring copper" should not bring less than the value of a silver ma'ah M. **Men. 13:4C**: It has been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Eliezer b. Jacob says, "He must present nothing less than a small copper hook."

E. (1) STONES OF THE ALTAR, (2) DIRT OF THE ALTAR, (3) WORN-OUT HOLY BOOKS, AND (4) THEIR WORN-OUT COVERS — IN ANY QUANTITY AT ALL.

THEY STORE THEM AWAY IN ORDER TO HIDE THEM FOR PERMANENT STORAGE. R. JUDAH SAYS, "ALSO: HE WHO TAKES OUT ANY OF THE APPURTENANCES OF AN IDOL IN ANY QUANTITY AT ALL IS LIABLE, SINCE IT SAYS, 'AND THERE SHALL CLEAVE NOUGHT OF THE DEVOTED THING TO YOUR HAND' (DEU. 13: 17)."

1. V:1: Said R. Judah, "The worm that eats scrolls, the worm that eats silk, the grape mite, the fig worm, and the pomegranate worm all represent a danger."

a. V:2: Story.

LVI. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 9:7

A. HE WHO TAKES OUT A PEDDLER'S BASKET, EVEN THOUGH THERE ARE MANY DIFFERENT SORTS OF THINGS IN IT, IS LIABLE ONLY FOR A SINGLE SIN-OFFERING.

GARDEN SEEDS — LESS THAN A DRIED FIG'S BULK. R. JUDAH B. BETERAH SAYS, "FIVE."

1. I:1: Garden seeds — less than a dried fig's bulk: By way of contradiction to the view that for seeds, the seed for at least two plants involves culpability: "Manure or fine sand enough to manure a cabbage stalk," the words of R. Aqiba. And sages say, "Enough to manure a leek" (M. **Shab. 8:5C-D**).

B. THE STANDARD MEASURES FOR THE FOLLOWING ARE: (1) FOR CUCUMBER SEEDS — TWO, (2) GOURD SEEDS — TWO, (3) EGYPTIAN BEAN SEEDS — TWO; THE STANDARD MEASURE FOR (1) A CLEAN, LIVE LOCUST — IN ANY QUANTITY WHATSOEVER; THE STANDARD MEASURE FOR (2) A DEAD ONE — THE SIZE OF A DRIED FIG;

1. II:1: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: He who carries out seeds, if it is for planting, two are the requisite number to incur liability, and if it is for eating, enough to fill the mouth of a pig. And how much does it take for a pig's mouthful? One. If it is for fuel, as much as is needed to boil a soft-boiled egg. If it is for calculating, two; others say, five (T. **Shab. 8:31J-N**).

2. II:2: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: He who takes out two hairs of a horse's tail or a cow's tail, lo, this one is liable, because he makes them into hunting nets. He who takes out two stiff bristles of a pig, lo, this one is liable; of palm bands, two; of palm fillets, one (T. **Shab. 9:1-2A**).

C. THE STANDARD MEASURE FOR (3) 'A VINEYARD BIRD' A KIND OF LOCUST WHETHER ALIVE OR DEAD — IN ANY QUANTITY AT ALL, FOR THEY STORE IT AWAY FOR LATER USE AS A REMEDY:

1. III:1: So what's a vineyard bird?

D. R. JUDAH SAYS, "ALSO ONE WHO TAKES OUT A LIVING UNCLEAN LOCUST — IN ANY QUANTITY AT ALL, FOR THEY STORE IT AWAY FOR A CHILD TO PLAY WITH IT."

1. IV:1: But the initial Tannaite authority thinks that that is not so. How come? It is lest the child eat it.

LVII. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 10:1:

A. HE WHO PUT SOMETHING AWAY FOR SEED, FOR A SAMPLE, OR FOR A REMEDY AND THEN TOOK IT OUT ON THE SABBATH IS LIABLE IN ANY AMOUNT WHATSOEVER:

1. I:1: He who put something away for seed, for a sample, or for a remedy and then took it out on the Sabbath is liable in any amount whatsoever: Why use the language, put something away? Rather, use the formulation, He who took something out for use for seed, for a sample, or for a remedy and then took it out on the Sabbath is liable in any amount whatsoever?

2. I:2: Said R. Judah said Samuel, "R. Meir imposed liability even on one who carried out a single grain of wheat for sowing."

B. BUT ANY OTHER PERSON IS LIABLE ON THAT SAME ACCOUNT ONLY IN THE SPECIFIED MEASURE PERTINENT TO THAT SORT OF THING.

1. II:1: Our Mishnah paragraph does not accord with the view of R. Simeon b. Eleazar, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority:

2. II:2: Said Raba said R. Nahman, "If someone took out the bulk of a fig of seed for eating and changed his mind and decided to use it for sowing, or if he took it out for sowing and changed his mind and decided to eat it instead, he is liable."

3. II:3: Raba raised this question: "If one carried out into public domain a half fig's bulk for sowing, but it swelled and he decided to eat it, what is the rule? If you should take the position in that case that he is liable, on the grounds, 'Take this route and the requisite measure has been met, take that route and the requisite measure has been met,' here, since at the moment at which he took the things out, it was not of the volume subject to a valid measure for eating, he should not be culpable for his action. Or perhaps, since, had he kept dumb and not formed an intention regarding it, he would have been liable by reason of the intentionality of using it for seed, here, too, he should be liable. And, further, if you should wish to say, since, had he kept dumb and not formed an intention regarding it, he would have been liable by reason of the intentionality of using it for seed, here, too, he should be liable, then, if he carried out a fig's bulk of the stuff for eating and it

dried up and he changed his mind and decided to use it for sowing, what's the law? Here, it is certainly the case that, had he kept dumb and said nothing, on account of his initial intentionality he would not have become culpable? Or perhaps, we adopt as our criterion the situation now prevailing, so he should be liable? And if you should take the view that we adopt as our criterion the situation now prevailing, so he should be liable, if he took out a fig's bulk for eating and it dried up and then went and swelled up again, what is the law? Does the principle of disqualification apply for the Sabbath or does it not?"

4. II:4: Raba raised this question of R. Nahman, "If one tossed an olive's bulk of food in the status of heave-offering into an unclean room, what is the law? For what purpose? If it has to do with violation of the Sabbath, we require the volume of a dried fig. If it is with respect to uncleanness, then the requisite measure that we require is an egg's bulk for edibles. In point of fact, it has to do with the Sabbath, for instance, a case in which the volume is less than an egg's bulk of food, but this quantity completes the volume to an egg's bulk of food. Then what is the issue? Since the food would effect a combination with respect to uncleanness, he also would be liable in the matter of the Sabbath? Or perhaps, in anything having to do with the Sabbath, we require the volume of a dried fig?"

C. IF THE PERSON WENT AND PUT IT BACK, HE IS LIABLE SHOULD HE TAKE IT OUT AGAIN ONLY IN THE SPECIFIED MEASURE PERTINENT TO IT.

1. III:1: So what else is new!

LVIII. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 10:2

A. HE WHO TAKES OUT FOOD AND PUTS IT DOWN ON THE THRESHOLD, WHETHER HE THEN WENT AND TOOK IT OUT, OR SOMEONE ELSE TOOK IT OUT, IS EXEMPT FROM LIABILITY TO A SIN-OFFERING, FOR HE HAS NOT COMPLETELY PERFORMED HIS PROHIBITED ACT OF LABOR AT ONE TIME.

1. I:1: He who takes out food and puts it down on the threshold: What is the definition of this threshold? Should I say that it is a threshold that is public domain? Then how can he be exempt, having taken something out from private to public domain? So it must be a threshold in private domain. But then, as to the statement, whether he then went and took it out, or someone else took it out, is exempt from liability to a sin-offering, lo, what he has done is take something out from private to public domain! So it must be a threshold that is in neglected domain, and in this way we are informed that the operative consideration is that it has come to rest in neglected public domain. But if it had not come to rest in neglected public domain, he would have been liable.

B. A BASKET WHICH IS FULL OF PRODUCE, WHICH ONE PUT ON THE OUTER HALF OF THE THRESHOLD, EVEN THOUGH THE LARGER QUANTITY OF THE PRODUCE IS OUTSIDE — HE IS EXEMPT, UNLESS HE TAKES OUT THE ENTIRE BASKET.

1. II:1: Said Hezekiah, "They made this statement only concerning a basket full of cucumbers or gourds which are partly inside and partly outside, but if it were full of mustard, he would be liable." Therefore he takes the view that the union effected by a basket is not classified as a union. We do not regard all the mustard

as one because it is united by the basket and treat it the same as cucumbers and gourds. And R. Yohanan said, “Even if it is filled with mustard, he is exempt.” Therefore he takes the view that the union effected by a basket is classified as a union.

2. II:2: And so said Raba, ““They made this statement only concerning a basket full of cucumbers or gourds which are partly inside and partly outside, but if it were full of mustard, he would be liable.” Therefore he takes the view that the union effected by a basket is not classified as a union. We do not regard all the mustard as one because it is united by the basket and treat it the same as cucumbers and gourds. And Abbayye said, “Even if it is filled with mustard, he is exempt.” Therefore he takes the view that the union effected by a basket is classified as a union.

LIX. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 10:3

A. HE WHO TAKES SOMETHING OUT, (1) WHETHER IN HIS RIGHT HAND OR IN HIS LEFT, (2) IN HIS LAP OR (3) ON HIS SHOULDER, IS LIABLE, FOR SO IS THE MANNER OF CARRYING AN OBJECT BY THE CHILDREN OF KOHATH (NUM. 7: 9).

IF HE TAKES SOMETHING OUT (1) ON THE BACK OF HIS HAND, (2) ON HIS FOOT, (3) IN HIS MOUTH, (4) IN HIS ELBOW, (5) IN HIS EAR, OR (6) IN HIS HAIR, (1) IN HIS WALLET WITH ITS MOUTH DOWNWARD, (2) BETWEEN HIS WALLET AND HIS CLOAK, (3) IN THE HEM OF HIS CLOAK, (4) IN HIS SHOE, (5) IN HIS SANDAL, HE IS EXEMPT FROM LIABILITY TO A SIN-OFFERING. FOR HE HAS NOT CARRIED THE OBJECT OUT THE WAY PEOPLE GENERALLY CARRY OUT OBJECTS.

1. I:1: Said R. Eleazar, “He who carries out a burden at a distance of ten handbreadths above the ground is liable, for that was how the children of Kohath carried a burden.”

2. I:2: Said Rab in the name of R. Hiyya, “He who carries out a burden on the Sabbath on his head is liable to a sin-offering, because that’s how the people of Husal do it.”

LX. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 10:4

A. HE WHO INTENDS TO TAKE OUT SOMETHING BEFORE HIM, AND IT SLIPPED BEHIND HIM IS EXEMPT. IF HE INTENDED TO CARRY IT OUT BEHIND HIM AND IT SLIPPED IN FRONT OF HIM, HE IS LIABLE.

1. I:1: What differentiates the case in which he who intends to take out something before him, and it slipped behind him that he is exempt? It is because what he intended to do has not been carried out. But if so, then, if he intended to carry it out behind him and it slipped in front of him, he is liable — here, too, what he intended to do has not been carried out!

2. I:2: Does the case in which he intended to carry something behind him and it slipped behind him represent a conflict of Tannaite opinion? For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:

a. I:3: Expansion of the foregoing.

B. TRULY DID THEY SAY, A WOMAN WHO WORE DRAWERS AND TOOK SOMETHING OUT IN THEM, WHETHER IN FRONT OF HER OR BEHIND HER, IS LIABLE, FOR THEY ARE LIKELY TO BE MOVED AROUND:

1. II:1: A Tannaite statement: Any statement involving “truly did they say” constitutes the decided law.

C. R. JUDAH SAYS, “ALSO: LETTER CARRIERS.”

1. III:1: A Tannaite statement: because that’s how the state clerks do it.

LXI. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 10:5A-D

A. HE WHO TAKES OUT A LOAF OF BREAD INTO THE PUBLIC DOMAIN IS LIABLE. IF TWO PEOPLE TOOK IT OUT, THEY ARE EXEMPT. IF ONE PERSON COULD NOT TAKE IT OUT, BUT TWO PEOPLE TOOK IT OUT, THEY ARE LIABLE. AND R. SIMEON DECLARES THEM EXEMPT.

1. I:1: Said R. Judah said Rab, and some say, said Abbaye, and some say, it was set forth in a Tannaite statement: If either party by himself can carry out the loaf by himself — R. Meir declares him liable. R. Judah and R. Simeon declare him exempt. If this one cannot do it by himself and that one cannot do it by himself — R. Judah and R. Meir declare him liable. And R. Simeon declares him exempt. If this one can do it by himself and that one cannot do it by himself, all parties concur that he is liable.

2. I:2: Further along these same lines.

3. I:3: What is the source in Scripture for this matter?

4. I:4: So what is at issue between these authorities?

a. I:5: Analysis of a subordinate point in the foregoing.

b. I:6: As above.

LXII. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 10:5E-K

A. HE WHO TAKES OUT FOOD IN A VOLUME LESS THAN THE SPECIFIED MEASURE IN A UTENSIL IS EXEMPT EVEN ON ACCOUNT OF TAKING OUT THE UTENSIL, FOR THE UTENSIL IS SECONDARY TO IT THE FOOD.

1. I:1: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: He who takes out food in a volume sufficient to meet the specified measure — if he does so in a utensil, he is liable for taking out the food but exempt for taking out the utensil. But if the utensil was necessary for carrying out the food, he is liable also for the utensil so he is liable on two counts.

B. HE WHO TAKES OUT A LIVING PERSON IN A BED IS EXEMPT EVEN ON ACCOUNT OF TAKING OUT THE BED, FOR THE BED IS SECONDARY TO HIM.

1. II:1: May we say that our Mishnah paragraph accords with the position of R. Nathan and not rabbis, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority....

C. IF HE TOOK OUT A CORPSE IN A BED, HE IS LIABLE:

1. III:1: Said Rabbah bar bar Hannah said R. Yohanan, and said R. Joseph said R. Simeon b. Laqish, “R. Simeon would declare exempt even one who carries out a corpse to bury it.” Said Raba, “R. Simeon concedes in the case of one who carries out a spade for digging or a scroll of the Torah for recitation, that he is liable since that’s for his own need, not the corpse’s.”

a. III:2: Case.

D. AND SO ONE WHO TAKES OUT AN OLIVE’S BULK OF CORPSE MATTER AND AN OLIVE’S BULK OF CARRION AND A LENTIL’S BULK OF A DEAD CREEPING THING IS LIABLE. AND R. SIMEON DECLARES HIM EXEMPT:

1. IV:1: We have learned in the Mishnah there: He who removes the tokens of uncleanness or cauterizes the quick flesh transgresses a negative rule (M. **Neg. 7:4A**). It has been stated: If he removed one out of two hairs, he is liable. There is no longer a valid symptom for the skin ailment. If it was one out of three — R. Nahman said, “He is liable.” R. Sheshet said, “He is exempt.”

LXIII. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 10:6A-E

A. HE WHO PARES HIS FINGERNAILS WITH ONE ANOTHER, OR WITH HIS TEETH:

1. I:1: Said R. Eleazar, “There is a difference of opinion only when one does so by hand, but if it is with an implement, all parties concur that he is liable.”

2. I:2: And said R. Eleazar, “There is a difference of opinion only when one does so for himself, but if he does it for another, all concur that he is exempt.”

B. SO, TOO, IF HE PULLED OUT THE HAIR OF HIS (1) HEAD, (2) MOUSTACHE, OR (3) BEARD:

1. II:1: A Tannaite statement: One who on the Sabbath removes a scissors’ nip of hair is liable if he did so inadvertently to a sin-offering.” And how much is “a scissors’ nip of hair”?

2. II:2: It has been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Simeon b. Eleazar says, “In the case of a fingernail the greater part of which has fallen off, or shreds of skin the greater part of which has fallen off, if he removed them by hand, he is exempt; if he removed them with a utensil, lo, this one is liable” (T. **Shab. 9:12D-F**).

a. II:3: Gloss of foregoing.

3. II:4: Said R. Judah, “The decided law accords with the position of R. Simeon b. Eleazar.”

C. AND SO SHE WHO (1) DRESSES HER HAIR, (2) PUTS ON EYE-SHADOW, OR (3) ROUGES HER FACE — R. ELIEZER DECLARES LIABLE FOR DOING SO ON THE SABBATH. AND SAGES PROHIBIT DOING SO BECAUSE OF THE PRINCIPLE OF SABBATH REST.

1. III:1: — on what count is she liable?

2. III:2: It has been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Simeon b. Eleazar says, “She who plaits the hair or paints the eyes or rouges the face — if she does it to herself, she is exempt; if to someone else, she is liable.” And so said R. Simeon b. Eleazar

in the name of R. Eliezer, “A woman should not put paint on her face, on the count of dyeing” (T. **Shab. 9:13A-D**).

a. III:3: Theoretical problems on the count for which various deeds are culpable. He who milks is liable on the count of unloading, he who sets milk is liable on the count of selecting, he who makes cheese is liable on the count of building.

b. III:4: Secondary gloss of materials of III.2.

I. III:5: Practical rulings.

II. III:6: As above.

A. Secondary development of foregoing.

LXIV. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 10:6F-H

A. HE WHO PICKS SOMETHING FROM A POT WHICH HAS A HOLE IN THE BOTTOM IS LIABLE. IF HE PICKS SOMETHING FROM A POT WHICH HAS NO HOLE IN THE BOTTOM, HE IS EXEMPT. AND R. SIMEON EXEMPTS HIM ON THIS ACCOUNT AND ON THAT ACCOUNT.

1. I:1: For Raba Abbayye contrasted the following — and others say, for Rab R. Hiyya bar Rab contrasted the following: “We have learned in the Mishnah: And R. Simeon exempts him on this account and on that account. Therefore, it follows, from R. Simeon’s perspective, a perforated pot is disposed of in the same way as an unperforated pot. But by contradiction: R. Simeon says, ‘The sole difference between a perforated pot and one that is not perforated is that plants in an unperforated pot are rendered susceptible to uncleanness if water falls on them but that is not so for those in an unperforated pot.’”

2. I:2: A certain elder asked R. Zira, “If the root is over the hole, how does R. Simeon rule if someone pulls up the root on the Sabbath, this root being nourished directly by the ground?”

B. TOPICAL APPENDIX ON CLAY UTENSILS

1. I:3: Said Raba, “There are five measurements that pertain to a clay utensil that has a hole in it...”

2. I:4: Said R. Assi, “I have heard that there is a measure pertaining to a clay utensil ‘such as lets a pomegranate fall out.’”

3. I:5: Said R. Ashi, “They repeat: ‘A clay utensil — the measure of a hole that renders the utensil unfit for use in collecting purification water is sufficient to let liquid in; one that will let a liquid flow out is mentioned only in regard to whether or not it is a defective utensil.’”

4. I:6: Said Ulla, “Two Amoraic authorities in the West disputed this matter, R. Yosé bar Abin and R. Yosé bar Zabeda. One said, ‘the requisite hole is that it be large enough to let pomegranates fall out,’ and the other said, ‘the requisite hole is that it be large enough for a small root to penetrate.’ Your mnemonic is, ‘all the same is the one who does a lot or a little.’”

5. I:7: Said R. Hinena bar Kahana in the name of R. Eliezer, “A clay utensil — the measure of a hole that renders it insusceptible is one large enough for olives to fall through.”

LXV. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 11:1-2

A. HE WHO THROWS AN OBJECT FROM PRIVATE DOMAIN TO PUBLIC DOMAIN, OR FROM PUBLIC DOMAIN TO PRIVATE DOMAIN, IS LIABLE.

1. I:1: He who throws: Note: Throwing is a derivative of the generative classification of labor of carrying out. But as to carrying from private to public domain, how on the basis of Scripture do we know that that act is forbidden on the Sabbath?

2. I:2: Thus we have found that it is forbidden on the Sabbath to carry objects out from private domain to public domain. How do we know that carrying objects in from public domain to private domain also is forbidden?

3. I:3: And as to that which we have learned in the Mishnah: He who throws something from a distance of four cubits toward a wall — if he throws it above ten handbreadths, it is as if he throws it into the air which is public domain. If it is less than ten handbreadths, it is as if he throws an object onto the ground which is private domain. He who throws an object to a distance of four cubits on the ground, is liable (M. **Shab. 11: 3**) — how do we know that he who throws an object for four cubits in public domain is liable?

4. I:4: Said R. Judah said Samuel, “The sin of the wood gatherer at Num. 15:32ff. was that he carried the wood for four cubits in public domain.”

B. TOPICAL APPENDIX ON THE WOOD-GATHERER OF NUM. 15:32

1. I:5: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: “The gatherer of wood was Zelophahad. Here the word ‘wilderness’ occurs, ‘and while the children of Israel were in the wilderness, they found a man gathering sticks’ (Num. 15:32), and elsewhere the word ‘wilderness’ occurs, ‘our father died in the wilderness’ (Num. 27: 3). Just as in the latter context reference is to Zelophahad, so here the same meaning pertains,” the words of R. Aqiba. Said to him R. Judah b. Beterah “Aqiba! One way or the other you are destined to stand in judgment. If you are right, the Torah protected him and you expose him, and if you are wrong, you slander that righteous man” (Sifré to Numbers CXIII:I.3).

a. I:6: Another case of revealing what Scripture did not.

b. I:7: Said R. Simeon b. Laqish, “He who casts suspicion on genuinely upright people is smitten in his body, for it is written, ‘And Moses said, but behold, they will not believe me’ (Exo. 4: 1). But it was perfectly clear to the Holy One, blessed be He, that the Israelites were faithful. He said to him, ‘They are faithful, children of the faithful, but you are the one who in the end will prove unfaithful. They are faithful: ‘And the people believed’ (Exo. 4:31); they are the children of the faithful: ‘And Abraham believed in the Lord’ (Gen. 15: 6). But you are the one who in the end will prove

unfaithful: ‘And the Lord said to Moses and Aaron, because you didn’t believe in me’ (Num. 20:12).”

I. I:8: Said Raba, and some say, R. Yosé bar Hanina, “A good reward comes more quickly than punishment. With reference to punishment: ‘And he took it out and behold it was afflicted with the skin ailment, as white as snow’ (Exo. 4: 6), while with reference to a good reward: ‘And he took it out of his bosom and behold it was turned again as his other skin’ (Exo. 4: 7) — from his very bosom it had already turned as his other skin.”

II. I:9: Continuation of foregoing.

C. HE WHO THROWS AN OBJECT FROM PRIVATE DOMAIN TO PRIVATE DOMAIN, AND PUBLIC DOMAIN INTERVENES — R. AQIBA DECLARES HIM LIABLE TO A SIN-OFFERING. AND SAGES EXEMPT HIM.

1. II:1: Rabbah raised this question: “Do they differ concerning space within ten handbreadths of the ground? Then this is what is subject to dispute: The one authority maintains, ‘An object caught in the air is equivalent in respect to the Sabbath to one that has come to rest,’ and the other authority holds, ‘An object caught in the air is not equivalent in respect to the Sabbath to one that has come to rest.’ But as to the passage of the object above ten handbreadths from the ground, all parties concur that one is exempt, and we do not treat as analogous throwing an object and reaching an object across such a space. Or perhaps they differ as to the space above ten handbreadths from the ground. And this is what is subject to dispute: One authority holds that we do treat as analogous throwing an object and reaching an object across such a space. And the other authority holds that we do not treat as analogous throwing an object and reaching an object across such a space. But as to the passage of an object within ten handbreadths of the ground, all parties concur that he is liable. How come? Because ‘an object caught in the air is equivalent in respect to the Sabbath to one that has come to rest.’”

a. II:2: Gloss of foregoing.

I. II:3: Gloss of the gloss.

A. II:4: Scriptural proof for a proposition in the foregoing.

2. II:5: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: If one tossed an object from public domain to public domain, with private domain intervening — Rabbi declares the act liable. And sages declare it exempt.

3. II:6: It is obvious that if he intended to toss the object eight cubits but threw it four, it is as though he wrote SIM as part of SIMEON and he is liable, since that would form a word on its own. But if one intended to throw an object four cubits and he threw it for eight, what is the law? Do we maintain the view, well, anyhow, he did what he planned in transporting the object? Or do we say well, anyhow, it didn’t land where he wanted?

4. II:7: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: He who tosses an object from public domain to public domain with private domain intervening — if it traveled four cubits over public domain both segments of public domain being

regarded as joined together he is liable. If it traveled less than four cubits over public domain, he is exempt (cf. T. **Shab. 10:1A-C**).

a. II:8: Gloss of foregoing.

5. II:9: Said R. Samuel bar Judah said R. Abba said R. Huna said Rab, “If someone transfers an object through four cubits of public domain that is roofed over, he is exempt from liability, since that area is not comparable to the case of the flags of the wilderness.”

D. THE BOARDS OF THE TABERNACLE IN THE WILDERNESS

1. II:10: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: “The boards were a cubit thick at the bottom and tapered to a fingerbreadth thick at the top: ‘They shall be entire to the top thereof’ (Exo. 26:24), and elsewhere, ‘the waters were entire and were cut off’ (Jos. 3:17),” the words of R. Judah. And R. Nehemiah says, “Just as at the bottom they were a cubit thick, so at the top they were a cubit thick: ‘And in like manner they shall be entire.’”

2. II:11: “And the middle bar in the midst of the boards shall pass through from end to end” (Exo. 26:28): A Tannaite statement: It stood there by a miracle one long straight bar that passed along three walls, the necessary bending between the angles of the walls was miraculously done by itself.

3. II:12: “Moreover you shall make the tabernacle with ten curtains; the length of each curtain shall be twenty-eight cubits” (Exo. 26: 1-2): Assign the length over the breadth of the tabernacle — how long was it? Twenty-eight cubits. Take off ten for the roof, thus leaving nine cubits on each side.

4. II:13: “And you shall make curtains of goats’ hair for a tent over the tabernacle; eleven curtains you shall make them; the length of each curtain shall be thirty cubits and the breadth of each curtain four cubits” (Exo. 26: 7-8): Assign the length of the breadth of the tabernacle, how much was it? Thirty cubits. Take off ten for the roof, leaving ten on each side.

5. II:14: So, too, it has been taught on Tannaite authority: “‘And the cubit on one side and the cubit of the other side, of that which remains in the length of the curtains of the tent’ (Exo. 26:13) — this was to cover the cubit of the sockets,” the words of R. Judah. R. Nehemiah says, “It was to cover the cubit of the boards.”

6. II:15: A Tannaite statement of the household of R. Ishmael: To what was the tabernacle comparable? To a woman who goes out into the street with her skirts trailing behind her on the ground.

7. II:16: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: The boards of the tabernacle were cut out and the sockets were grooved, and the claps in the loops looked like stars set in the sky.”

8. II:17: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: The lower curtains were made of blue wool, purple wool, crimson thread, and fine linen, and the upper ones were made of goats’ hair. It took more skill to make the upper ones than the lower ones. For in respect to the lower ones it is written, “And all the women who were smart did spin with their hands” (Exo. 35:25), and in reference to the upper

ones, “And all the women whose heart stirred them up in wisdom spun the goats’ hair” (Exo. 35:26).

a. II:18: And it has been taught on Tannaite authority in the name of R. Nehemiah: “It was washed directly on the goats and spun on the goats.”

E. HOW SO? TWO BALCONIES OPPOSITE ONE ANOTHER EXTENDING INTO THE PUBLIC DOMAIN — HE WHO STRETCHES OUT OR THROWS AN OBJECT FROM THIS ONE TO THAT ONE IS EXEMPT. IF BOTH OF THEM WERE DIFFERENT PRIVATE DOMAINS ON THE SAME SIDE OF THE STREET AND AT THE SAME STORY, HE WHO STRETCHES AN OBJECT OVER IS LIABLE, AND HE WHO THROWS FROM ONE TO THE OTHER IS EXEMPT. FOR THUS WAS THE MODE OF LABOR OF THE LEVITES: TWO WAGONS, ONE AFTER THE OTHER, IN THE PUBLIC DOMAIN — THEY STRETCH BEAMS FROM THIS ONE TO THAT ONE, BUT THEY DO NOT THROW THEM FROM ONE TO THE OTHER —

1. III:1: Said Rab in the name of R. Hiyya, “As for the wagons, the space that was underneath them, between them, and at their sides is classified as public domain.” The width of the wagons was five cubits, five cubits of space was allowed between them in breadth, and the boards were ten cubits in length; when placed crosswise on top of the wagons they projected two and a half cubits on both sides; so the space between them was completely covered over, and yet he calls it public domain.

LXVI. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 11:2I-K

A. THE BANK OF A CISTERN AND THE ROCK TEN HANDBREADTHS HIGH AND FOUR BROAD — HE WHO TAKES SOMETHING FROM THAT AREA OR WHO PUTS SOMETHING ONTO THAT AREA IS LIABLE. IF THEY WERE LESS THAN THE STATED MEASUREMENTS, HE IS EXEMPT FROM ANY PENALTY FOR SUCH AN ACTION.

1. I:1: Why employ for the Tannaite formulation, The bank of a cistern and the rock, rather than simply saying, a cistern and the rock? That odd formulation supports the position of R. Yohanan, for R. Yohanan has said, “A cistern and its bank combine to reach the requisite height of ten handbreadths such that the cistern forms private domain.”

2. I:2: R. Mordecai addressed this question to Rabbah: “A pillar in public domain, ten handbreadths high and four broad, and one tossed something which came to rest on it — what is the law? Do we say, lo, removing the object violated a prohibition and bringing it to rest violated a prohibition, or, perhaps, since it comes from a place that is not subject to liability, it is not a culpable action?”

3. I:3: Said R. Misha, “R. Yohanan raised this question: A wall in public domain, ten handbreadths high but not four broad, surrounding neglected public domain and thus turning it into private domain, and one throws something and it lands on top of the wall — what is the law? Do we say, since it is not four handbreadths broad, it is a place that is not subject to liability? Or maybe, since it turns the area into private domain, it is as though it were filled up reaching the top of the wall so that the wall and the neglected public domain are one, the whole now forming private domain?”

4. I:4: R. Yohanan raised this question: “A pit nine handbreadths deep, from which one removed a piece a handbreadth in thickness, bringing the pit to a depth of ten handbreadths deep — what is the law? Does the taking up of the piece thus deepening the pit and the making of the partition take place simultaneously, in which case he is culpable? Or is he not culpable? And if you should propose that, since there was no partition ten handbreadths deep to begin with, he is not liable, then, if a pit was ten handbreadths deep and one put into it a piece of dirt and so diminished the depth, what is the law? Might we say that putting down the object and removing the partition thereby took place at one and the same time, in which case he is liable, or is he not liable?”

5. I:5: Raba raised this question: “If one threw a board and it landed on poles ten handbreadths high but not four square, and the board is four square, what is the law as to the construction’s constituting private domain, since it is now ten handbreadths high and four square?”

6. I:6: Said Raba, “It is clear to me: Water that is lying on water — lo, that is a situation in which it has come to rest. A nut that is lying upon water — lo, that is not a situation in which it has come to rest.” Raba raised this question: “A nut that is lying in a utensil, and a utensil is floating on water — do we invoke the criterion of the situation of the nut, in which case it has come to rest, or do we go by the criterion of the utensil, which, being unstable, has not come to rest?”

a. I:7: As to oil floating on wine there is a dispute between R. Yohanan b. Nuri and rabbis, for we have learned in the Mishnah: Oil which is floating on the surface of wine, and one who has immersed on that day and awaits sunset for the completion of his rite of purification a tebul-yom touched the oil — he has rendered unfit only the oil. R. Yohanan b. Nuri says, “Both of them are deemed connected to one another” (M. **T.Y. 2:5H-K**).

7. I:8: Said Abbaye, “In the case of a pit in public domain ten handbreadths deep and eight wide, into which one tossed a mat — he is liable; but if he divided it with a mat, down the middle, he is not liable.” The thickness of the mat leaves less than four square handbreadths on either side, so that neither is now private domain.

8. I:9: And said Abbaye, “A pit in public domain, ten handbreadths deep and four wide, filled with water, into which one tossed something — he is liable. If it is full of produce and one tossed something into it, he is not liable. How come? The water does not have the effect of nullifying the partition, but the produce nullifies the partition.”

LXVII. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 11:3A-D

A. HE WHO THROWS SOMETHING FROM A DISTANCE OF FOUR CUBITS TOWARD A WALL — IF HE THROWS IT ABOVE TEN HANDBREADTHS, IT IS AS IF HE THROWS IT INTO THE AIR WHICH IS PUBLIC DOMAIN. IF IT IS LESS THAN TEN HANDBREADTHS, IT IS AS IF HE THROWS AN OBJECT ONTO THE GROUND WHICH IS PRIVATE DOMAIN. HE WHO THROWS AN OBJECT TO A DISTANCE OF FOUR CUBITS ON THE GROUND, IS LIABLE.

1. I:1: He who throws something from a distance of four cubits toward a wall: But lo, the object doesn't come to rest!

2. I:2: Said R. Judah said Rab said R. Hiyya, "If one threw an object above ten handbreadths and it went and came to rest in a hole of any size at all, that brings us to the dispute of R. Meir and rabbis, for R. Meir takes the view that in our imagination we hollow the hole to complete it to the requisite dimensions, so liability is incurred, and rabbis take the view that we do not do so."

3. I:3: Said R. Judah said Rab, "A mound that reaches ten handbreadths within a space of four handbreadths, which is too steep to be climbed in an ordinary stride, so the top is classified as private domain, onto the top of which one tossed an object, which came to rest — he is liable."

LXVIII. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 11:3E-F

A. IF HE THREW AN OBJECT WITHIN THE SPACE OF FOUR CUBITS AND IT ROLLED BEYOND FOUR CUBITS, HE IS EXEMPT. IF HE THREW AN OBJECT BEYOND FOUR CUBITS AND IT ROLLED BACK INTO FOUR CUBITS, HE IS LIABLE.

1. I:1: If he threw an object beyond four cubits and it rolled back into four cubits, he is liable: But lo, the object doesn't come to rest! Said R. Yohanan, "That is a case in which beyond the four cubits it comes to rest on something, whatever the dimensions thereof, even for a moment."

a. I:2: Tannaite restatement.

2. I:3: Said Raba, "For an article that is carried within three handbreadths of the ground to be regarded as having come to rest, in rabbis' opinion, it has to be put down on something of some small size at least."

LXIX. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 11:4

A. HE WHO THROWS AN OBJECT TO A DISTANCE OF FOUR CUBITS INTO THE SEA IS EXEMPT. IF IT WAS SHALLOW WATER AND A PUBLIC PATH PASSED THROUGH IT, HE WHO THROWS AN OBJECT FOR A DISTANCE OF FOUR CUBITS IS LIABLE. AND WHAT IS THE MEASURE OF SHALLOW WATER? LESS THAN TEN HANDBREADTHS IN DEPTH. IF THERE WAS SHALLOW WATER, AND A PUBLIC PATH GOES THROUGH IT, HE WHO THROWS INTO IT TO A DISTANCE OF FOUR CUBITS IS LIABLE.

1. I:1: Said one of the rabbis to Raba, "There is no problem understanding why there are two references to 'passing through.' So we are informed that if it is possible to pass through, although with difficulty, that is classified as passing through; if it is possible to use with difficulty only, that is not classified as use. A public road that passes through a pool counts as public domain; a pit in the street nine handbreadths deep can be used but only inconveniently, so it is not the same as a pillar of that height on which one can put a burden, which is classified as public domain. But how come there are two references to shallow water?"

LXX. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 11:5

A. HE WHO THROWS AN OBJECT (1) FROM THE SEA TO DRY LAND OR (2) FROM DRY LAND TO THE SEA, OR (3) FROM THE SEA TO A BOAT, OR (4) FROM A BOAT TO THE SEA, OR (5) FROM ONE BOAT TO ANOTHER, IS EXEMPT:

1. I:1: It has been stated: A boat — R. Huna said, “They may stick a projection, of whatever size, over the side of the ship, and from it water may be drawn from the sea.” R. Hisda and Rabbah b. R. Huna say, “One makes an enclosure of four cubits and draws water that way.” An enclosure above the water is made, which renders the water immediately below technically private domain, and through this, the water is drawn.

a. I:2: Case illustrating the principle.

B. IF BOATS ARE TIED TOGETHER, THEY MOVE OBJECTS FROM ONE TO THE NEXT. IF THEY ARE NOT TIED TOGETHER, EVEN THOUGH THEY LIE CLOSE TOGETHER, THEY DO NOT CARRY OBJECTS FROM ONE TO THE OTHER.

1. II:1: That’s obvious! Said Raba, “Not at all. The rule is necessary to allow carrying by means of a small boat that is tethered between the ships, which are fastened to the opposite sides of the tender.”

2. II:2: Said Samuel, “And that is the rule even if they are tied together by a cloak ribbon.”

LXXI. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 11:6

A. HE WHO THROWS AN OBJECT AND REALIZES REMEMBERS WHAT HE HAS DONE AFTER IT LEAVES HIS HAND, IF ANOTHER PERSON CAUGHT IT, IF A DOG CAUGHT IT, OR IF IT BURNED UP IN A FIRE INTERVENING IN ITS FLIGHT PATH — HE IS EXEMPT. IF HE THREW IT INTENDING TO INFLICT A WOUND, WHETHER AT A MAN OR AT A BEAST, AND REALIZES WHAT HE HAS DONE BEFORE IT INFLICTED THE WOUND, HE IS EXEMPT:

1. I:1: He who throws an object and realizes what he has done after it leaves his hand, if another person caught it...he is exempt: Lo, if it should come to rest, he would be liable. But didn’t he realize what happened? And we have learned in the Mishnah: All those who may be liable to sin-offerings in fact are not liable unless at the beginning and the end, their sin is done inadvertently.

B. THIS IS THE GOVERNING PRINCIPLE: ALL THOSE WHO MAY BE LIABLE TO SIN-OFFERINGS IN FACT ARE NOT LIABLE UNLESS AT THE BEGINNING AND THE END, THEIR SIN IS DONE INADVERTENTLY. BUT IF THE BEGINNING OF THEIR SIN IS INADVERTENT AND THE END IS DELIBERATE, OR THE BEGINNING DELIBERATE AND THE END INADVERTENT, THEY ARE EXEMPT — UNLESS AT THE BEGINNING AND AT THE END THEIR SIN IS INADVERTENT.

1. II:1: It has been stated: If the object traveled for two cubits when the one who threw it did so inadvertently, but the next two cubits of the voyage were subject to his deliberate will, and then two more cubits unwittingly – Rabbah said, “He is exempt.” Raba said, “He is liable.”

2. II:2: Said Raba, “If one threw an object and it fell into the mouth of a dog or into a furnace, he is liable.”

LXXII. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 12:1

A. HE WHO BUILDS — HOW MUCH DOES HE BUILD SO AS TO BE LIABLE ON THAT COUNT? HE WHO BUILDS — IN ANY MEASURE AT ALL.

1. I:1: He who builds — in any measure at all: But what purpose could possibly be served by “any measure at all” of building?

2. I:2: Said Samuel, “He who on the Sabbath arranges a building stone moving it around to find the right spot is guilty.”

B. HE WHO HEWS STONE, HITS WITH A HAMMER OR ADZE, BORES — IN ANY MEASURE AT ALL IS LIABLE.

1. II:1: He who hews stone: On what count is hewing stone culpable?

2. II:2: He who makes a hole in a hen coop for ventilation — on what count is he culpable?

3. II:3: One who inserts a pin through the eyelet of a spade — on what count is hewing stone culpable?

a. II:4: And all three items are required.

4. II:5: R. Nathan bar Oshayya asked R. Yohanan, “On what count is hewing stone culpable?” He made a gesture to him with his hand, as if to say, “On the count of striking with a hammer.”

C. THIS IS THE GOVERNING PRINCIPLE: WHOEVER ON THE SABBATH PERFORMS A FORBIDDEN ACT OF LABOR AND THE RESULT OF HIS ACT OF LABOR ENDURES IS LIABLE.

1. III:1: What is encompassed under the governing principle?

D. RABBAN SIMEON B. GAMALIEL SAYS, “ALSO: HE WHO HITS WITH A HAMMER ON AN ANVIL WHEN HE IS PERFORMING AN ACT OF LABOR IS LIABLE. FOR HE IS TANTAMOUNT TO ONE WHO IMPROVES PREPARES FOR ANOTHER ACT OF LABOR.”

1. IV:1: But what does he do that this constitutes an act of labor?

LXXIII. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 12:2

A. HE WHO PLOUGHS — IN ANY MEASURE WHATSOEVER,

1. I:1: He who ploughs — in any measure whatsoever: So what good is that small bit of ploughing?

B. HE WHO (1) WEEDS, HE WHO (2) CUTS OFF DEAD LEAVES, AND HE WHO (3) PRUNES — IN ANY MEASURE WHATSOEVER, IS LIABLE.

HE WHO GATHERS BRANCHES OF WOOD — IF IT IS TO IMPROVE THE FIELD — IN ANY MEASURE AT ALL; IF IT IS FOR A FIRE — IN A MEASURE OF WOOD SUFFICIENT TO COOK A SMALL EGG, IS LIABLE.

HE WHO GATHERS HERBS IF IT IS TO IMPROVE THE FIELD — IN ANY MEASURE AT ALL; IF IT IS FOR CATTLE TO EAT — IN THE MEASURE OF A LAMB’S MOUTHFUL, IS LIABLE.

1. II:1: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: He who picks endives and cuts greens, if this is for human consumption — one is liable for doing so on the Sabbath and cutting a volume of a dried fig; if it is for animal food, one is liable for cutting or picking enough for a kid’s mouthful.

2. a. II:2: Comment on the foregoing.

LXXIV. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 12:3

A. HE WHO WRITES TWO LETTERS, WHETHER WITH HIS RIGHT HAND OR WITH HIS LEFT, WHETHER THE SAME LETTER OR TWO DIFFERENT LETTERS, WHETHER WITH DIFFERENT PIGMENTS, IN ANY ALPHABET, IS LIABLE. SAID R. YOSÉ, “THEY IMPOSED LIABILITY ON ONE WHO WRITES TWO LETTERS ONLY BECAUSE OF MAKING A MARK. FOR SO DID THEY WRITE MAKE A MARK ON THE BOARDS OF THE TABERNACLE, TO DETERMINE WHICH BELONGED WITH WHICH.”

1. I:1: Whether with his right hand or with his left: There is no problem understanding why one should be liable for writing with the right hand, which is that that is how writing is done. But why should one be liable for writing with the left hand? Lo, that isn’t the ordinary way of writing!

B. SAID R. JUDAH, “WE FIND THAT A SHORT NAME COMES FROM A LONG NAME, SHEM FROM SHIMEON OR FROM SHEMUEL, NOAH FROM NAHOR, DAN FROM DANIEL, GAD FROM GADIEL.”

1. II:1: Then it is for writing two different letters that R. Judah imposes liability, but for writing the same letter twice he does not. But hasn’t it been taught on Tannaite authority...

a. II:2: What R. Simeon says is the same as the initial Tannaite authority! And should you say that between them would be writing the double A of “I will gird you” (Isa. 45: 5), the double alef does not form an independent word, the initial Tannaite authority maintaining that for writing the double A of that word, one is not liable, and R. Simeon’s maintaining that, since writing A twice is done in charms in general, he would be culpable, then shall we propose that R. Simeon takes the more stringent position? Surely it has been taught on Tannaite authority:

b. II:3: Gloss of Tannaite statement of II:1.

2. Said R. Judah, “We find that a short name comes from a long name, Shem from Shimeon or from Shemuel, Noah from Nahor, Dan from Daniel, Gad from Gadiel”: But are the cases parallel? The final M in the name SHeM is closed, but the M in the name SHiMeoN is open! Said R. Hisda, “That bears the implication, if a letter is to be written closed that is, a closed mem, occurring at the end of the word is written open as it would be in the middle of the word, it is valid.”

a. II:5: Gloss of foregoing.

C. TOPICAL APPENDIX ON THE MEANINGS OF LETTERS OF THE ALPHABET

1. II:6: Rabbis said to R. Joshua b. Levi, “Just now children have come to the study house and said things the like of which even in the days of Joshua b. Nun were never said. Thus: alef bet means, learn wisdom; gimmel dalet means, show kindness to the poor. How come the foot of the gimmel reaches out to the dalet? Because it is appropriate for the benevolent to pursue the poor.

2. II:7: If we match the letters, so that the alef stands for a tav, and the bet for a shin, we get: he who rejects me — shall I desire him? Exchanging the bet for the shin: he who doesn’t delight in me — shall my name rest on him?

LXXV. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 12:4-5

A. HE WHO WRITES TWO LETTERS DURING A SINGLE SPELL OF INADVERTENCE IS LIABLE. IF HE WROTE WITH (1) INK, (2) CAUSTIC, (3) RED DYE, (4) GUM, OR (5) COPPERAS,

1. I:1: Ink: This is soot ink.

B. OR WITH ANYTHING WHICH LEAVES A MARK: ON TWO WALLS FORMING A CORNER, OR ON TWO LEAVES OF A TABLET, WHICH ARE READ WITH ONE ANOTHER, HE IS LIABLE. HE WHO WRITES ON HIS FLESH IS LIABLE.

1. II:1: Including what?

2. II:2: A Tannaite statement of R. Hiyya: If the writ of divorce is written with lead, black pigment, or coal, it is valid.

C. HE WHO SCRATCHES A MARK ON HIS FLESH — R. ELIEZER DECLARES HIM LIABLE TO A SIN-OFFERING. AND R. JOSHUA DECLARES HIM EXEMPT.

1. III:1: It has been taught on Tannaite authority: Said R. Eliezer to them, “But didn’t Ben Sateda Jesus bring witchcraft from Egypt by writing the formulas on his skin?” They said to him, “He was a singular fool, and we don’t derive proof of propositions on the basis of the actions of idiots” (T. **Shab. 11:15D-E**).

D. IF ONE WROTE WITH (1) FLUIDS BLOOD, WATER, MILK, HONEY, ETC., AS AT M. MAKH. 6: 4, (2) FRUIT JUICE, (3) DIRT FROM THE STREET, (4) WRITER’S SAND, OR WITH ANYTHING WHICH DOES NOT LEAVE A LASTING MARK, HE IS EXEMPT. (1) IF HE WROTE WITH THE BACK OF HIS HAND, WITH HIS FOOT, MOUTH, OR ELBOW,

(2) IF HE WROTE ONE LETTER ALONGSIDE A LETTER ALREADY WRITTEN,

1. IV:1: Who is the Tannaite authority for this ruling?

E. (3) IF HE WROTE A LETTER ON TOP OF A LETTER ALREADY WRITTEN,

1. V:1: Who is the Tannaite authority for this ruling?

2. V:2: A Tannaite statement: If one wrote one letter and thereby completed a book, or wove a thread and thereby completed a garment, he is liable. Who is the Tannaite authority?

3. V:3: Said R. Ammi, “If one wrote a single letter in Tiberias and another in Sepphoris, he is liable, since it is an act of writing which lacks only being brought into proximity.”

F. (4) IF HE INTENDED TO WRITE A HET AND WROTE TWO ZAYINS, (5) IF HE WROTE ONE ON THE GROUND AND ONE ON THE BEAM, (6) IF HE WROTE TWO LETTERS ON THE TWO WALLS OF THE HOUSE, ON THE TWO SIDES OF A LEAF OF PAPER, SO THAT THEY CANNOT BE READ WITH ONE ANOTHER, HE IS EXEMPT.

1. VI:1: If he intended to write a het and wrote two zayins,...he is exempt. A Tannaite statement: If one corrected a single letter, he is liable. Now look: If one wrote a single letter, he would be exempt, so how can he be liable if he merely corrects one?

2. VI:2: A Tannaite teaching: If one intended to write a single letter and he happened to write two, he is liable.”

G. IF HE WROTE ONE LETTER AS AN ABBREVIATION, R. JOSHUA B. BETERAH DECLARES HIM LIABLE. AND SAGES DECLARE HIM EXEMPT.

1. VII:1: Said R. Yohanan in the name of R. Yosé b. Zimra, “How on the basis of Scripture do we know that abbreviations are valid? Because it is written, ‘For the father of a multitude of nations I have made you’ (Gen. 17: 5), and the letters in those words serve as abbreviations for, ‘I have made you a father of nations, a chosen one of nations I have made you, a beloved one of nations I have made you, a king I have made you for the nations, an eminent figure I have made you among the nations, faithful I have made you among the nations.’”

LXXVI. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 12:6

A. HE WHO WRITES TWO LETTERS IN TWO DISTINCT SPELLS OF INADVERTENCE, ONE IN THE MORNING AND ONE AT TWILIGHT, RABBAN GAMALIEL DECLARES HIM LIABLE. AND SAGES DECLARE HIM EXEMPT.

1. I:1: What is at issue in this dispute?

LXXVII. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 13:1-2

A. R. ELIEZER SAYS, “HE WHO WEAVES THREE THREADS AT THE BEGINNING OF THE WEB, OR WHO ADDED ONE ONTO THAT WHICH IS ALREADY WOVEN, IS LIABLE.” AND SAGES SAY, “WHETHER AT THE BEGINNING OR AT THE END, ITS MEASURE FOR CULPABILITY IS TWO THREADS.”

1. I:1: When R. Isaac came, he taught the Tannaite formulation as two.”

2. I:2: It has been taught on Tannaite authority: He who on the Sabbath weaves three threads to begin with, or added one thread to what is already woven, is liable. And sages say, “Whether to begin with or at the end, the requisite measure of weaving for liability is two threads.”

3. I:3: He who on the Sabbath weaves three threads to begin with, or added one thread to what is already woven, is liable — the unattributed statement accords with R. Eliezer.

B. HE WHO MAKES TWO MESHERS FOR THE HEDDLES:

1. II:1: What is the meaning of for the heddles?

C. OR THE SLEY OF A LOOM, OR TWO MESHES IN A SIFTER, SIEVE, OR BASKET, IS LIABLE.

1. III:1: What is the sley of a loom?

D. HE WHO SEWS TWO STITCHES IS LIABLE:

1. IV:1: Lo, we have learned this item in the catalogue of generative classifications of labor: he who sews two stitches!

E. AND HE WHO TEARS IN ORDER TO SEW TWO STITCHES IS LIABLE:

1. V:1: How would you find such a case?

LXXVIII. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 13:3-4

A. HE WHO TEARS HIS CLOTHING BECAUSE OF HIS ANGER OR ON ACCOUNT OF HIS BEREAVEMENT:

1. I:1: But by contrast: He who tears his clothing because of his anger or on account of his bereavement or for his deceased is liable, and though he violates the Sabbath, he has carried out his obligation to tear his clothing as a mark of mourning!

2. I:2: But if it was a sage, he would be obligated to mourn for him, as has been taught on Tannaite authority...

a. I:3: Secondary expansion of the foregoing.

B. TOPICAL COMPOSITE ON MOURNING FOR A SAGE

1. I:4: Said R. Simeon b. Pazzi said R. Joshua b. Levi in the name of Bar Qappara, "Whoever sheds tears for a good man — the Holy One, blessed be He, counts them up and puts them away in his treasure house: 'You count my grievings, put my tears into your bottle, are they not in your book' (Psa. 56: 9)."

2. I:5: Said R. Judah said Rab, "Whoever is dilatory in lamenting a sage is worthy of being buried alive: 'And they buried him in the border of his inheritance in Timnath-serah, which is in the hill country of Ephraim, on the north of the mountain of Gaash' (Jos. 24:30) — since the word Gaash shares consonants with the root for rage this teaches that the mountain raged against them to kill them." Said R. Hiyya bar Abba said R. Yohanan, "Whoever is dilatory in lamenting a sage won't live a long time: measure for measure: 'In measure when you send her away you contend with her' (Isa. 27: 8)."

a. I:6: Further item bearing the attributive, R. Hiyya bar Abba said R. Yohanan.

C. AND ALL THOSE WHO EFFECT DESTRUCTION, ARE EXEMPT. BUT HE WHO DESTROYS IN ORDER TO IMPROVE — THE MEASURE FOR HIS ACTION IS THE SAME AS FOR HIM WHO IMPROVES.

1. II:1: A Tannaite statement of R. Abbahu before R. Yohanan: R. Abbahu repeated as a Tannaite formulation before R. Yohanan: "All actions that serve destructive purposes done on the Sabbath are exempt from liability on account of violating the Sabbath, except for someone who does injury to another and one who sets a fire for a destructive purpose."

D. THE MEASURE FOR ONE WHO BLEACHES, HACKLES, DYES, OR SPINS IS A DOUBLE SIT. AND HE WHO WEAVES TWO THREADS — HIS MEASURE IS A SIT.

1. III:1: R. Joseph demonstrated that it was a double measure.

LXXIX. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 13:5

A. R. JUDAH SAYS, “HE WHO HUNTS A BIRD INTO A TOWER TRAP, OR A DEER INTO A HOUSE, IS LIABLE.” AND SAGES SAY, “HE WHO DRIVES A BIRD INTO A TOWER TRAP, OR A DEER INTO A HOUSE, INTO A COURTYARD, OR INTO A CORRAL.”

COMMENT ON INTERSECTING MISHNAH-PASSAGE

1. I:1: There we have learned in the Mishnah: They do not catch fish in a vivarium on a festival day. And they do not cast food for them. But they do catch a wild beast or fowl in a vivarium. And they do cast food for them (M. **Bes. 3:1A-D**). They pointed out a contradiction (to M. **Bes. 3:1C-D**): Vivaria for wild beasts, fowl and fish they do not catch from them on a festival day. And they do not cast food for them (T. **Y.T. 3: 1**). Therefore the rulings concerning wild beasts are contradictory, and the rulings concerning fowl are contradictory.

B. RABBAN SIMEON B. GAMALIEL SAYS, “NOT ALL CORRALS ARE THE SAME. THIS IS THE GOVERNING PRINCIPLE: IF IT YET LACKS FURTHER WORK OF HUNTING, HE WHO PENS IT IN ON THE SABBATH IS EXEMPT. IF IT DOES NOT LACK FURTHER WORK OF HUNTING, HE IS LIABLE.”

1. II:1: Said R. Joseph said R. Judah said Samuel, “The decided law accords with the view of Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel.”

2. II:2: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: He who hunts a blind or sleeping deer, he is liable; a lame, aged, or sick deer, he is exempt T. **Shab. 12:4A-B**.

a. II:3: Said Abbaye to R. Joseph, “So what’s the difference between them?”

b. II:4: Tannaite restatement.

3. II:5: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: “He who hunts locusts, wild locusts, hornets, or gnats on the Sabbath is liable,” the words of R. Meir. And sages say, “In the case of any, the species of which is hunted, he is liable, but in the case of other species of which is not hunted, he is exempt.”

4. II:6: It has further been taught on Tannaite authority: He who hunts locusts at the time of dew is not liable, but at the time of dry heat, is liable. Eleazar b. Mahabai says, “If they were coming along in swarms, he is exempt.”

a. II:7: The question was raised: Does Eleazar b. Mahabai refer to the first or the second clause?

LXXX. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 13:6

A. A DEER WHICH ENTERED A HOUSE, AND SOMEONE LOCKED IT IN — HE WHO LOCKED IT IN IS LIABLE. IF TWO PEOPLE LOCKED IT IN, THEY ARE EXEMPT. IF ONE PERSON COULD NOT LOCK THE DOOR, AND TWO PEOPLE DID SO, THEY ARE LIABLE. AND R. SIMEON DECLARES THEM EXEMPT.

1. I:1: Said R. Jeremiah bar Abba said Samuel, “He who on the Sabbath hunts a lion is liable only if he brings it into its cage.”

LXXXI. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 13:7

A. IF ONE OF THEM SAT DOWN AT THE DOORWAY AND DID NOT COMPLETELY FILL IT SO THAT THE DEER COULD YET ESCAPE, BUT A SECOND PERSON SAT DOWN AND FINISHED FILLING IT, THE SECOND PERSON IS LIABLE. IF THE FIRST PERSON SAT DOWN AT THE DOORWAY AND FILLED IT UP, AND A SECOND ONE CAME ALONG AND SAT DOWN AT HIS SIDE, EVEN THOUGH THE FIRST ONE GOT UP AND WENT ALONG, THE FIRST REMAINS LIABLE, AND THE SECOND EXEMPT. LO, TO WHAT IS THIS EQUIVALENT? TO ONE WHO LOCKS HIS HOUSE TO SHUT IT UP AND PROTECT IT, AND A DEER TURNS OUT TO BE SHUT UP AND TRAPPED INSIDE.

1. I:1: Said R. Abba said R. Hiyya bar Ashi said Rab, “If on the Sabbath a bird crept under one’s garments, he may sit and watch it until it gets dark.”

2. I:2: Samuel said, “Every reference to ‘exempt’ in the matter of the Sabbath bears the meaning, ‘exempt but forbidden,’ except for these three, in which the action is both exempt and permitted; and this case trapping a deer is one.” The others are capturing a snake, and manipulating an abscess.

LXXXII. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 14:1

A. THE EIGHT CREEPING THINGS MENTIONED IN THE TORAH THE WEASEL, MOUSE, GREAT LIZARD, GECKO, LAND CROCODILE, LIZARD, SAND LIZARD, AND CHAMELEON — HE WHO HUNTS THEM OR WOUNDS THEM IS LIABLE:

1. I:1: Since the language is used, he who hunts them or wounds them is liable, it follows that they have a hide. So what Tannaite authority takes that view? Said Samuel, “It is R. Yohanan b. Nuri, for we have learned in the Mishnah: R. Yohanan b. Nuri says, ‘The eight creeping things (Lev. 11:29-30) have hides’ (M. [Hul. 9:2H](#)).”

2. I:2: Levi asked Rab, “How on the basis of Scripture do we know the rule regarding a wound that is permanent?”

a. I:3: Gloss of verse cited in the foregoing.

B. AND AS TO ALL OTHER ABOMINATIONS AND CREEPING THINGS, HE WHO WOUNDS THEM IS EXEMPT.

1. II:1: Lo, he who kills them is liable. Now who is the Tannaite authority who takes that position? Said R. Jeremiah, “It is R. Eliezer. For it has been taught on

Tannaite authority: Said R. Eliezer, ‘He who kills a louse on the Sabbath is as though he killed a camel.’”

C. HE WHO HUNTS THEM FOR USE IS LIABLE. HE WHO HUNTS THEM NOT FOR USE IS EXEMPT.

1. III:1: Which Tannaite authority stands behind this rule? Said R. Judah said Rab, “It is R. Simeon, who has said, ‘For performing on the Sabbath an act of labor that is not required for its own purpose one is liable.’”

2. III:2: Said Samuel, “He who takes a fish out of the sea, as soon as a part of the fish the size of a sela dries up, is liable for taking life; it can’t live after that.”

3. III:3: Said Mar bar Hammeduri said Samuel, “He who pokes his hand into the innards of a beast and removed an embryo inside her is liable.”

4. III:4: Said Abbaye, “One who picks fungus from the handle of a pitcher is liable on the count of uprooting something from where it is growing.”

5. III:5:

D. A WILD BEAST AND A BIRD WHICH ARE IN HIS DOMAIN — HE WHO HUNTS THEM IS EXEMPT. HE WHO WOUNDS THEM IS LIABLE.

1. IV:1: Said R. Huna, “They may write phylacteries on the hide of clean fowl.” Said R. Joseph, “What is he telling us? That their skin is classified as hide? We have learned that in the Mishnah: ...wounds them is liable!” Said to him Abbaye, “In point of fact, he is telling us a number of things. For if it were solely from the Mishnah passage that we had to derive our information, we might have supposed that since it has holes all over holding the feathers, it would not qualify; so we are informed that it does qualify as hide. That is in line with what they say in the West: ‘Any hole over which ink can pass is not classified as a hole.’”

E. TOPICAL APPENDIX ON MATERIALS USED FOR PHYLACTERIES

a. IV:2: Mar b. Rabina asked R. Nahman bar Isaac, “What is the law on writing phylacteries on the skin of a clean fish?”

b. IV:3: How on the basis of Scripture do we know that they write phylacteries only on the hide of a clean beast?

I. IV:4: Secondary addition.

II. IV:5: Secondary statement supplementing IV:3.

c. IV:6: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: Phylacteries may be written on the hide of a clean beast and on the hide of a clean wild beast and on the hide of carrion and terefah beasts of the same classification; they may be tied with their hair and sewn with their tendons. It is a law revealed by God to Moses at Sinai that phylacteries may be tied around with their hair and sewn with their tendons.

LXXXIII. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 14:2

A. THEY DO NOT MAKE PICKLING BRINE ON THE SABBATH. BUT ONE MAKES SALT WATER AND DIPS HIS BREAD IN IT AND PUTS IT INTO COOKED FOOD:

1. I:1: They do not make pickling brine on the Sabbath. But one makes salt water and dips his bread in it and puts it into cooked food: What is the sense of the opening statement?

B. SAID R. YOSÉ, “NOW IS THAT NOT PICKLING BRINE, WHETHER IT IS LARGE QUANTITY OR SMALL QUANTITY? WHAT IS THE SORT OF SALT WATER WHICH IS PERMITTED? ONE FIRST PUTS OIL INTO WATER OR INTO SALT AND THEN MIXES THE SALT WITH THE WATER.”

1. II:1: The question was raised: Is the upshot of R. Yosé’s statement to forbid or to permit doing so?

2. II:2: A Tannaite statement of R. Judah bar Habiba: “They do not prepare strong salt water.”

3. II:3: A Tannaite statement of R. Judah bar Habiba: “On the Sabbath they don’t salt a radish or an egg.” R. Hezekiah in the name of Abbayye said, “It is forbidden to do so with a radish but permitted with an egg.”

4. II:4: A Tannaite statement of R. Judah bar Habiba: “If it weren’t for the outer shell, a citron, radish, or egg the white being the outer shell would never leave the belly.”

a. II:5: Rabin was walking behind R. Jeremiah on the shore of the sea of Sodom. He said to him, “What is the law about washing in this water on the Sabbath?”

5. II:6: Said Mar Uqba said Samuel, “A person may soak collyrium eye salve on the eve of the Sabbath and on the Sabbath put it on his eyes, without scruple.”

a. II:7: Illustrative materials.

b. II:8: Illustrative materials.

C. TOPICAL APPENDIX ON DISEASES AND THE USE ON THE SABBATH OF THEIR REMEDIES

1. II:9: It has been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Nathan says, “The demon that sets on the hand is a free agent and stays until one washes his hands three times.”

2. II:10: Said R. Yohanan, “Stibium removes the Princess an eye demon, stops tears, nurtures the eye lashes.”

3. II:11: And said Mar Uqba said Samuel, “Leaves have no healing power.” Said R. Joseph, “Coriander has no healing power.”

4. II:12: And said Mar Uqba said Samuel, “All kinds of cuscuta are permitted except for a kind of cucumber that has healing power, which is used only for healing and may not be used on the Sabbath.”

5. II:13: Said R. Hisda, “To glair roast meat is permitted, to make hashed eggs is forbidden.”

6. II:14: And said Mar Uqba, “He who gets hit on his hand or foot may reduce the swelling with wine, and need not scruple.”

a. II:15: Case.

7. II:16: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: People may wash in the water of Gerar, Hammetan, Essa, and Tiberias, but not in the Great Sea, water in which flax has been steeped, or in the sea at Sodom.

LXXXIV. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 14:3

A. THEY DO NOT EAT GREEK HYSSOP ON THE SABBATH, BECAUSE IT IS NOT A FOOD FOR HEALTHY PEOPLE:

1. I:1: They do not eat Greek hyssop on the Sabbath because it is not a food for healthy people: Said R. Joseph, “Hyssop at Lev. 14:4 is artemisia abrotanum of the bush.”

a. I:2: Case.

2. I:3: R. Pappi said, “It is marjoram.”

B. BUT ONE EATS PENNYROYAL:

1. II:1: So what’s pennyroyal?

C. OR DRINKS KNOT GRASS WATER:

1. III:1: So what’s knot grass water?

a. III:2: Case.

b. III:3: Case.

D. ALL SORTS OF FOODS A PERSON EATS WHICH SERVE FOR HEALING, AND ALL SUCH DRINKS HE MAY DRINK:

1. IV:1: What is encompassed by the language, All sorts of foods?

2. IV:2: Said Rabina to Raba, “What is the law on drinking urine on the Sabbath?” He said to him, “There is an explicit Mishnah statement: All such drinks he may drink — but people don’t ordinarily drink urine.”

E. ...EXCEPT FOR PALM TREE WATER PURGATIVE WATER:

1. V:1: A Tannaite statement: except water that pierces.

2. V:2: What is the definition of palm tree water?

3. V:3: Said Ulla, “I myself have drunk a cup of hard liquor in Babylonia and it’s better than that water, on condition that one has not drunk it for a prior forty days.”

4. V:4: R. Joseph said, “Egyptian beer is one part barley, one part safflower, and one part salt.”

F. OR A CUP OF ROOT WATER, BECAUSE THEY ARE SOLELY FOR JAUNDICE. BUT ONE MAY DRINK PALM TREE WATER TO QUENCH HIS THIRST. AND ONE ANOINTS WITH ROOT OIL, IF IT IS NOT FOR HEALING

1. VI:1: So what’s root water?

2. VI:2: For a woman affected with flux uncleanness, a mixture of a third of that with wine helps for her not to become barren: but if not, then bring three qapiza measures of Persian onions and boil them in wine and give the mixture to her to drink, saying, “Stop your flux.”

3. VI:3: For jaundice, a mixture of two-thirds of that with beer, and the patient will be cured but be impotent.

4. VI:4: Said R. Yohanan, “One who wants to warm up the one suffering from jaundice should wrap him up well in his sheet.”

a. VI:5: Gloss.

b. VI:6: Story.

5. VI:7: For jaundice, a mixture of two-thirds of that with beer, and the patient will be cured but be impotent.

LXXXV. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 14:4

A. HE WHO HAS TOOTH PROBLEMS MAY NOT SUCK VINEGAR THROUGH THEM. BUT HE DUNKS HIS BREAD IN THE NORMAL WAY, AND IF HE IS HEALED, HE IS HEALED:

1. I:1: R. Aha Arika, who is the same as R. Aha bar Pappa, pointed the following conflict out to R. Abbahu, “We have learned in the Mishnah: He who has tooth problems may not suck vinegar through them. So that implies that vinegar is good for the teeth. But by contrast, it is written, ‘Like vinegar to the teeth and smoke to the eyes’ (Pro. 10:26).”

2. I:2: He who has tooth problems may not suck vinegar through them. But he dunks his bread in the normal way, and if he is healed, he is healed: But it has been taught on Tannaite authority: He may not suck vinegar and spit it out, but he may suck it and swallow it?

B. HE WHO IS CONCERNED ABOUT HIS LOINS WHICH GIVE HIM PAIN, HE MAY NOT ANOINT THEM WITH WINE OR VINEGAR. BUT HE ANOINTS WITH OIL — NOT WITH ROSE OIL. PRINCES ON THE SABBATH ANOINT THEMSELVES WITH ROSE OIL ON THEIR WOUNDS, SINCE IT IS THEIR WAY TO DO SO ON ORDINARY DAYS. R. SIMEON SAYS, “ALL ISRAELITES ARE PRINCES.”

1. II:1: Said R. Abba bar Zabeda said Rab, “The law accords with R. Simeon.”

LXXXVI. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 15:1

A. ON ACCOUNT OF TYING WHAT SORTS OF KNOTS ON THE SABBATH ARE PEOPLE LIABLE? (1) A CAMEL DRIVER’S KNOT, AND (2) A SAILOR’S KNOT. AND JUST AS ONE IS LIABLE FOR TYING THEM, SO HE IS LIABLE FOR UNTYING THEM:

1. I:1: What is a camel driver’s knot, and a sailor’s knot?

B. R. MEIR SAYS, “ANY KNOT WHICH HE CAN UNTIE WITH ONE HAND — THEY ARE NOT LIABLE ON ITS ACCOUNT FOR TYING IT.”

1. II:1: R. Ahadeboy, brother of Mar Aha, raised this question: “From R. Meir’s perspective, what about a slip knot however strongly fastened? Is his operative consideration that the knot can be untied with one hand, and that is the case here? Or perhaps his operative consideration is that it is not well-tied, but this one is?”

LXXXVII. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 15:2A-C

A. YOU HAVE KNOTS ON ACCOUNT OF WHICH THEY ARE NOT LIABLE, LIKE A CAMEL DRIVER'S KNOT AND A SAILOR'S KNOT.

1. I:1: There is a contradiction in the very body of the statement before us. First you say, You have knots on account of which they are not liable, like a camel driver's knot and a sailor's knot, so while there is no liability, still, they are subject to the prohibition of not being tied on the Sabbath. But then the Tannaite formulation proceeds, A woman ties the slit of her shift..., with the result that even to begin with it is permitted to make such knots.

B. A WOMAN TIES (1) THE SLIT OF HER SHIFT:

1. II:1: That isn't very surprising.

C. (2) THE STRINGS OF HER HAIR-NET AND OF HER BELT:

1. III:1: That isn't very surprising.

D. (3) THE THONGS OF A SHOE OR SANDAL:

1. IV:1: It has been stated: If one unties the laces of his shoes or sandals — one Tannaite formulation: he is liable for a sin-offering. And it has further been taught on Tannaite authority: He is exempt, although such a deed is forbidden.

a. IV:2: Illustrative case.

c. IV:3: As above.

l. IV:4: Gloss of foregoing.

A. IV:5: Intersecting Mishnah-rule examined in its own terms.

E. (4) LEATHER BOTTLES OF WINE OR OIL:

1. V:1: That isn't very surprising.

F. AND (5) A COVER OVER MEAT.

1. VI:1: That isn't very surprising.

G. R. ELIEZER B. JACOB SAYS, "THEY TIE A KNOT BEFORE A DOMESTIC BEAST SO THAT IT WILL NOT GO FORTH."

1. VII:1: That isn't very surprising.

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

LXXXVIII. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 15:2D-F

A. THEY TIE A BUCKET WITH A BELT BUT NOT WITH A ROPE. R. JUDAH PERMITS TYING WITH A ROPE. A GOVERNING PRINCIPLE DID R. JUDAH STATE, "ON ACCOUNT OF ANY SORT OF KNOT WHICH DOES NOT LAST THEY ARE NOT LIABLE."

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

2. I:2: Said R. Hiyya bar Ashi said Rab, “One may bring a cord from his house and tie it onto a cow and its trough and we are not concerned that it may become a permanent knot.
3. I:3: Said R. Judah said Samuel, “All implements of a weaver may be handled on the Sabbath for some purpose legitimate to the Sabbath.”
4. I:4: It has been stated: Said R. Nahman said Samuel, “All implements of a weaver may be handled on the Sabbath for some purpose legitimate to the Sabbath, including the upper beam and the lower beam, but not the vertical rollers.”
5. I:5: R. Yohanan addressed this question to R. Judah bar Livai: “As to the weaver’s tools, for instance, the upper beam and the lower beam, what is the law on handling them on the Sabbath?”

LXXXIX. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 15:3

A. THEY FOLD UP CLOTHING EVEN FOUR OR FIVE TIMES. AND THEY SPREAD BEDS ON THE NIGHT OF THE SABBATH FOR USE ON THE SABBATH, BUT NOT ON THE SABBATH FOR USE AFTER THE SABBATH:

1. I:1: They fold up clothing even four or five times: Said the household of R. Yannai, “They have repeated that rule only in the case of an individual person, but when it comes to two persons, that is not the case. When two people do it, they will smooth the creases and that is an act of repair or improvement. And with reference to a single individual’s doing so, too, we have made that statement only in connection with new garments, but as to old garments, it may not be done. And even as to new ones, we have made this statement only as to white ones, but not as to colored ones. And we made this statement only if he has no others for a change of clothing, but if he has others for a change, it is not the case.”
2. I:2: Said R. Huna, “If one had other clothing for a change of clothes, he may change, but if he has no other clothing for a change of clothes, he should lower his clothing making them look longer, in the manner of wealthy people.”
3. I:3: “And you shall honor it, not doing your own business lit.: not doing your own ways” (Isa. 58:13) — “And you shall honor it” — so your garments for the Sabbath shouldn’t be similar to your garments for the weekday.

a. I:4: Gloss of foregoing.

b. I:5: As above.

I. I:6: Secondary extension of the foregoing.

II. I:7: Continuation of the foregoing.

III. I:8: As above.

IV. I:9: As above.

B. COMPOSITE ON RUTH, BEGINNING WITH HER PREPARATION OF PROPER GARMENTS FOR THE SABBATH

1. I:10: “Wash yourself therefore and anoint yourself and put your garment on you” (Rut. 3: 3): Said R. Eleazar, “This refers to Sabbath garments.”

2. I:11: “Rebuke a wise man and he will become still wiser” (Pro. 9: 9) — Said R. Eleazar, “This refers to Ruth the Moabite and Samuel the Ramatite. Ruth the Moabite: for while Naomi said to her, ‘Wash yourself therefore and anoint yourself and put your garment on you’ (Rut. 3: 3), yet: ‘And she went down to the threshing floor’ and only then ‘did according to all that her mother-in-law instructed her’ (Rut. 3: 6).”

3. I:12: “And she went and came and gleaned in the field” (Rut. 2: 3) — Said R. Eleazar, “She went back and forth until she found with whom to go.”

4. I:13: “And she went and came and gleaned in the field” (Rut. 2: 3) — Said R. Eleazar, “She went back and forth until she found with whom to go.”

5. I:14: “And at mealtime Boaz said to her, come here” (Rut. 2:14) — Said R. Eleazar, “He thereby give her a hint: ‘The kingdom of the house of David was destined to come forth from you.’ For it is written, ‘hither’ in that regard: ‘Then David the king went in and sat before the Lord, and he said, Who am I O Lord God and what is my house, that you have brought me hither’ (2Sa. 7:18).”

6. I:15: “And at mealtime Boaz said to her, come here” (Rut. 2:14) — Said R. Eleazar, “He thereby give her a hint: ‘The kingdom of the house of David was destined to come forth from you.’ For it is written, ‘hither’ in that regard: ‘Then David the king went in and sat before the Lord, and he said, Who am I O Lord God and what is my house, that you have brought me hither’ (2Sa. 7:18).”

7. I:16: “And dip your morsel in vinegar” (Rut. 2:14) — Said R. Eleazar, “On the basis of this statement it is the fact that vinegar is good in hot weather.”

8. I:17: “And she sat beside the reapers” (Rut. 2:14) — Said R. Eleazar, “At the side of the reapers, but not among them. He gave a hint to her that the kingdom of the house of David was destined to be split up.”

9. I:18: “And he handed her parched grain and she ate and had enough and some left over” (Rut. 2:14) — Said R. Eleazar, “‘she ate’ — in the time of David; ‘and had enough’ — in the time of Solomon. ‘And some left over’ — in the time of Hezekiah.

10. I:19: “And beneath his glory shall he light a burning like the burning of a fire” (Isa. 10:16) — Said R. Yohanan, “Under his glory, but not actually his glory.”

C. FURTHER ON PROPER DRESS ON THE SABBATH

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

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

a. I:22: Extension of foregoing.

3. I:23: We have learned in the Mishnah as follows: On the saddle of the householder it interposes, and on that of the water skin carriers, it does not interpose. On a packsaddle it interposes. Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel says, “It interposes only if the spot is at least as big as an Italian issar” M. **Miq. 9:5I-K**. On garments: On one side, it does not interpose. On both sides, it interposes. R.

Judah says in the name of R. Ishmael, “Even if it is on one side only, it interposes.” R. Yosé says, “It interposes on the clothes of the construction workers if on one side only; but in the clothes of the farmer only if on both sides” M. **Miq. 9:6**. R. Simeon b. Laqish raised this question of R. Hanina, “In the case of a saddle, is it sufficient for the stain to interpose if it is on one side, or must it be on both sides?”

a. I:24: Gloss of foregoing.

I. I:25: Inserted topical definition.

b. I:26: Continuation of I:24.

D. R. ISHMAEL SAYS, “THEY FOLD CLOTHES AND LAY OUT BEDS ON THE DAY OF ATONEMENT FOR THE SABBATH. AND THE FAT PIECES OF THE SABBATH-OFFERING ARE OFFERED ON THE DAY OF ATONEMENT.” R. AQIBA SAYS, “THOSE OF THE SABBATH ARE NOT OFFERED ON THE DAY OF ATONEMENT, AND THOSE OF THE DAY OF ATONEMENT ARE NOT OFFERED ON THE SABBATH.”

1. II:1: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: “‘The burnt-offering of the Sabbath on the Sabbath thereof’ (Num. 28:10) The burnt-offering of one Sabbath may be completed, with its fat burnt on the altar, on another Sabbath; the burnt-offering of one Sabbath must be completed on that same Sabbath. — this teaches that the fat of the offering of one Sabbath may be offered on the Day of Atonement. Might one suppose that those of the Day of Atonement’s offerings may be burned on the Sabbath? Scripture says, ‘on the Sabbath thereof,’” the words of R. Ishmael. R. Aqiba says, “‘The burnt-offering of the Sabbath on the Sabbath thereof’ (Num. 28:10) — this teaches that the fat of an offering prepared on the Sabbath may be offered on a festival. Might one suppose that that is the case also with the Day of Atonement? Scripture says, ‘on the Sabbath thereof.’”

a. II:2: Gloss of foregoing.

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

a. II:4: Gloss of foregoing.

3. II:5: Said R. Zira said R. Huna, and some say, said R. Abba said R. Huna, “On a Day of Atonement that coincided with the Sabbath, it is forbidden to trim vegetables.”

4. II:6: Said R. Hiyya bar Abba said R. Yohanan, “On a Day of Atonement that coincided with the Sabbath, it is permitted to trim vegetables.”

a. II:7: Gloss of foregoing.

XC. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 16:1A-F

A. ALL HOLY SCRIPTURES DO THEY SAVE FROM FIRE, WHETHER THEY READ IN THEM OR DO NOT READ IN THEM.

1. I:1: It has been stated: If they were written in an Aramaic translation of Scripture or in any other language — R. Huna said, “They do not save them from a fire.” And R. Hisda said, “They do save them from a fire.”

2. I:2: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: As to written-out blessings and amulets, even though they contain letters or passages of the Torah in abundance, they do not save them on the Sabbath from a fire but are allowed to burn up where they are. In this connection they have said: Those who write blessings are as though they burned the Torah. There was the case of someone in Sidon who was writing along these lines. They came and told R. Ishmael, and R. Ishmael went to look into the matter. When he was climbing up the ladder, the other realized it, so he took a sheaf of benedictions and stuffed them into a bowl of water. In this language did R. Ishmael speak to him: “Greater is the penalty for the latter deed than the penalty for the former deed” (T. **Shab. 13:4B-D**).

3. I:3: The exilarch asked Rabbah bar R. Huna, “If they were written in paint, red ink, gum ink, or calcanthum (cf. T. **Shab. 13:4A**), in Hebrew, do they save them from a fire or do they not save them from a fire?”

4. I:4: R. Huna bar Halub raised this question of R. Nahman: “A scroll of the Torah in which it is not possible to count eighty-five letters, such as the section, ‘And it came to pass when the ark set forward’ (Num. 10:35-36) — what is the law on saving it from a fire on the Sabbath?”

a. I:5: Secondary question consequent upon the foregoing.

I. I:6: Further discussion on the cited passage.

II. I:7: As above.

5. I:8: The question was raised: Do they save the blank spaces of a scroll of the Torah from a fire or do they not save them from a fire?

a. I:9: Secondary expansion of the foregoing.

6. I:10: Joseph bar Hanina asked R. Abbahu, “As to the scrolls that happen to belong to a temple of idolatry, do they save them from a fire or do they not save them from a fire?”

a. I:11: On keeping out of a Temple of idolatry.

b. I:12: On keeping out of a Temple of idolatry.

B. AND EVEN THOUGH THEY ARE WRITTEN IN ANY LANGUAGE BESIDES HEBREW, IF THEY BECOME USELESS THEY REQUIRE STORAGE AND ARE NOT TO BE BURNED.

AND ON WHAT ACCOUNT DO THEY NOT READ IN SOME OF THEM? BECAUSE OF THE NEGLECT OF THE PROPER STUDY OF THE TORAH IN THE STUDY HOUSE.

1. II:1: Said Rab, “They made that statement only when the study house is in session, but when it is not the time of the study house, they may read them.” And Samuel said, “Even when the study house is not in session, they do not read them.”

XCI. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 16:1G-K

A. THEY SAVE THE CASE OF THE SCROLL WITH THE SCROLL AND THE CASE OF THE PHYLACTERIES WITH THE PHYLACTERIES, EVEN THOUGH THERE IS MONEY IN THEM.

1. I:1: Free-standing discussion which invokes our Mishnah-rule as a subordinated fact in its analytical argument.

a. I:2: Development of the analytical argument.

b. I:3: Development of the analytical argument.

c. I:4: Development of the analytical argument.

B. AND WHERE DO THEY TAKE THEM TO SAVE THEM? TO A CLOSED ALLEY WHICH IS NOT OPEN AS A THOROUGHFARE AND SO IS NOT PUBLIC DOMAIN. BEN BETERAH SAYS, “ALSO: TO ONE WHICH IS OPEN AS A THOROUGHFARE.”

1. II:1: What is the definition of an open alley and what is the definition of a closed alley?

XCII. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 16:2

A. THEY SAVE FOOD ENOUGH FOR THREE MEALS — CALCULATED FROM WHAT IS SUITABLE FOR HUMAN BEINGS FOR HUMAN BEINGS, WHAT IS SUITABLE FOR CATTLE FOR CATTLE.

1. I:1: They save food enough for three meals: But since the man's trouble is subject to permission, why not let him save more than that? Said Raba, “Since a person will be excited about saving his property, if you permit him to save more, he may end up putting out the fire.”

a. I:2: Gloss of a subordinated detail of the foregoing.

2. I:3: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: If one has saved bread made of fine flour, he may not save one made of coarse; if coarse, he may still save one of fine flour. One may save food on the Day of Atonement for use on the Sabbath, but not on the Sabbath for the Day of Atonement, and, it goes without saying, not on the Sabbath for a festival or on a Sabbath for the next following Sabbath (T. **Shab. 13:7B-C, 13:6N-R**).

3. I:4: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: If one forgot a loaf of bread in the oven, and the day became sanctified through the advent of the Sabbath, they may save enough of it to serve as food for three meals. And one may say to others, “Come and save some of it for your own use.” But this is on condition that he not settle with them after the Sabbath. And when he takes the loaf off the wall of the oven, he does so with a knife but not with the paddle usually used for that purpose (T. **Shab. 13:8A-D**).

a. I:5: Analysis of foregoing.

4. I:6: Said R. Hisda, “A person should always get up early on Friday to provide for the requirements of the Sabbath: ‘And it shall come to pass on the sixth day that they shall prepare that which they bring in’ (Exo. 16: 5) — on the spot.”

5. I:7: Said R. Abba, “And on the Sabbath one is liable to break bread using two loaves. “What is the scriptural basis? ‘Double bread’ (Exo. 16:22) is what is written.”

B. HOW SO? IF A FIRE BROKE OUT ON THE NIGHT OF THE SABBATH, THEY SAVE FOOD FOR THREE MEALS. IF IT BROKE OUT IN THE MORNING, THEY SAVE FOOD FOR TWO MEALS. IF IT BROKE OUT IN THE AFTERNOON, THEY SAVE FOOD FOR ONE MEAL. R. YOSÉ SAYS, “UNDER ALL CIRCUMSTANCES THEY SAVE FOOD FOR THREE MEALS.”

1. II:1: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: How many meals is a person required to eat on the Sabbath? Three. R. Hidqa says, “Four meals is a person obligated to eat on the Sabbath.”

a. II:2: Gloss: Said R. Yohanan, “Both authorities interpret the same verse of Scripture: ‘And Moses said, eat that today, for today is a Sabbath to the Lord, today you shall not find it in the field’ (Exo. 16:25). R. Hidqa takes the view that the three ‘todays’ are counted in addition to the meal of the prior evening, while rabbis maintain that they encompass the meal of the prior evening.”

b. II:3: Further analysis of II:1.

c. II:4: Further analysis of II:1.

l. II:5: Secondary gloss of a detail of the foregoing.

2. II:6: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: As to the plates on which one ate in the evening, one may wash them to eat with them in the morning; in the morning, one may wash them to eat with them at noon; at noon, one may wash them to eat with them at dusk; at dusk and thereafter, one may not wash them again until sunset. But as to glasses, ladles, and flasks, one may wash them all day long, there being no fixed time for drinking.

C. THE PLEASURES OF THE SABBATH AND THE REWARDS FOR OBSERVING ITS SANCTITY

1. II:7: Said R. Simeon b. Pazzi said R. Joshua b. Levi in the name of Bar Qappara, “Anyone who fulfills the duty of eating three meals on the Sabbath is saved from three punishments: the anguish of the Messiah, the judgment of Gehenna, and the war of Gog and Magog.”

2. II:8: Said R. Yohanan in the name of R. Yosé, “To anyone who makes the Sabbath a time of rejoicing they give an inheritance without limit: ‘Then you shall delight yourself in the Lord and I will make you ride on the high places of the earth and I will feed you with the heritage of Jacob your father’ (Isa. 58:14). That will not be like that of Abraham: ‘Arise, walk through the land in the length of it’ (Gen. 13:17), nor like that of Isaac: ‘For to thee and your seed I will give all these lands’ (Gen. 26: 3), but like that of Jacob: ‘And you shall spread abroad to the west, east, north, and south’ (Gen. 28:14).”

3. II:9: Said R. Judah said Rab, “To anyone who makes the Sabbath a time of rejoicing they give whatever his heart desires: ‘Delight yourself also in the Lord and he will give you your heart’s desires’ (Psa. 37: 4). Now I don’t know what

this 'delight' is, but when it says, 'and you shall call the Sabbath a delight' (Isa. 58:13), you must say, that refers to the pleasure of the Sabbath."

4. II:10: In what way does one show his delight in the Sabbath?

5. II:11: Said R. Hiyya bar Abba said R. Yohanan, "Whoever keeps the Sabbath in accord with its rule, even if he worships an idol like the generation of Enosh, do they forgive: 'Blessed is Enosh who does this...who keeps the Sabbath from profaning it' (Isa. 56: 2) — read the letters that yield 'profaning it' as though they bore vowels to yield 'being forgiven.'"

6. II:12: Said R. Judah said Rab, "If the Israelites had observed the first Sabbath, no nation or language could have ruled over them: 'And it came to pass on the seventh day that there went out some of the people to gather' (Exo. 16:27), followed by, 'Then came Amalek' (Exo. 17: 8)."

7. II:13: Said R. Yohanan in the name of R. Simeon b. Yohai, "If the Israelites keep two successive Sabbaths in a proper manner, they will be saved immediately: 'Thus says the Lord concerning the eunuchs that keep my Sabbaths' (Isa. 56: 4), followed by, 'even them will I bring to my holy mountain' (Exo. 56: 7)."

8. II:14: Said R. Yosé, "May my portion be among those who eat three meals on the Sabbath."

a. II:15: Other statements attributed to Yosé.

b. II:16: More of the same.

9. II:17: Said R. Nahman, "May I be rewarded for observing three meals on the Sabbath."

a. II:18: Gloss of foregoing.

b. II:19: Sayings in the same model on different topics.

10. II:20: R. Hanina would stand in his cloak on the eve of the Sabbath at sunset and exclaim, "Come and let us go forth to greet the Sabbath, the Queen."

a. II:21: Further illustrative story.

b. II:22: Further illustrative story.

c. II:23: Further illustrative story.

d. II:24: As above.

D. A FURTHER MISCELLANY: ON WHAT COUNT DO PEOPLE ACHIEVE MERIT TO ENJOY OTHER BENEFITS; FURTHER REWARDS FOR KEEPING THE SABBATH. PUNISHMENT FOR FAILURE TO KEEP THE SABBATH

1. II:25: Rabbi raised this question to R. Ishmael b. R. Yosé: "Through what deeds do the rich folk in the Land of Israel enjoy the merit that brings them heavenly favor in the form of wealth?" ...And as to those in other countries?" "Because they honor the Sabbath."

2. II:26: For said R. Hiyya bar Abba, "One time I was received as a guest in the home of a householder in Laodicea, and they brought before me a table of gold borne by sixteen men; there were sixteen silver chains fixed to it, with plates, goblets, pitchers, and flaxes set thereon, and on it there were all kinds of food,

dainties and spices. When they set it down, they cited the verse, ‘The earth is the Lord’s and the fullness thereof’ (Psa. 24: 1), and when they took it away after the meal they recited, ‘The heavens are the heavens of the Lord but the earth he has given to the children of men’ (Psa. 115:16). I said to him, ‘My son, through what deeds do you enjoy the merit of enjoying such comfort?’ He said to me, ‘I was a butcher, and out of every fine beast I said, May this be for the Sabbath.’”

3. II:27: Said Caesar to R. Joshua b. Hananiah, “How come the food cooked for the Sabbath has such a wonderful fragrance?”

4. II:28: Said the exilarch to R. Hamnuna, “What is the meaning of the verse of Scripture, ‘and you shall call the holy of the Lord honorable’ (Isa. 58:13)?”

5. II:29: “And you shall honor it” (Isa. 58:13) — Rab said, “By bringing in the holy day earlier than usual.” Samuel said, “By ending it later than usual.”

a. II:30: Practice of Various Sages in Observance of the Sabbath

b. II:31: As above.

c. II:32: As above.

6. II:33: Said Raba, and some say, R. Joshua b. Levi, “Even an individual praying by himself on the eve of the Sabbath has to say the verses of the Sabbath, ‘And the heaven and the earth were finished’ (Gen. 2: 1).”

7. II:34: Said R. Eleazar, “How on the basis of Scripture do we know that speech is equivalent to action? ‘By the word of the Lord were the heavens made’ (Psa. 33: 6).”

8. II:35: Said R. Hisda said Mar Uqba, “Whoever says the Prayer on the eve of the Sabbath and includes the Sabbath verses, ‘And the heaven and the earth were finished...’ (Gen. 2: 1ff) — the two angels who accompany a person put their hands on his head and say to him, ‘and your iniquity is taken away and your sin atoned for’ (Isa. 6: 7).”

9. II:36: It has been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Yosé bar Judah says, “Two ministering angels accompany a person on the eve of the Sabbath from synagogue to home, one good, the other bad. And when he comes home and finds the candle burning, the table set, the bed laid out, the good angel says to him, ‘May it be God’s will that things should be this way on other Sabbaths,’ and the bad angel willy-nilly says, ‘Amen.’ But if it is not that way, then the bad angel says, ‘May it be God’s will that things should be this way on other Sabbaths,’ and the good angel willy-nilly says, ‘Amen.’”

10. II:37: Said R. Eleazar, “A person should always set his table on the eve of the Sabbath, even if he only needs to put out food in the volume of an olive.”

a. II:38: Illustration.

11. II:39: Said R. Joshua b. Levi, “Whoever says the formula, ‘Amen, may his great name be blessed,’ with all his strength — they tear up for him the decree that has been issued against him: ‘When retribution was annulled in Israel, for the people offered themselves willingly, Bless you the Lord’ (Jud. 5: 2). Why was ‘retribution annulled’? Because ‘the people offered themselves willingly.’”

12. II:40: Said R. Simeon b. Laqish, “Whoever responds ‘Amen’ with all his might — they open for him the gates of the Garden of Eden: ‘Open you the gates, that the righteous nation, which keeps truth, may enter in’ (Isa. 26: 2). Don’t read the letters that yield ‘that keeps truth’ in that way, but as if they bore vowels to yield, ‘that say amen.’”

13. II:41: Said R. Judah b. R. Samuel in the name of Rab, “Fire takes place only in a place in which there is a desecration of the Sabbath, as it is said, ‘But if you will not hearken to me to hallow the Sabbath day and not to bear a burden...then will I kindle a fire in the gates thereof, and it shall devour the palaces of Jerusalem and it shall not be quenched’ (Jer. 17:27).”

14. II:42: Said Abbaye, “Jerusalem was ruined only because they violated the Sabbath therein: ‘And they have hidden their eyes from my Sabbaths, therefore I am profaned among them’ (Eze. 22:26).”

15. II:43: Said R. Judah said Rab, “What is the meaning of the verse of Scripture, ‘Do not touch my anointed and do my prophets no harm’ (1Ch. 16:22)? ‘Do not touch my anointed’: This refers to the schoolchildren in the household of their teacher. ‘...And do my prophets no harm’: This refers to disciples of sages.” Said R. Simeon b. Laqish in the name of R. Judah the Patriarch, “The world endures only for the breath of the children in the schoolhouse of their teacher.”

16. II:44: And said Raba, “Jerusalem was destroyed only once faithful people had disappeared from among them, as it is said, ‘Run you to and fro through the streets of Jerusalem and see now and know and look in the spacious piazzas there, see if you can find a man, if there be any who does justly, who seeks truth, and I will pardon him’ (Jer. 5: 1).”

XCIH. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 16:3-4

A. THEY SAVE A BASKET FULL OF LOAVES OF BREAD, EVEN IF IT CONTAINS ENOUGH FOOD FOR A HUNDRED MEALS,

1. I:1: They save a basket full of loaves of bread, even if it contains enough food for a hundred meals: But lo, to begin with, the Tannaite rule states explicitly: They save food enough for three meals — and no more!

2. I:2: R. Huna b. R. Joshua raised this question: “If he took off his garment and collected and put things therein, collected and put things therein, what is the rule? Is he comparable to one who comes to save food or to one who comes to collect?”

B. A WHEEL OF PRESSED FIGS, AND A JUG OF WINE. AND ONE SAYS TO OTHERS, “COME AND SAVE WHAT YOU CAN FOR YOURSELVES AS WELL.” NOW IF THEY WERE INTELLIGENT, THEY COME TO AN AGREEMENT WITH HIM AFTER THE SABBATH.

1. II:1: An agreement? Whatever for? They have acquired title of what was in fact ownerless property?

C. WHERE DO THEY TAKE THEM TO SAVE THEM? TO A COURTYARD WHICH IS INCLUDED WITHIN THE SABBATH LIMIT THAT FUSES THE AREA INTO A SINGLE DOMAIN ERUB. BEN BETERAH SAYS, “ALSO: TO ONE WHICH IS NOT INCLUDED

WITHIN THE SABBATH LIMIT THAT FUSES THE AREA INTO A SINGLE DOMAIN ERUB.” AND TO THAT PLACE ONE TAKES OUT ALL HIS UTENSILS. AND HE PUTS ON ALL THE CLOTHING WHICH HE CAN PUT ON, AND HE CLOAKS HIMSELF IN ALL THE CLOAKS HE CAN PUT ON. R. YOSÉ SAYS, “EIGHTEEN ITEMS OF CLOTHING.”

AND HE GOES BACK, PUTS ON CLOTHING, AND TAKES IT OUT, AND HE SAYS TO OTHERS, “COME AND SAVE THE CLOTHING WITH ME.”

1. III:1: How come the language here is, for yourselves, while in connection with saving clothing, the language that is used is, And he says to others, “Come and save the clothing with me?”

2. III:2: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: “One may put on clothing and carry it out and take it off and then go back and put on clothing and carry it out and take it off, even the entire day,” the words of R. Meir. R. Yosé says, “He may take out eighteen pieces of clothing.”

XCIV. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 16:5

A. R. SIMEON B. NANNOS SAYS, “THEY SPREAD OUT A LAMB’S HIDE OVER A CHEST, BOX, OR CUPBOARD, WHICH HAS CAUGHT FIRE, FOR IT WILL ONLY SINGE.”

1. I:1: Said R. Judah said Rab, “In the case of a cloak that has caught fire on one side, they put water on it on the other side, and if the fire happens to go out, it happens to go out.”

2. I:2: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: A lamp that is on a board — one may shake the board and the lamp falls, and if it goes out, it goes out. Said the household of R. Yannai, “They have made this rule only in the case of one who forgets it there, but if he put it there, the board becomes a stand for something that it is forbidden to handle on the Sabbath and therefore the board also cannot be handled at all.”

3. I:3: A Tannaite statement: A lamp that is behind the door — one may open and close the door in a normal way, and if the lamp goes out, it goes out.

4. I:4: Said R. Judah, “On the Sabbath a person may open a door that is opposite a fire.”

B. AND THEY MAKE A PARTITION WITH ANY SORT OF UTENSILS, WHETHER FILLED WITH WATER OR EMPTY, SO THAT THE FIRE WILL NOT PASS. R. YOSÉ PROHIBITS DOING SO WITH NEW CLAY UTENSILS FILLED WITH WATER, FOR THEY CANNOT TAKE THE FIRE, SO WILL SPLIT OPEN, AND THE WATER WITHIN THEM WILL PUT OUT THE FIRE.

1. II:1: Does that bear the implication that rabbis hold, indirectly causing a flame to go out is permitted, and R. Yosé maintains, indirectly causing a flame to go out is forbidden? But lo, we have a tradition that reverses the positions, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority: People may make a partition of empty bottles and full ones not likely to burst; and what are full ones not likely to burst? Metal utensils. R. Yosé says, “Also utensils made in Kefar Shihin and Kefar Hananiah are not likely to burst” he, too, permits only utensils not likely to burst.

a. II:2: Further analysis of the foregoing. Well, then, there is a striking conflict between statements of rabbis and between statements of R. Yosé, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority....

XCIV. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 16:6

A. A GENTILE WHO CAME TO PUT OUT A FIRE — THEY DO NOT SAY TO HIM, “PUT IT OUT,” OR “DO NOT PUT IT OUT,” FOR THEY ARE NOT RESPONSIBLE FOR HIS SABBATH REST:

1. I:1: Said R. Ammi, “In the case of a fire, sages have permitted one to say, ‘Whoever puts it out won’t lose.’”

2. I:2: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: There was the case in which a fire broke out in the courtyard of Joseph b. Simai in Shihin, and soldiers from the garrison at Sepphoris came to put it out, because he was a royal agent, but he didn’t let them on account of the honor owing to the Sabbath. But a miracle was done for him, and it rained and put out the fire. In the evening he sent to every one of them two selas, and to the commanding officer five. And when sages heard about it they said, “He didn’t have to do it that way, for lo, we have learned in the Mishnah: A gentile who came to put out a fire — they do not say to him, ‘Put it out,’ or ‘Do not put it out,’ for they are not responsible for his Sabbath rest” (T. **Shab. 13:9B**).

B. BUT A MINOR ISRAELITE CHILD WHO CAME TO PUT OUT A FIRE — THEY DO NOT HEarken TO HIM AND LET HIM DO SO, BECAUSE HIS SABBATH REST IS THEIR RESPONSIBILITY:

1. II:1: That implies that should a minor eat carrion, the court is commanded to stop him.

XCVI. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 16:7

A. THEY COVER A LAMP WITH A DISH SO THAT IT WILL NOT SCORCH A RAFTER; AND THE EXCREMENT OF A CHILD:

1. I:1: R. Judah, R. Jeremiah bar Abba, and R. Hanan bar Raba visited the household of Abin of Neshiqqayya. To R. Judah and R. Jeremiah bar Abba they brought couches, for to R. Hanan bar Raba they didn’t bring one. Now he found him reciting to his son, and the excrement of a child, on account of the child that he not cover himself with the crap. He said to him, “Abin, Only an idiot teaches his son idiocy? Isn’t the shit itself deemed fit for the dogs and that is why it may be handled and disposed of, so there is no need to turn a dish over it anyhow? And should you say, it wasn’t suitable for the dogs from the preceding day, hasn’t it been taught on Tannaite authority: Streams and springs that flow out — lo, they are in the status of whomever takes their water (T. **Y.T. 4: 8**)”?

B. AND A SCORPION, SO THAT IT WILL NOT BITE. SAID R. JUDAH, “A CASE CAME BEFORE RABBAN YOHANAN B. ZAKKAI IN ARAB, AND HE SAID, ‘I SUSPECT HE IS LIABLE FOR A SIN-OFFERING.’”

1. II:1: Said R. Joshua b. Levi, “Whatever does injury may be killed on the Sabbath.”

2. II:2: A Tannaite authority repeated before Raba bar R. Huna, “He who kills snakes or scorpions on the Sabbath — the spirit of the pious gets no pleasure from him.”

3. II:3: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: If someone stumbles upon snakes or scorpions and kills them, it is certain that he was assigned to kill them. If he doesn’t kill them, it is certain that they were assigned to kill him, but a miracle was done for him by Heaven.

a. II:4: Story.

l. II:5: Gloss of the foregoing story.

b. II:6: Story.

C. MISCELLANY ON DISPOSITION ON THE SABBATH OF OBJECTS IN THE HOUSEHOLD OF RABBI

1. II:7: And said R. Abba bar Kahana said R. Hanina, “As to the candlesticks of the household of Rabbi made in one piece, it is permitted to handle them on the Sabbath.”

2. II:8: And said R. Abba bar Kahana said R. Hanina, “The palanquins of Rabbi’s household may be handled on the Sabbath.”

3. II:9: And said R. Abba bar Kahana said R. Hanina, “The palanquins of Rabbi’s household may be handled on the Sabbath.”

XCVII. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 16:8

A. A GENTILE WHO LIT A CANDLE — AN ISRAELITE MAY MAKE USE OF ITS LIGHT. BUT IF HE DID SO FOR AN ISRAELITE, IT IS PROHIBITED TO DO SO ON THE SABBATH. IF A GENTILE DREW WATER TO GIVE WATER TO HIS BEAST, AN ISRAELITE GIVES WATER TO HIS BEAST AFTER HIM. BUT IF HE DID SO FOR AN ISRAELITE, IT IS PROHIBITED TO USE IT ON THE SABBATH. IF A GENTILE MADE A GANGWAY BY WHICH TO COME DOWN FROM A SHIP, AN ISRAELITE GOES DOWN AFTER HIM. BUT IF HE DID SO FOR AN ISRAELITE, IT IS PROHIBITED TO USE IT ON THE SABBATH”
M’SH B: RABBAN GAMALIEL AND ELDERS WERE TRAVELING BY BOAT, AND A GENTILE MADE A GANGWAY BY WHICH TO COME DOWN OFF THE SHIP, AND RABBAN GAMALIEL AND SAGES WENT DOWN BY IT:

1. I:1: The several cases were necessary. For if we were told only the rule about the lamp, I might have supposed that the lamp is as good for a hundred people as for one, but as to water, I might suppose that it is subject to a precautionary decree, lest he come and add to the quantity drawn on the Israelite’s account.

2. I:2: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: A gentile who gathered hay for his beasts — an Israelite may feed his beasts after him, but if this was for the Israelite, it is forbidden. If he filled a bucket with water for his beast, an Israelite may give his beast water after him. But if this was for the Israelite, it is forbidden.

Under what circumstances? When he doesn't know him, but if he knows him, it is forbidden (T. **Shab. 13:12B-E**).

a. I:3: Secondary analysis of the foregoing.

b. I:4: As above.

I. I:5: Case.

XCVIII. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 17:1-2

A. ALL UTENSILS ARE HANDLED ON THE SABBATH, AND THEIR DETACHED DOORS ALONG WITH THEM, EVEN THOUGH THEY WERE DETACHED ON THE SABBATH. FOR THEY ARE NOT EQUIVALENT TO DOORS OF A HOUSE, FOR THE LATTER ARE NOT PREPARED IN ADVANCE OF THE SABBATH TO BE USED.

1. I:1: All utensils are handled on the Sabbath...even though they were detached on the Sabbath: And it goes without saying that they may be handled even though they were detached on a weekday.

2. I:2: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: The door of a box, chest, or cabinet may be removed but not replaced; that of a hen coop may neither be removed nor replaced (T. **Shab. 14:1I-J**).

a. I:3: Analysis of foregoing.

B. ONE HANDLES (1), A HAMMER TO SPLIT NUTS, (2) AN AX TO CHOP OFF A FIG, (3) A SAW TO CUT THROUGH CHEESE, (4) A SHOVEL TO SCOOP UP DRIED FIGS, (5) A WINNOWING SHOVEL OR (6) A FORK TO GIVE SOMETHING THEREON TO A CHILD:

1. II:1: Said R. Judah, "That is a nut hammer for splitting nuts, not a smith's hammer." He takes the view that as to something the ordinary work of which is forbidden, then even when required for itself, it is forbidden to handle such an object for a permitted purpose. Since the normal function of a smith's hammer is to do work forbidden on the Sabbath, it also may not be handled even for a permitted purpose.

2. II:2: It has been stated: R. Hiyya bar Abba said R. Yohanan said, "A goldsmith's hammer is the subject of our Mishnah rule." R. Shemen bar Abba said, "A spice hammer."

C. (7) A SPINDLE OR (8) A SHUTTLE STAFF TO THRUST INTO SOMETHING:

1. III:1: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: An unripe fig that one hid in straw, or a cake that one hid in live coals, part of which got uncovered, may be handled the straw or coals need not be handled. And if not, it is forbidden to handle such a thing. R. Eleazar b. Taddai says, "They stick them onto a reed or a whorl and the straw or coals shake off on their own."

a. III:2: Secondary analysis of the foregoing.

D. (9) A SEWING NEEDLE TO TAKE OUT A THORN, (10) A SACK MAKER'S NEEDLE TO OPEN A DOOR:

1. IV:1: Raba b. Rabbah sent word to R. Joseph: "May our lord teach us! As to a needle the eye or point of which one has removed, what is the law?"

2. IV:2: As to making a baby vomit — R. Nahman forbids doing so on the Sabbath. R. Sheshet permits.

XCIX. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 17:3

A. A REED FOR OLIVES, IF IT HAS A KNOT ON ITS TOP, RECEIVES UNCLEANNESS. AND IF NOT, IT DOES NOT RECEIVE UNCLEANNESS. ONE WAY OR THE OTHER, IT IS HANDLED ON THE SABBATH.

1. I:1: How come? This is a flat utensil made of wood, and such are not susceptible to uncleanness? Why so? Because we require what is comparable to a sack Lev. 11:32, having a receptacle!

C. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 17:4A-B

A. R. YOSÉ SAYS, “ALL UTENSILS ARE HANDLED, EXCEPT FOR A LARGE SAW OR PLOUGHSHARE.”

1. I:1: Said R. Nahman, “A fuller’s trough is in the category of the pin of a plough.”

2. I:2: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: At first they ruled: Three utensils may be moved about on the Sabbath: a fig cake knife, a pot soup ladle, and a small table knife. They went back and permitted, went back and permitted, went back and permitted so adding to the list, until they reached the rule: All utensils are handled, except for a large saw or ploughshare (T. **Shab. 14:1A-B**).

a. I:3: Gloss of foregoing. What is the meaning of they went back and permitted, went back and permitted, went back and permitted?

b. I:4: As above. Said R. Hanina, “In the time of Nehemiah b. Hakaliah was this Mishnah teaching repeated for the first time namely, at first they ruled: Three utensils may be moved about on the Sabbath: a fig cake knife, a pot soup ladle, and a small table knife, for it is written, ‘In those days I saw in Judah some treading winepresses on the Sabbath and bringing in sheaves’ (Neh. 13:15).”

c. I:5: As above. Said R. Eleazar, “The law concerning handling on the Sabbath canes, staves, fastenings and a mortar were all repeated prior to the decree permitting all utensils.”

CI. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 17:4C-D

A. ALL UTENSILS ARE HANDLED IN CASE OF NEED AND NOT IN CASE OF NEED. R. NEHEMIAH SAYS, “THEY ARE HANDLED ONLY IN CASE OF NEED.”

1. I:1: What is the definition of, in case of need, and what is the definition of not in case of need?

a. I:2: Extension of the foregoing.

l. I:3: Illustrative case.

4. I:4: Said R. Abba said R. Hiyya bar Ashi said Rab, “Table brushes that are made of cloth may be handled on the Sabbath, but not those made of palm twigs.” The latter are used for sweeping the floor, which is forbidden.

CII. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 17:5

A. ALL UTENSILS WHICH ARE HANDLED ON THE SABBATH — FRAGMENTS DERIVING FROM THEM MAY BE HANDLED ALONG WITH THEM, ON CONDITION THAT THEY PERFORM SOME SORT OF USEFUL WORK EVEN IF IT IS NOT WHAT THEY DID WHEN THEY WERE WHOLE: SO HOW LARGE MUST THESE FRAGMENTS BE TO BE REGARDED AS USEFUL FOR SOME WORK, IF NOT THE WORK THEY ORIGINALLY DID? (1) FRAGMENTS OF A KNEADING TROUGH — MUST BE SUFFICIENTLY LARGE ON THEIR OWN TO COVER THE MOUTH OF A BARREL, (2) GLASS FRAGMENTS — MUST BE SUFFICIENTLY LARGE ON THEIR OWN TO COVER THE MOUTH OF A FLASK. R. JUDAH SAYS, “ON CONDITION THAT THEY PERFORM THE SORT OF WORK WHICH THEY DID WHEN THEY WERE WHOLE: FRAGMENTS OF A KNEADING TROUGH — MUST BE SUFFICIENTLY LARGE ON THEIR OWN TO POUR PORRIDGE INTO THEM, (2) GLASS FRAGMENTS — MUST BE SUFFICIENTLY LARGE ON THEIR OWN TO POUR OIL INTO THEM.”

1. I:1: Said R. Judah said Samuel, “The dispute pertains to a case in which the utensils were broken on the eve of the Sabbath, for one authority maintains the theory that the sherds may be handled only if they are fit for something that is along the lines of their own prior function but not for something that is along the lines of some different function altogether; and the other takes the view, even if it is fit for something that is along the lines of some different function altogether, it is permitted to handle them. But if they were broken on the Sabbath, all parties concur that, whatever the present use, they are permitted, since they are deemed ready for this purpose from prior to the advent of the Sabbath by reason of their genesis.”

a. I:2: Data required for understanding the foregoing.

2. I:3: Said R. Nahman, “Bricks left over from a building may be handled, since they are fit for seats. But if one sets them out in rows, then he has certainly designated them for another building, not for seats.”

3. I:4: Said R. Nahman said Samuel, “A little sherd may be handled in a courtyard, but not in neglected public domain.”

4. I:5: Said R. Judah said Samuel, “As to the bung of a barrel that was broken into pieces, it is permitted to handle it on the Sabbath.”

5. I:6: Said Bar Hammeduri said Samuel, “Shreds of reeds that have been detached from a mat may be handled on the Sabbath.”

6. I:7: Said R. Zira said Rab, “Remnants of silk of aprons may not be handled on the Sabbath.”

7. I:8: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: The fragments of an old oven — lo, they are classified like all utensils that may be handled in a courtyard,” the words of R. Meir. R. Judah says, “They may not be handled.” Testified R. Yosé

in the name of R. Eliezer b. Jacob concerning the fragments of an old oven that they may be handled on the Sabbath, and concerning its cover, that it does not require a handle in order for it to be permitted to handle it on the Sabbath (T. **Shab. 14: 3**).

a. I:9: Analysis of foregoing.

I. I:10: Secondary development.

II. I:11: As above.

b. I:12: Further analysis of I:8.

CIH. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 17:6-7

A. A STONE IN A GOURD SHELL USED FOR WEIGHTING IT — IF THEY DRAW WATER IN IT AND IT DOES NOT FALL OUT, THEY DRAW WATER WITH IT THE GOURD SHELL. AND IF NOT, THEY DO NOT DRAW WATER WITH IT:

1. I:1: A stone in a gourd shell used for weighting it — if they draw water in it and it does not fall out, they draw water with it the gourd shell: There we have learned in the Mishnah: A stone which is over the mouth of a jar — one tilts the jar on its side and the stone falls off. If the jar was among other jars, one lifts the jar up and turns it on its side, so that the stone falls off (M. **Shab. 21:2A-C**). In the latter connection, said Rabbah said R. Ammi said R. Yohanan, “They have repeated that rule only in the case of one who forgets, but if one puts it there prior to the Sabbath, it then serves as the foundation for an article that may not be handled.” And R. Joseph said R. Assi said R. Yohanan, “They have repeated that rule only in the case of one who forgets, but if one puts it there prior to the Sabbath, it serves as a covering of a barrel and it may be handled and moved, and one doesn’t have to tilt the barrel.”

a. I:2: What is at issue between them?

2. I:3: It has been stated: R. Yosé b. Saul said, “It was a pile of beams.” And R. Yohanan b. Saul said, “It was a ship’s sounding pole”

B. A BRANCH TIED TO A PITCHER — THEY DRAW WATER WITH IT ON THE SABBATH.

1. II:1: Only if it is tied on, but not if it is not tied on? Then may we say that our Mishnah paragraph does not accord with Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority...

C. THE WINDOW SHUTTER STOPPER OF A SKYLIGHT — R. ELIEZER SAYS, “WHEN IT IS TIED ON AND SUSPENDED, THEY SHUT THE WINDOW WITH IT. AND IF NOT, THEY DO NOT SHUT THE WINDOW WITH IT.”

1. III:1: Said Rabbah bar bar Hannah said R. Yohanan, “All concur that to begin with, on a festival, one may not make a temporary shelter, and it goes without saying, or on the Sabbath. They differ in the matter of adding on to a building, R. Eliezer says, ‘They do not add to a building on the festival, and it goes without saying, or on the Sabbath’ And Sages say, ‘They do add to a building on the Sabbath, and, it goes without saying, on the festival.’ (T. **Suk. 1:8E-F**).”

D. AND SAGES SAY, “ONE WAY OR THE OTHER, THEY SHUT THE WINDOW WITH IT.”

1. IV:1: What is the sense of one way or the other?

2. IV:2: Expounded R. Isaac Nappaha at the date of the exilarch: “The decided law accords with R. Eliezer.”

CIV. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 17:8

A. ALL UTENSIL COVERS WHICH HAVE HANDLES ARE HANDLED ON THE SABBATH. SAID R. YOSÉ, “UNDER WHAT CIRCUMSTANCES? IN THE CASE OF LIDS OVER OPENINGS IN THE GROUND. BUT AS TO LIDS OF UTENSILS, ONE WAY OR THE OTHER WITHOUT OR WITH HANDLES, THEY ARE MOVED ABOUT ON THE SABBATH.”

1. I:1: All utensil covers which have handles are handled on the Sabbath: Said R. Judah bar Shila said R. Assi said R. Yohanan, “But that is the case only if they are still classified as utensils.”

CV. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 18:1-2D

A. THEY CLEAR AWAY EVEN FOUR OR FIVE BASKETS OF STRAW OR GRAIN:

1. I:1: Even four or five: Now that one is permitted to clear away five baskets of straw to make room for guests, what’s the need to specify four?

2. I:2: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: They may not begin to make use of a storage area for the first time, but one may make a path through it to enter and go out.

a. I:3: Gloss of foregoing.

3. I:4: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: “Produce that is heaped up, if one has begun using it on Friday, it is permitted to draw supplies from it on the Sabbath, and if not, it is forbidden to draw supplies from it on the Sabbath,” the words of R. Simeon. R. Aha permits.

a. I:5: Gloss.

b. I:6: Continuing the foregoing.

4. I:7: The question was raised: “As to these four or five baskets of which they have spoken, does that mean, only four or five baskets and no more? Therefore the intent is to minimize the walking. Or maybe it is better to minimize the burden and one can break up the mass into smaller quantities?”

5. I:8: The question was asked: As to this reference to four or five, does that mean, even though he has more guests? Or maybe it all depends on the number of guests? And if you wish to say, it all depends on the number of guests, then can one person clear away for everybody, or perhaps each one has to do it for himself?

B. ON ACCOUNT OF GUESTS, OR ON ACCOUNT OF AVOIDING NEGLECT OF THE HOUSE OF STUDY. BUT THEY DO NOT CLEAR AWAY A STOREROOM:

1. II:1: Said R. Yohanan, “Hospitality to travellers is a great as getting up early to attend the school house, for the Tannaite formulation is, on account of guests, or on account of avoiding neglect of the house of study.”

C. HOSPITALITY. GIVING PEOPLE THE BENEFIT OF THE DOUBT

a. II:2: On the theme of hospitality: Said R. Judah said Rab, “Greater value attaches to hospitality to travelers than receiving the presence of God, as it is written, ‘And Lot said to them, O not so, my Lord, behold now, your servant has found grace in your sight, and you have magnified your mercy that you have shown to me in saving my life’ (Gen. 19:18-19).”

b. II:3: On the theme of hospitality: Said R. Judah bar Shila said R. Assi said R. Yohanan, “There are six matters of which a person enjoys the yield in this world but the principal endures for him for the world to come, and these are they: Hospitality to guests, visiting the sick, introspection in prayer, early rising to the schoolhouse, raising one’s children for study of the Torah, and giving one’s fellow the benefit of the doubt.”

c. II:4: On the theme of hospitality; giving people the benefit of the doubt.

I. II:5: Giving people the benefit of the doubt.

II. II:6: Giving people the benefit of the doubt.

D. THEY CLEAR AWAY (1) CLEAN HEAVE-OFFERING:

1. III:1: Yeah, so what else is new!

E. (2) DOUBTFULLY TITHED PRODUCE,

1. IV:1: But doubtfully tithed produce isn’t fit for him as food!

F. (3) FIRST TITHE THE HEAVE-OFFERING OF WHICH HAS BEEN REMOVED,

1. V:1: Yeah, so what else is new!

G. (4) SECOND TITHE AND (5) CONSECRATED PRODUCE WHICH HAVE BEEN REDEEMED;

1. VI:1: Yeah, so what else is new!

H. AND DRIED LUPINE, FOR IT IS FOOD FOR POOR PEOPLE:

1. VII:1: Specifically dry, not wet. How come? Since it is better, a goat won’t eat it.

I. BUT THEY DO NOT CLEAR AWAY (6) PRODUCE FROM WHICH TITHES HAVE NOT BEEN REMOVED:

1. VIII:1: Yeah, so what else is new!

J. (7) FIRST TITHE THE HEAVE-OFFERING OF WHICH HAS NOT BEEN REMOVED:

1. IX:1: Yeah, so what else is new!

K. (8) SECOND TITHE AND (9) CONSECRATED PRODUCE WHICH HAVE NOT BEEN REDEEMED:

1. X:1: Yeah, so what else is new!

L. ARUM, OR MUSTARD. RABBAN SIMEON B. GAMALIEL PERMITS IN THE CASE OF ARUM, BECAUSE IT IS FOOD FOR RAVENS IN THE HOUSE.

1. XI:1: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: They handle cistus, because it is food for gazelles, and mustard, because it is food for doves. Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel says, “They handle fragments of glass, for it is food for ostriches.”

Said to him R. Nathan, “If so, let them handle bundles of twigs, because it is food for elephants” (T. **Shab. 14:8A-D**).

a. XI:2: Secondary analysis of the foregoing.

b. XI:3: As above.

I. XI:4: As above. Said Abbayye, “Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel, R. Simeon, R. Ishmael, and R. Aqiba all take the position that every Israelite is in the status of a prince.”

M. BUNDLES OF STRAW, BRANCHES, OR YOUNG SHOOTS — IF ONE PREPARED THEM FOR FOOD FOR CATTLE, THEY HANDLE THEM, AND IF NOT, THEY DO NOT HANDLE THEM.

1. XII:1: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: Bundles of straw, branches, or young shoots — if one prepared them for food for cattle, they handle them. And if not, they do not handle them. Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel says, “If they may be handled with one hand, they handle them, and if not, they do not handle them” (T. **Shab. 14:10A-B**).

a. XII:2: Gloss of foregoing.

2. XII:3: It has been stated: It is permitted to handle salted meat on the Sabbath. As to tasteless, unsalted meat — R. Huna said, “It is permitted to handle it.” R. Hisda said, “It is forbidden to handle it.”

3. XII:4: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: It is permitted to handle salt fish, but it is forbidden to handle unsalted fish. As to meat, whether it is unflavored or salted, it is permitted to handle it.

4. XII:5: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: They may handle bones, since they are food for dogs. So, too, putrid meat, because it is food for beasts; uncovered water, because it is suitable for a cat. Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel says, “It may not be kept at all because of the danger to human life” (cf. T. **Shab. 14:9C**).

CVI. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 18:2E-I

A. THEY TURN UP A BASKET FOR CHICKENS, SO THAT THEY MAY GO UP INTO THE HEN HOUSE AND DOWN ON IT:

1. I:1: Said R. Judah said Rab, “A beast that fell into a water channel — one brings pillows and bolsters and puts them under it, and if it climbed up and out on them, so it did.”

B. A CHICKEN THAT FLED — THEY DRIVE IT ALONG UNTIL IT GOES BACK INTO THE CHICKEN YARD.

THEY PULL CALVES OR YOUNG ASSES IN THE PUBLIC WAY. A MOTHER DRAGS ALONG HER CHILD. SAID R. JUDAH, “UNDER WHAT CIRCUMSTANCES? WHEN THE CHILD LIFTS UP ONE FOOT AND PUTS THE OTHER DOWN. BUT IF HE DRAGS HIS FEET, IT IS FORBIDDEN TO DRAG IT.”

1. II:1: They drive it along but they don't make it walk, so this is in line with that which our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: They may make a domesticated beast, wild animal, or bird walk in a courtyard, but not a fowl.

2. II:2: One Tannaite statement: They may make a domesticated beast, wild animal, or bird walk in a courtyard, but not in public domain, but a woman may make her child walk in public domain, and, it goes without saying, in a courtyard. And it has further been taught on Tannaite authority: They do not carry in a courtyard a domesticated beast, wild animal, or bird, but they push them along so they will enter it (T. **Shab. 15:1A-C**).

3. II:3: Said Abbaye, "One who slaughters a chicken should press the legs on the ground or lift them up off the ground, lest it place its claw on the ground and tear its organs loose before they are cut."

CVII. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 18:3

A. THEY DO NOT DELIVER THE YOUNG OF CATTLE ON THE FESTIVAL, BUT THEY HELP OUT. AND THEY DO DELIVER THE YOUNG OF A WOMAN ON THE SABBATH.

1. I:1: How do they help out

2. I:2: What is done?

B. THEY CALL A MIDWIFE FOR HER FROM A DISTANT PLACE, AND THEY VIOLATE THE SABBATH ON HER THE WOMAN IN CHILDBIRTH'S ACCOUNT.

1. II:1: Now since the Tannaite authority has said, They call a midwife for her from a distant place, what's the point of adding, and they violate the Sabbath on her the woman in childbirth's account?

a. II:2: Gloss of the Tannaite evidence introduced in the foregoing.

b. II:3: As above.

2. II:4: Said R. Judah said Samuel, "A woman who is giving birth, so long as the uterus is open, whether she said 'I need' or whether she did not say, 'I need,' in her behalf they desecrate the Sabbath. Once the uterus is closed, whether she said 'I need' or whether she did not say, 'I need,' in her behalf they do not desecrate the Sabbath."

a. II:5: Gloss of foregoing. At what point is the opening of the uterus?

I. II:6: On the subject of the uterus during childbirth.

II. II:7: On the subject of the uterus during childbirth.

III. II:8: On the subject of the uterus during childbirth.

3. II:9: Said R. Judah said Samuel, "They may make a fire for a woman in childbirth on the Sabbath."

C. ON THE MATTER OF BLOODLETTING

a. II:10: On a topic subordinated in the foregoing, the matter of bloodletting.

b. II:11: On bloodletting.

- c. II:12: On bloodletting.
- d. II:13: On bloodletting.
- e. II:14: On bloodletting.
- f. II:15: On bloodletting.
- g. II:16: On bloodletting.
- h. II:17: On bloodletting.
- i. II:18: On bloodletting.

D. AND THEY TIE THE UMBILICAL CORD. R. YOSÉ SAYS, “ALSO: THEY CUT IT.”

AND ALL THINGS REQUIRED FOR CIRCUMCISION DO THEY PERFORM ON THE SABBATH.

1. III:1: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: They tie the umbilical cord. R. Yosé says, “They also cut it, and hide the afterbirth, to keep the offspring warm.” Said Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel, “Princesses hide it in bowls of oil, rich women in wool fleece, poor women in soft rags” (T. **Shab. 15: 3**).

a. III:2: Said R. Nahman said Rabbah bar Abbuha said Rab, “The decided law accords with R. Yosé.”

b. III:3: And said R. Nahman said Rabbah bar Abbuha said Rab, “Everything said in the chapter of rebuke is done on the Sabbath for a woman in childbirth: ‘And as for your nativity, in the day on which you were born your navel was not cut, nor were you washed in water to clean you, you were not salted at all, nor swaddled at all’ (Eze. 16: 4).”

CVIII. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 19:1

A. R. ELIEZER SAYS, “IF ONE DID NOT BRING A UTENSIL USED FOR CIRCUMCISION ON THE EVE OF THE SABBATH, HE BRINGS IT OPENLY ON THE SABBATH.” AND IN THE TIME OF THE DANGER, ONE COVERS IT UP IN THE PRESENCE OF WITNESSES:

1. I:1: He brings it openly on the Sabbath: The question was raised: Is the operative consideration behind the ruling of R. Eliezer special concern for that particular religious duty, or was it because of suspicion that if the one who brought the knife did so surreptitiously, he might be suspect of violating the Sabbath?

2. I:2: It has further been taught on Tannaite authority: “One brings it out in the open and doesn’t bring it covered up,” the words of R. Eliezer. R. Judah says in the name of R. Eliezer, “They had the custom in the time of danger of bringing the knife covered up in the presence of witnesses.”

3. I:3: The question was raised: As to the witnesses that have been mentioned, does this mean him and one other, or him and two others?

B. AND FURTHER DID R. ELIEZER STATE, “THEY CUT WOOD TO MAKE COALS TO PREPARE AN IRON UTENSIL FOR CIRCUMCISION.”

1. II:1: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: In the locale of R. Eliezer on the Sabbath they would cut wood to heat charcoal to forge iron to make a circumcision knife, since in his view it was permitted to do everything that was

required in connection with the rite. In the locale of R. Yosé the Galilean, they would eat chicken meat with milk.

a. II:2: The importance of following local custom.

b. II:3: Said R. Isaac, “There was a town in the Land of Israel, in which they acted in accord with R. Eliezer, and they died at the right time. Moreover, the evil kingdom made a decree against Israel in respect to circumcision, but in respect to that town no such decree was made.”

C. THE IMPORTANCE OF CIRCUMCISION

1. II:4: It has been taught on Tannaite authority: Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel says, “Every religious duty that the Israelites accepted with joy, for instance circumcision, as it is written, ‘I rejoice at your word, as one that finds great spoil’ (Psa. 119:162), they still do with joy. Every religious duty that they accepted grudgingly, for example, the prohibition of consanguineous marriage, as it is written, ‘And Moses heard the people weeping throughout their families’ (Num. 11:10), that is, on account of the rules governing their families, they still do grudgingly” — for there is no marriage contract that doesn’t involve contention.”

2. II:5: It has been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Simeon b. Eleazar says, “Any religious duty for which the Israelites gave up their lives unto death in the time of the government decrees, for instance, idolatry and circumcision, is still strongly confirmed in their possession, but any religious duty for which the Israelites did not give up their lives unto death in the time of the government decrees, for instance, phylacteries, is still infirmly held by them.”

a. II:6: Gloss of foregoing.

b. II:7: Gloss of foregoing.

D. FURTHER ANALYSIS OF THE MISHNAH-PARAGRAPH

1. II:8: Said R. Abba bar R. Adda said R. Isaac, “Once they forgot and didn’t bring the knife on the eve of the Sabbath so they brought it on the Sabbath.”

2. II:9: R. Zira asked R. Assi, “An alleyway in which the residents did not form a symbolic partnership to create a single domain for purposes of carrying on the Sabbath — what is the law as to carrying something in the whole of it utensils present at the start of the Sabbath? Do we claim that it is comparable to a courtyard, so that, just as a courtyard, even though they have not formed a symbolic partnership, it is permitted to carry objects through the whole of it, so here, too, even though they did not form a symbolic partnership in it, it is permitted to carry through the whole of it? Or maybe there is no comparison to a courtyard, for a courtyard has four walls, but this doesn’t have four walls? Or, also, a courtyard has tenants, but this has no tenants?”

a. II:10: Further analysis of the problem raised in the foregoing.

3. II:11: Said R. Hiyya bar Abba said R. Yohanan, “Not for all purposes did R. Eliezer say, ‘What is required to make it possible to carry out a religious duty overrides the restrictions of the Sabbath,’ for lo, the two loaves represent the obligation of the day, and R. Eliezer derives the rule that baking them overrides the restrictions of the Sabbath only from an argument based on a verbal analogy rather

than holding that just as the duty is to put them out as an offering to the Lord, so baking them, necessary to carry out that duty, is permitted on the Sabbath as well.”

a. II:12: Extension of the foregoing. With reference to R. Yohanan, “Not for all purposes did R. Eliezer say...,” what did Yohanan mean to exclude? Should we say that it is to exclude the taking of the palm branch on Tabernacles that coincided with a Sabbath (Lev. 23:40)? But hasn’t it been taught on Tannaite authority: “The taking of the palm branch and everything having to do with preparing it override the restrictions of the Sabbath,” the words of R. Eliezer?

I. II:13: Gloss of the foregoing. “The taking of the palm branch and everything having to do with preparing it override the restrictions of the Sabbath,” the words of R. Eliezer — How does R. Eliezer know this fact?

II. II:14: Gloss of II:13.

III. II:15: Gloss of II:13: “The unleavened bread and everything having to do with preparing it override the restrictions of the Sabbath,” the words of R. Eliezer — How does R. Eliezer know this fact?

IV. II:16: Gloss of II:13: “The ram’s horn and everything having to do with preparing it override the restrictions of the Sabbath,” the words of R. Eliezer — How does R. Eliezer know this fact?

V. II:17: Gloss of II:13: “Circumcision and everything having to do with preparing it override the restrictions of the Sabbath,” the words of R. Eliezer — How does R. Eliezer know this fact?

VI. II:18: Gloss of II:13: In any event rabbis differ from R. Eliezer only with respect to what is required to carry out circumcision, but as to circumcision itself, all parties concur that it does override the restrictions of the Sabbath. So how we do know that fact?

VII. II:19: Continuation of the foregoing. And R. Yohanan said, With reference to the verses, “You shall keep my covenant” (Gen. 17: 9), “And in the eighth day the flesh of his foreskin shall be circumcised” (Lev. 12: 3), “Said Scripture, ‘By day’ — even if the eighth day falls on the Sabbath.”

VIII. II:20: Continuation of the foregoing. R. Aha bar Jacob said, “Said Scripture, ‘...on the eighth day...’ — even if it is the Sabbath.”

A. II:21: Secondary gloss of II.19-20. It has been taught on Tannaite authority in accord with R. Yohanan and not in accord with R. Aha bar Jacob:

1. II:22: As above. Said Raba, “Lo, as to the Tannaite authority before us, to begin with why was he satisfied, but in the end what troubled him?”

4. II:23: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: The rite of circumcision overrides the rules of the skin ailment, whether it is done at its correct time or not at its correct time; it overrides the restrictions of festivals only when it is done at its correct time on the eighth day.

a. II:24: What is the source of this statement?

I. II:25: Gloss of the proof given above. Said Raba, “Lo, as to the Tannaite authority before us, to begin with why was he satisfied, but in the end what troubled him?”

II. II:26: Continuation of foregoing. That proof suffices for an adult, in the context of which “flesh” is written; so, too, in the context of an infant “flesh” is written. But how do we know that the same is the case for one who is of intermediate age?

III. II:27: Continuation of foregoing. Raba said, “That circumcision at the proper time overrides the restrictions of the skin ailment does not require a verse of Scripture, since that proposition derives from an argument a fortiori, as follows: If circumcision overrides the restrictions of the Sabbath, which is the weightier matter, surely it should override the restrictions of the skin ailment.”

IV. II:28: Continuation of foregoing. And lo, the exchange of Raba and R. Safra represents a Tannaite exchange as well, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority:

A. II:29: Secondary gloss of the foregoing.

1. II:30: Different version.

2. II:31: Continuation of the foregoing.

I. II:32: Gloss of foregoing.

E. AN ENCOMPASSING PRINCIPLE DID R. AQIBA STATE, “ANY SORT OF LABOR IN CONNECTION WITH CIRCUMCISION WHICH IT IS POSSIBLE TO DO ON THE EVE OF THE SABBATH DOES NOT OVERRIDE THE RESTRICTIONS OF THE SABBATH, AND THAT WHICH IT IS NOT POSSIBLE TO DO ON THE EVE OF THE SABBATH DOES OVERRIDE THE PROHIBITIONS OF THE SABBATH.”

1. III:1: Said R. Judah said Rab, “The decided law accords with R. Aqiba.”

CIX. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 19:2

A. THEY DO PREPARE ALL THAT IS NEEDED FOR CIRCUMCISION ON THE SABBATH: THEY (1) CUT THE MARK OF CIRCUMCISION, (2) TEAR,

1. I:1: Now since the Tannaite framer of the passages repeats each item on its own, what is the language, all that is needed for circumcision on the Sabbath, meant to encompass?

2. I:2: Who is the Tannaite authority who maintained, Once he has completed the rite, he may not return to cut away those that do not invalidate the circumcision?

3. I:3: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: They trim the membrum, and if one does not trim it, he is subject to the penalty of extirpation.

a. I:4: Who is penalized in that way?

B. (3) SUCK OUT THE WOUND

1. II:1: Said R. Pappa, “A surgeon who didn’t suck out the wound — that is a source of danger, and we throw him out.”

C. AND THEY PUT ON IT A POULTICE AND CUMIN.

1. III:1: Said Abbaye, “Mother said to me, “A salve for all pains is seven parts of fat and one of wax.”

D. IF ONE DID NOT POUND IT ON THE EVE OF THE SABBATH, HE CHEWS IT IN HIS TEETH AND PUTS IT ON. IF ONE DID NOT MIX WINE AND OIL ON THE EVE OF THE SABBATH, LET THIS BE PUT ON BY ITSELF AND THAT BY ITSELF.

1. IV:1: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: Things that are not done for circumcision on the Sabbath are done for it on the festival day: They crush cumin, beat up wine and oil together, on its account.

2. IV:2: Said Abbaye to R. Joseph, “What differentiates the matter of crushing cumin on festivals? It is because it can be used in a recipe. But wine and oil are suitable for a sick person on the Sabbath.”

3. IV:3: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: They don’t strain mustard through a mustard strainer, nor do they sweeten it with a glowing coal.

a. IV:4: Gloss.

b. IV:5: Gloss.

c. IV:6: Gloss as above.

E. AND THEY DO NOT MAKE A BANDAGE IN THE FIRST INSTANCE. BUT THEY WRAP A RAG AROUND THE WOUND OF THE CIRCUMCISION. IF ONE DID NOT PREPARE THE NECESSARY RAG ON THE EVE OF THE SABBATH, HE WRAPS THE RAG AROUND HIS FINGER AND BRINGS IT, AND EVEN FROM A DIFFERENT COURTYARD

1. V:1: Said Abbaye, “Mother told me, ‘The side selvedge of the infant’s bandage should be uppermost facing outward, lest a thread stick and the infant end up with a penis that has been cut off.’

CX. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 19:3

A. THEY WASH OFF THE INFANT, BOTH BEFORE THE CIRCUMCISION AND AFTER THE CIRCUMCISION, AND THEY SPRINKLE HIM, BY HAND BUT NOT WITH A UTENSIL. R. ELEAZAR B. AZARIAH SAYS, “THEY WASH THE INFANT ON THE THIRD DAY AFTER CIRCUMCISION EVEN IF IT COINCIDES WITH THE SABBATH, SINCE IT SAYS, ‘AND IT CAME TO PASS ON THE THIRD DAY WHEN THEY WERE SORE’ (GEN. 34:25).”

1. I:1: First you say, They wash off the infant meaning in the normal manner, but then by hand but not with a utensil! Both R. Judah and Rabbah bar Abbuha say, “The intent of the Tannaite formulation is to explain, how do they do it, namely: They wash off the infant, both before the circumcision and after the circumcision: How so? They sprinkle him by hand but not with a utensil.”

a. I:2: Case.

b. I:3: When R. Dimi came, he said R. Eleazar said, “The decided law accords with R. Eleazar b. Azariah.”

c. I:4: Recapitulation of the foregoing.

I. I:5: Gloss of foregoing.

2. I:6: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: They put on a wound on the Sabbath dry wadding or a dry sponge, but not a dry reed or dry rags.

B. IF THE SEXUAL TRAITS OF THE INFANT ARE A MATTER OF DOUBT, OR IF THE INFANT BEARS THE SEXUAL TRAITS OF BOTH SEXES, THEY DO NOT VIOLATE THE SABBATH ON HIS ACCOUNT:

1. II:1: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: “Foreskin”: If it is assuredly the foreskin of a male child, then the rite overrides the restrictions of the Sabbath, but in a case of doubt, then the rite does not override the restrictions of the Sabbath.

a. II:2: Gloss.

b. II:3: It has been stated: Rab said, “The decided law is in accord with the initial Tannaite authority.” And Samuel said, “The decided law is in accord with R. Simeon b. Eleazar.”

I. II:4: R. Adda bar Ahbah: To him was born an infant who was circumcised. He made the rounds of thirteen circumcisers to bring out a drop of blood for the sake of circumcision, but they refused to do so on the Sabbath, so he himself did it and botching the job, cut off his penis. He said, “May such and so come upon me, for I have violated what Rab said.”

A. II:5: Secondary expansion of foregoing.

2. I:6: Said R. Assi, “Any infant whose mother is unclean by reason of childbirth is circumcised on the eighth day but it is done immediately, and any whose mother is not unclean by reason of childbirth is not circumcised on the eighth day: ‘If a woman conceive seed and bear a male child, then she shall be unclean... and in the eighth day the flesh of his foreskin shall be circumcised’ (Lev. 12: 2-3).”

a. II:7: Tannaite reprise.

3. II:8: It has been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Simeon b. Gamaliel says, “Any human offspring that survived for thirty days is not classified as a miscarriage, as it is said, ‘And those that are to be redeemed of them from a month old shall you redeem’ (Num. 18:16). Any animal that lives for eight days is not classified as a miscarriage, ‘and from the eighth day and henceforth it shall be accepted for an offering’ (Lev. 22:27).”

a. II:9: Secondary gloss.

b. II:10: Further gloss of II:8.

I. II:11: Clarification of the issue.

II. II:12: Continuation of the foregoing.

A. II:13: Illustrative case.

B. II:14: As above.

4. II:15: It has been stated: If the offspring died within thirty days and the mother widow of the deceased father went and got betrothed assuming that she no longer had a levirate obligation — Rabina in the name of Raba said, “If she is the wife of a member of the Israelite caste, she undertakes the rite of removing the shoe, but if she is the wife of a member of the priestly caste, she does not even have to do that.” R. Mesharshayya in the name of Raba said, “All the same is this woman and that one: She performs the rite of removing the shoe.”

C. AND R. JUDAH PERMITS IN THE CASE OF AN INFANT BEARING THE TRAITS OF BOTH SEXES.

1. III:1: Said R. Shizbi said R. Hisda, “It was for not all purposes that R. Judah permitted in the case of an infant bearing the traits of both sexes, for if you take that position, the offspring also would be subject to a vow of valuation.”

CXI. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 19:4

A. HE WHO HAD TWO INFANTS, ONE TO CIRCUMCISE AFTER THE SABBATH AND ONE TO CIRCUMCISE ON THE SABBATH, AND WHO FORGOT WHICH WAS WHICH AND CIRCUMCISED THE ONE TO BE CIRCUMCISED AFTER THE SABBATH ON THE SABBATH, IS LIABLE. IF HE HAD ONE TO CIRCUMCISE ON THE EVE OF THE SABBATH AND ONE TO CIRCUMCISE ON THE SABBATH, AND HE FORGOT AND ON THE SABBATH, CIRCUMCISED THE ONE TO BE CIRCUMCISED ON THE EVE OF THE SABBATH. R. ELIEZER DECLARES HIM LIABLE TO A SIN-OFFERING. AND R. JOSHUA EXEMPTS HIM.

1. I:1: He who had two infants, one to circumcise after the Sabbath and one to circumcise on the Sabbath, and who forgot which was which and circumcised the one to be circumcised after the Sabbath on the Sabbath, is liable: R. Huna repeated, “He is liable.” R. Judah repeated, “He is exempt from liability.”

CXII. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 19:5

A. AN INFANT IS CIRCUMCISED ON THE EIGHTH, NINTH, TENTH, ELEVENTH OR TWELFTH DAY AFTER BIRTH, NEVER SOONER, NEVER LATER. HOW SO? UNDER NORMAL CIRCUMSTANCES, IT IS ON THE EIGHTH DAY. IF HE WAS BORN AT TWILIGHT, HE IS CIRCUMCISED ON THE NINTH DAY. IF HE WAS BORN AT TWILIGHT ON THE EVE OF THE SABBATH, HE IS CIRCUMCISED ON THE TENTH DAY THE FOLLOWING SUNDAY. IN THE CASE OF A FESTIVAL WHICH FALLS AFTER THE SABBATH, HE WILL BE CIRCUMCISED ON THE ELEVENTH DAY MONDAY. IN THE CASE OF TWO FESTIVAL DAYS OF THE NEW YEAR, HE WILL BE CIRCUMCISED ON THE TWELFTH DAY TUESDAY.

AN INFANT WHO IS SICK — THEY DO NOT CIRCUMCISE HIM UNTIL HE GETS WELL.

1. I:1: An infant who is sick — they do not circumcise him until he gets well: Said Samuel, “Once a fever has left the child, he is given seven full days of recovery.”

2. I:2: The question was raised: Do we require a full twenty-four hours of recovery?

CXIII. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 19:6

A. THESE ARE THE SHREDS OF THE FORESKIN, IF THEY REMAIN WHICH RENDER THE CIRCUMCISION INVALID: FLESH WHICH COVERS THE GREATER PART OF THE CORONA — AND SUCH A ONE DOES NOT EAT HEAVE-OFFERING.

1. I:1: Flesh which covers the greater part of the corona: Said R. Abina said R. Jeremiah bar Abba said Rab, “It is the flesh that covers the greater part of the height of the corona.”

B. AND IF HE WAS FAT SO THE CORONA APPEARS TO BE COVERED UP, ONE HAS TO FIX IT UP FOR APPEARANCE’S SAKE.

1. II:1: Said Samuel, “An infant’s penis that was overgrown with flesh, we look into the case. So long as, when he has an erection, he appears circumcised, it is not necessary to circumcise him, but if not, it is necessary to recircumcise him.”

C. IF ONE CIRCUMCISED BUT DID NOT TEAR THE INNER LINING THE CUT DID NOT UNCOVER THE CORONA, SINCE THE MEMBRANE WAS NOT SPLIT AND PULLED DOWN, IT IS AS IF HE DID NOT PERFORM THE ACT OF CIRCUMCISION.

1. III:1: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: He who performs the rite of circumcision says, “Blessed... who has sanctified us by his commandments and commanded us concerning circumcision.” The father of the boy says, “Blessed... who has sanctified us by his commandments and commanded us to bring him into the covenant of our father Abraham.”

CXIV. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 20:1

A. R. ELIEZER SAYS, “(1) ON THE FESTIVAL THEY SPREAD OUT A STRAINER, AND (2) ON THE SABBATH THEY POUR WINE INTO ONE WHICH IS ALREADY SPREAD OUT.”

1. I:1: Since R. Eliezer maintains that one may not add to a temporary “tent” such as is involved in suspending a strainer, can it be supposed that he would permit making one to begin with?

B. AND SAGES SAY, “(1) ON THE FESTIVAL THEY DO NOT SPREAD OUT A STRAINER:”

1. II:1: The question was raised: If one does spread it out, what is the rule?

a. II:2: Abbayye collected strict rulings of Tannaite statements external to the Mishnah and repeated them: A leather bag, strainer, canopy, or camp chair one may not stretch out, and if he did so, he is exempt from penalty, while such an act is forbidden. Permanent tents he should not set up, and if he did so, he is liable to a sin-offering. But as to a bed, chair, three-legged stool, and footstool he may set up to begin with these are not in the category of tents, since the covers are permanently spread out.

C. ...AND (2) ON THE SABBATH THEY DO NOT POUR WINE INTO ONE WHICH IS SPREAD OUT.

BUT ON THE FESTIVAL THEY POUR WINE INTO ONE WHICH IS SPREAD OUT.”

1. III:1: The question was raised: If one strained wine, what is the law?
2. III:2: On what grounds do we admonish a person not to perform the action, so that, if he does so, it will have been a deliberate and knowing act and he will be liable?
3. III:3: R. Ammi bar Ezekiel repeated as a Tannaite statement: "As to a doubled-over sheet, one may not spread it out, but if he did so, he is exempt because the top of this improvised tent is less than a handbreadth in width, though the act is forbidden. If a thread or cord was wound around it; the sheet was already on the pole from before the Sabbath, and a thread or cord was attached thereto by means of which it might be pulled down; when it is pulled down, one merely adds to a temporary or improvised tent, to begin with it is permitted to spread it out."
4. III:4: R. Kahana asked Rab, "As to a canopy, what is the law?"
5. III:5: Said Rab in the name of R. Hiyya, "A door curtain may be hung up and taken down being no tent, for it has no roof."
- a. III:6: And said R. Sheshet b. R. Idi, "A peaked cap is permitted."
6. III:7: R. Ammi bar Ezekiel sent word to R. Huna, "Tell us please, some of those really excellent statements that you told us in the name of Rab, two concerning the Sabbath, one concerning the Torah." He replied to him, "This is what has been taught on Tannaite authority: As to a leather bag, it is permitted to stretch it by its thongs. Said Rab, 'They made this statement only with reference to two men's doing so, but if done by one man, it is forbidden.'" As to the Torah, Rab said, "The Torah is destined to be forgotten in Israel."

D. TOPICAL APPENDIX ON THE PROPOSITION THAT THE TORAH IS DESTINED TO BE FORGOTTEN IN ISRAEL

- a. III:8: Expansion of a subordinate point in the foregoing. The Torah is destined to be forgotten in Israel.
- b. III:9: It has been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Simeon b. Yohai says, "God forbid that the Torah should be forgotten in Israel, as it is said, 'For it shall not be forgotten out of the mouths of their descendants' (Deu. 31:21). But then how should I interpret the verse, 'they shall run to and fro to seek the word of the Lord and shall not find it' (Amo. 8:11-12)? That they will not find a clarification of a statement of the law or a clarification of a passage of the Mishnah in any place."
- c. III:10: It has been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Yosé b. Elisha says, "If you see a generation on which great troubles break, go and examine the judges of Israel, for any punishment that comes into the world comes only on account of the judges of Israel, as it is said, 'Hear this, please you heads of the house of Jacob and rulers of the house of Israel, who abhor judgment and pervert all equity. They build up Zion with blood and Jerusalem with iniquity. The heads thereof judge for reward, and the priests thereof teach for hire, and the prophets thereof divine for money, yet will they lean upon the Lord? (Mic. 3: 9-11). They are wicked, yet they put their trust in him who by speaking brought the world into being. Therefore the Holy One, blessed be He, will bring upon them three

punishments for three transgressions for which they bear responsibility, as it is said, 'Therefore shall Zion for your sake be ploughed as a field, and Jerusalem shall become heaps, and the mountain of the house as the high places of a forest' (Mic. 3:12)."

d. III:11: Said Ulla, "Jerusalem will be redeemed only through righteousness, as it is written, 'Zion shall be redeemed with judgment and her converts with righteousness' (Isa. 1:27)."

e. III:12: Said R. Milai in the name of R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon, "What is the meaning of the verse, 'The Lord has broken the staff of the wicked, the scepter of the rulers' (Isa. 14: 5)? 'The Lord has broken the staff of the wicked': This refers to judges who become a staff for their court officers; 'The scepter of the rulers' refers to disciples of sages who belong to families of the judges."

f. III:13: Said R. Milai in the name of R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon, "What is the meaning of the verse, 'For your hands are defiled with blood, and your fingers with iniquity; your lips have spoken lies, your tongue speaks wickedness' (Isa. 59: 3)? 'For your hands are defiled with blood' speaks of judges; 'and your fingers with iniquity' speaks of the scribes of the judges; 'your lips have spoken lies' refers to the court clerks of the judges; 'your tongue speaks wickedness' means litigants."

g. III:14: And said R. Milai in the name of R. Isaac Magdalene, "From the day on which Joseph took his leave of his brothers, he didn't taste the taste of wine: 'The blessings of your father shall be on the head of Joseph, and on the crown of the head of him who was a Nazirite since his departure from his brothers' (Gen. 49:26)."

h. III:15: And said R. Milai, "As a reward for the fact, 'and when he sees you, he shall be glad in his heart' (Exo. 4:14) Aaron will have the merit of wearing the breastplate of judgment on his heart."

E. FURTHER STUDY OF THE ISSUES OF THE MISHNAH-PARAGRAPH

1. III:16: The people of Bashkar sent word to Levi, "As to setting up a canopy on the Sabbath, what is the law? About planting cuscuta in a vineyard, what is the law? As to dealing with a corpse on a festival, what is the law?"

a. III:17: Supplement: Declared Rab, "One who wants to may plant cuscuta in a vineyard."

b. III:18: Supplement: As to a corpse, he sent them word, "As to a corpse, neither Jews nor gentiles should get involved with it either on the first day of a festival or on the second day of a festival."

2. III:19: Said R. Abin bar Huna said R. Hama bar Guria, "A person may wrap himself in a canopy sheet and tie it with its cords to go out into the street on the Sabbath and need not scruple."

3. III:20: Said Rabbah bar R. Huna, "A person may practice deception with a strainer on a festival. This he does by spreading it out as if to hold pomegranates, but straining lees in it."

a. III:21: Case.

CXV. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 20:2

A. THEY POUR WATER OVER WINE DREGS SO THAT THEY WILL BE CLARIFIED:

1. I:1: Said Zeiri, “A person may put clear wine and clear water into a strainer on the Sabbath without apprehension, but not turbid liquid since this might constitute straining.”

B. AND THEY STRAIN WINE IN CLOTHS OR IN A TWIG BASKET:

1. II:1: Said R. Shimi bar Hiyya, “And that is on condition that one doesn’t make a hollow in the cloth.”

1. II:2: Said R. Hiyya bar Ashi said Rab, “And that is on condition that he doesn’t lift the basket a handbreadth above the bottom of the utensil that receives the wine and so make a tent of it.”

2. II:3: Said Rab, “Spreading a rag over half a cask to cover it is permitted; over the whole is forbidden on the count of making a tent.”

3. II:4: Said R. Pappa, “Someone shouldn’t stuff wood chips into the mouth of a cask jug, since it looks as though he’s making a strainer.”

C. AND THEY PUT AN EGG INTO A MUSTARD STRAINER:

1. III:1: R. Jacob Qorhah repeated as a Tannaite statement: “That is because that is done only to color the stew, but not for the purpose of straining or selecting.”

2. III:2: It has been stated: As to mustard grain that one needed on the Sabbath eve, on the next day — Said Rab, “One may crush it in a utensil but not by hand.”

3. III:3: It has been stated: R. Eleazar said, “One way or the other, it is forbidden.” And R. Yohanan said, “One way or the other, it is permitted.”

a. III:4: Illustrative story.

b. III:5: Illustrative story.

4. III:6: Said Mar Zutra, “The decided law is not in accord with any of these traditions. But it is in accord with that which has been stated: As to mustard that is knead on the eve of the Sabbath, on the next day one may crush it whether by hand or with a utensil and may put honey in it, but not beat it up but may only be mixed. If cress is chopped up on the eve of the Sabbath, the next day one may put in oil and vinegar and add pepperwort, and he must not beat it up but may mix it. Garlic that is crushed on the eve of the Sabbath, on the next day one may put in beans and grits, but not pound them, but may mix them up and add pepperwort.”

D. AND THEY PREPARE HONEYED WINE ON THE SABBATH.

R. JUDAH SAYS, “ON THE SABBATH IT IS DONE IN A CUP, AND ON A FESTIVAL DAY IN A FLAGON, AND ON THE INTERVENING DAYS OF A FESTIVAL IN A BARREL.” R. SADOQ SAYS, “ALL DEPENDS ON THE NUMBER OF GUESTS.”

1. IV:1: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: On the Sabbath people may prepare a wine-honey-pepper mixture, but not aromatic water.

a. IV:2: Story.

CXVI. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 20:3

A. THEY DO NOT SOAK ASAFOETIDA IN WARM WATER. BUT ONE PUTS IT INTO VINEGAR.

1. I:1: The question was raised: If one did soak it, what is the law?
2. I:2: R. Yohanan asked R. Yannai, “What is the law if one soaked asafoetida in cold water?”
3. I:3: For what do people make it?
 - a. I:4: Gloss of foregoing.
 - b. I:5: Story.

B. COMPOSITE OF RULINGS ON THE SABBATH IN HISDA’S NAME, JOINED TO BEGIN WITH AS A GLOSS TO THE FOREGOING

- A. I:6: Said R. Hisda, “As to linen, it is permitted to draw it away from the cane, it is forbidden to draw it out of the cane.”
- B. I:7: Said R. Hisda, “As to a bunch of vegetables, if it is fit for food for animals, it may be handled, if not, it is forbidden.”
 1. I:8: Miscellaneous insertion.
- C. I:9: Other statements by Hisda, not related to I:7.

C. AND THEY DO NOT SOAK VETCHES OR RUB THEM. BUT ONE PUTS THEM INTO A SIEVE OR A BASKET.

THEY DO NOT SIFT CHOPPED STRAW IN A SIFTER. NOR DOES ONE PUT IT ON A HIGH PLACE SO THAT THE CHAFF WILL FALL OUT. BUT ONE TAKES IT IN A SIEVE AND POURS IT INTO THE CRIB.

1. II:1: Our Mishnah rule does not accord with the following Tannaite authority, as has been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Eliezer b. Jacob says, “They don’t look at a sieve at all or handle it for any purpose.”

CXVII. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 20:4

A. “THEY CLEAN OUT A MANGER BEFORE AN OX THAT IS BEING FATTENED. AND THEY SWEEP ASIDE SPILLED FODDER ON ACCOUNT OF A GRAZING ANIMAL OR: EXCREMENT,” THE WORDS OF R. DOSA. AND SAGES PROHIBIT DOING SO:

1. I:1: The question was raised: Do rabbis disagree with the first or the second of the two rulings of R. Dosa or with them both?

B. THEY TAKE FODDER FROM BEFORE ONE BEAST AND PUT IT BEFORE ANOTHER BEAST ON THE SABBATH

1. II:1: One Tannaite statement: They take fodder from before an animal that is fastidious and they put it before one that is not. And it has further been taught on Tannaite authority: They take it from before an animal that is not fastidious and put it before one that is.

CXVIII. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 20:5

A. THE STRAW WHICH IS ON THE BED — ONE SHOULD NOT SHIFT IT WITH HIS HAND. BUT HE SHIFTS IT WITH HIS BODY. AND IF IT WAS FOOD FOR A BEAST, OR IF THERE WAS A CUSHION OR A SHEET ON IT, HE MAY SHIFT IT WITH HIS HAND. A PRESS USED BY HOUSEHOLDERS DO THEY LOOSEN BUT DO THEY NOT TIGHTEN. AND ONE OF LAUNDRYMEN ONE SHOULD NOT TOUCH AT ALL. R. JUDAH SAYS, “IF IT WAS UNTIED ON THE EVE OF THE SABBATH, ONE MAY UNTIE THE WHOLE THING AND REMOVE CLOTHING FROM IT.”

B. MISCELLANEOUS RULINGS ON SABBATH CONDUCT

1. I:1: Said R. Nahman, “As to a radish, if it is right side up, it is permitted, if it is upside down, it is forbidden because carrying indirectly is not classified as handling.”
2. I:2: Said R. Judah, “As to peppercorns, one may crush them one by one with a knife handle; it is forbidden to do so in twos.”
3. I:3: And said R. Judah, “One who bathes in water should first dry the part of his body that is not in the water, then come up out of the water, lest he come to carry water that is on him for four cubits in neglected public domain.”
4. I:4: Said Abbaye, and some say R. Judah, “As to mud on one’s foot, one may scrape it off on the ground but not on the wall.”
5. I:5: It has been stated: Mar b. Rabina said, “All the same are the one and the other: It is forbidden.” R. Pappa said, “All the same are the one and the other: It is permitted.”
6. I:6: Said Raba, “A person shouldn’t sit on the head of a stake, lest something roll away from him into public domain and he end up retrieving it.”
7. I:7: Said R. Kahana, “As to mud on one’s garment, one may rub off the inside but not the outside.”
8. I:8: Said R. Abbahu said R. Eleazar said R. Yannai, “They may scrape off a new shoe but not an old one.”
9. I:9: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: A person with small feet shouldn’t go forth wearing shoes for a person with big feet, but he may wear too large a shirt. A woman may not go out with an open toed shoe, nor may she perform the rite of removing the shoe with such a shoe, but if she does, the rite of removing the shoe is valid. And one may not go out into public domain wearing new shoes.
10. I:10: One Tannaite teaching: They remove a shoe from off its last. And it has been further taught on Tannaite authority: They do not remove it.

CXIX. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 21:1

A. A MAN TAKES UP HIS CHILD, WITH A STONE IN THE CHILD’S HAND:

1. I:1: A man takes up his child, with a stone in the child’s hand: Said Raba, “If one took out into public domain a living child, with a purse hanging around the

child's neck, he is liable on the count of carrying the purse; if it was a dead child with a purse around its neck, he is exempt."

a. I:2: Gloss of a detail of the foregoing.

2. I:3: We have learned in the Mishnah: A man takes up his child, with a stone in the child's hand. Said the household of R. Yannai, "This refers to a child who clings to his father." If so, why make reference in particular to a stone? The same rule would apply to a coin. So how come Raba said, "They repeated this rule only with reference to a stone, but if it were a coin, it would be forbidden to do so"?

B. ...OR A BASKET WITH A STONE IN IT:

1. II:1: But why should this be the rule? Rather, let the basket be regarded as a stand for a forbidden article?

C. AND THEY HANDLE UNCLEAN HEAVE-OFFERING ALONG WITH CLEAN HEAVE-OFFERING OR WITH UNCONSECRATED FOOD.

1. III:1: Said R. Hisda, "They taught this rule only in the case in which the food in the status of heave-offering is underneath, and the unclean is on top. But if the clean were on top and the unclean underneath, he has to take the clean and leave the unclean."

D. R. JUDAH SAYS, "ALSO: THEY TAKE OUT THE ONE PART OF HEAVE-OFFERING THAT HAS FALLEN INTO A HUNDRED PARTS OF UNCONSECRATED FOOD."

1. IV:1: But why should this be the case? Lo, he is making the food fit for use? This should be prohibited by a precautionary decree, lest one make it fit by means of an act of labor that is forbidden.

CXX. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 21:2

A. A STONE WHICH IS OVER THE MOUTH OF A JAR — ONE TILTS THE JAR ON ITS SIDE AND THE STONE FALLS OFF.

1. I:1: A stone which is over the mouth of a jar: Said R. Huna said Rab, "They repeated this rule only in the case of one who forgets, but if he put it there, it is treated as a basis for something that is forbidden and it may not be handled."

B. IF IT THE JAR WAS AMONG OTHER JARS, ONE LIFTS IT THE JAR UP AND THEN TURNS IT ON ITS SIDE, SO THAT IT THE STONE FALLS OFF.

1. II:1: Who is the Tannaite authority who takes the view that in any situation in which there is something permitted and something forbidden, we take up what is permitted, not what is forbidden here: we don't handle the stone, which is forbidden for handling, but we do handle the cask, which is permitted?

C. COINS WHICH ARE ON A PILLOW — ONE SHAKES THE PILLOW, AND THEY FALL OFF. IF THERE WAS SNOT ON IT, ONE WIPES IT OFF WITH A RAG.

IF IT WAS MADE OF LEATHER, THEY POUR WATER ON IT UNTIL IT THE SNOT DISAPPEARS.

1. III:1: It has been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Yosé says, "If the jug was lying in a storage house or there was glassware lying underneath it, he lifts it out

elsewhere, tilts it on a side, so it falls off, and then takes what he needs of it and puts it back.”

2. III:2: Said R. Huna said Rab, “They repeated this rule only in the case of one who forgets, but if he put it there, it is treated as a basis for something that is forbidden and it may not be handled.”

3. III:3: Said R. Oshayya, “If one forgot a purse in the courtyard, he may put a loaf or a child on top of it and move it.” Said R. Isaac, “If one forgot a brick in the courtyard, he may put a loaf or a child on top of it and move it.”

a. III:4: Exemplary story analyzed: Abbayye put a ladle on a pile of sheaves. Raba put a knife on a young dove that had been killed but was raw and unsalted and handled it.

CXXI. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 21:3

A. 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.”

1. I:1: Said R. Nahman, “We have no alternative but that the House of Shammai concur with R. Judah, and the House of Hillel with R. Simeon.” At issue is whether we may handle what we may not use; the House of Shammai reject that view, the House of Hillel accept it. Judah accepts that prohibition, Simeon rejects it.

B. THEY REMOVE FROM THE TABLE CRUMBS LESS THAN AN OLIVE’S BULK IN SIZE,

1. II:1: That supports the view of R. Yohanan, for said R. Yohanan, “Crumbs less than an olive in bulk still may not be wasted.”

C. PODS OF CHICK-PEAS, AND PODS OF LENTILS, BECAUSE IT IS FOOD FOR A BEAST.

A SPONGE, IF IT HAS A HANDLE — THEY WIPE WITH IT. AND IF NOT, THEY DO NOT WIPE WITH IT. AND SAGES SAY, “ONE WAY OR THE OTHER, IT IS HANDLED ON THE SABBATH. AND IT DOES NOT RECEIVE UNCLEANNES.”

1. III:1: It is R. Simeon, who rejects the principle that what may not be used may not be touched.

2. III:2: As to pits of Aramaean dates, it is permitted to handle them, since they are fit for cattle, on account of where they come from the date itself. And Persian ones are forbidden.

CXXII. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 22:1

A. A JAR WHICH BROKE ON THE SABBATH — THEY SAVE FROM ITS WINE ENOUGH SUSTENANCE FOR THREE MEALS. AND ONE SAYS TO OTHERS, “COME ALONG AND SAVE SOME FOR YOURSELF” ON CONDITION THAT ONE NOT SPONGE IT UP.

1. I:1: A Tannaite statement: One may not sponge up wine or dab up oil, so that one may not do it the way he does on a weekday.

2. I:2: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: If one's produce scattered in the courtyard, he may collect it a bit at a time and eat it, but he may not put it into a basket or a tub, so that one may not do it the way he does on a weekday.

B. THEY DO NOT SQUEEZE PIECES OF FRUIT TO GET OUT THE JUICE. AND IF THE JUICE CAME OUT ON ITS OWN, IT IS PROHIBITED FOR USE ON THE SABBATH. R. JUDAH SAYS, "IF THE PRODUCE WAS INTENDED FOR FOOD, WHAT EXUDES FROM IT IS PERMITTED. AND IF THE PRODUCE WAS INTENDED FOR DRINK, WHAT EXUDES FROM IT IS PROHIBITED."

1. II:1: Said R. Judah said Samuel, "R. Judah conceded to sages the cases of olives and grapes. How come? Since they are routinely available for pressing, he finds that fact agreeable and may be pleased to have the juice." And Ulla said Rab said, "R. Judah would differ also in the case of olives and grapes." And R. Yohanan said, "The decided law accords with R. Judah as to other produce but the law does not accord with R. Judah in the matter of olives and grapes." Said Rabbah said R. Judah said Samuel, "R. Judah conceded to sages the cases of olives and grapes, and sages concede R. Judah's position in respect to all other types of produce."

a. II:2: Secondary analysis of foregoing. But does R. Judah really maintain that if the purpose was not articulated, the liquid that exudes is forbidden?

2. II:3: And the members of the household of Menasia ben Menahem would press pomegranates — Said R. Nahman, "The decided law is in accord with the household of Menasia bar Menahem."

3. II:4: We have learned in the Mishnah there: If wine or olive sap fell into it and changed the color of part of it the water — it is invalid (cf. M. Miq. 7: 4). Now who is the Tannaite authority who maintains that olive sap is a liquid? At issue between them is the status of what exudes after the olives have been subject to their own pressure.

4. II:5: Said R. Judah said Samuel, "A person may squeeze out a grape cluster into a pot of food; for obviously the juice will not be drunk separately but is meant to season the food; as such it remains a food, a solid itself, but not into a plate from which it may be drunk on its own." Said R. Hisda, "From the teaching of our lord, we may learn the rule: One may milk a goat into a pot of food but not into plate."

a. II:6: Gloss of foregoing.

5. II:7: Said R. Zira said R. Hiyya bar Ashi said Rab, "A person may squeeze a grape cluster into a pot of food but not into a plate; he may squeeze a fish for the brine even onto a plate."

a. II:8: Further analysis of the foregoing.

6. II:9: Said R. Hiyya bar Ashi said Rab, "By the law of the Torah, one is liable only for treading out olives and grapes alone."

a. II:10: Discussion of a secondary rule in the foregoing, not relevant to our topic.

C. HONEYCOMBS WHICH ONE BROKE ON THE EVE OF THE SABBATH AND THEIR LIQUIDS EXUDED ON THEIR OWN — THEY ARE PROHIBITED. AND R. ELEAZAR PERMITS USE OF THE HONEY ON THE SABBATH.

1. III:1: When R. Hoshayya came from Nehardea, he came and brought in hand a Tannaite formulation as follows: Olives and grapes that one crushed on the eve of the Sabbath, and their juices exude on their own — they are forbidden that is, it is forbidden to drink the juice on the Sabbath. But R. Eleazar and R. Simeon permit.

CXXIII. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 22:2

A. WHATEVER IS PUT INTO HOT WATER ON THE EVE OF THE SABBATH — THEY SOAK IT AGAIN IN HOT WATER ON THE SABBATH.

1. I:1: Whatever is put into hot water on the eve of the Sabbath — they soak it again in hot water on the Sabbath: Gimme a furinstance of something that can be put into hot water but then soaked again!

a. I:2: Illustrative case.

b. I:3: Illustrative case.

c. I:4: Illustrative case.

d. I:5: Illustrative case.

B. AND WHATEVER IS NOT PUT INTO HOT WATER ON THE EVE OF THE SABBATH — THEY ONLY RINSE IT IN HOT WATER ON THE SABBATH, EXCEPT FOR PICKLED FISH, SMALL SALTED FISH, AND SPANISH TUNNY FISH, FOR RINSING THEM IS THE COMPLETION OF THEIR PREPARATION FOR EATING.

1. II:1: And if one did rinse them?

C. FREE-STANDING COMPOSITION, INSERTED BECAUSE OF II.2.N

1. II:2: In session before R. Yohanan were R. Hiyya bar Abba and R. Assi, and R. Yohanan was in session but dozing off. Said R. Hiyya bar Abba to R. Assi, “How come the chickens in Babylonia are fat?” He said to him, “Go to the wilderness of Gaza, and I’ll show you chickens fatter than they.” “How come the festivals in Babylonia are so joyful?” “Because they are so poor.” “How come the disciples of sages in Babylonia are so clearly designated as such in their garments?” “Because they really are not masters of the Torah.” “How come gentiles lust?” “Because they eat disgusting and creeping things.” At that moment R. Yohanan woke up and said to them, “Little ones, didn’t I say to you, ‘Say to wisdom, you are my sister’ (Pro. 7: 4) — if a matter is as clear to you as the fact that your sister is forbidden to marry you, say it, and if not, don’t say it.”

CXXIV. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 22:3

A. A PERSON BREAKS A JAR TO EAT DRIED FIGS FROM IT, ON CONDITION THAT HE NOT INTEND IN OPENING THE JAR TO MAKE IT INTO A UTENSIL.

1. I:1: A person breaks a jar to eat dried figs from it, on condition that he not intend in opening the jar to make it into a utensil: Said R. Oshaia, “They have repeated this rule only with reference to pressed raisins, but not to those that are loose.”

2. I:2: One Tannaite statement holds: One may untie, unravel or cut through the wicker wrappers of raisins and dates. And yet another states: One may untie, but not unravel or cut through the wicker wrappers of raisins and dates.

3. I:3: The question was asked of R. Sheshet, “What is the law on piercing a cask with a spit on the Sabbath? Is the intent to make an opening, which would be forbidden? Or is it to serve with a lavish hand, so it would be permitted?”

B. “BUT THEY DO NOT PIERCE THE PLUG OF A JAR,” THE WORDS OF R. JUDAH. AND SAGES PERMIT IT.

1. II:1: Said R. Huna, “The dispute concerns piercing it on top, but as to doing so at the side, all concur it is forbidden. Thus he repeats the Mishnah language in this way: And they do not pierce it on the side.”

2. II:2: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: They do not pierce a new hole in a utensil on the Sabbath, but as to enlarging one, one may enlarge a hole. And there are those who say, “They do not enlarge one.” But they concur that one may pierce an existing hole to begin with.

a. II:3: Analysis of foregoing. As to the first of the two Tannaite authorities, how come he maintains that one may not make a new hole? Is it because he is making an opening? Well, in addition to, he is improving an opening!

b. II:4: As above.

3. II:5: Putting a tube into a barrel — Rab prohibits. And Samuel permits.

a. II:6: Tannaite recapitulation.

C. AND THEY DO NOT PIERCE IT ON THE SIDE. AND IF IT WAS PIERCED, ONE SHOULD NOT PUT WAX ON IT, BECAUSE HE WOULD HAVE TO SPREAD IT OVER WHICH IS A PROHIBITED ACT.

SAID R. JUDAH, “A CASE CAME BEFORE RABBAN YOHANAN BEN ZAKKAI IN ARAB, AND HE SAID, ‘I FEAR ON HIS ACCOUNT THAT HE SHOULD BRING A SIN-OFFERING FOR VIOLATING THE SABBATH.’”

1. III:1: As to using oil for the same purpose — Rab prohibits. Samuel permits.

a. III:2: Gloss.

2. III:3: Said Tabut the fowler said Samuel, “To make a myrtle leaf for that purpose is forbidden.”

4. III:4: As to linen sheets worn as a garment — Rab forbids, and Samuel permits.

CXXV. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 22:4

A. THEY PUT A COOKED DISH IN A CISTERN SO THAT IT MAY BE PRESERVED:

1. I:1: They put a cooked dish in a cistern so that it may be preserved: obviously!

B. AND A VESSEL CONTAINING FRESH WATER INTO FOUL WATER TO KEEP IT COOL, AND COLD WATER INTO THE SUN TO WARM IT UP.

1. II:1: Obviously!

C. HE WHOSE CLOTHING FELL INTO WATER ON THE WAY GOES ALONG IN THEM AND DOES NOT SCRUPLE. WHEN HE REACHES THE OUTER COURTYARD, HE SPREADS THEM OUT IN THE SUN. BUT THIS HE DOES NOT DO IN FRONT OF PEOPLE.

1. III:1: Said R. Judah said Rab, “In any case in which sages have imposed a prohibition for appearance’s sake, then even if one is in the innermost chambers, such an action still is forbidden.”

2. III:2: Said R. Huna, “He who shakes out his cloak on the Sabbath is liable to a sin-offering. But we have stated that fact only with reference to new ones, but as to old ones, we have no objection. And we have stated that rule only with reference to black ones, but as to white or red ones, we have no objection. And the whole depends on whether or not he is meticulous bout them.”

a. III:3: Case.

b. III:4: Case.

3. III:5: Said R. Isaac bar Joseph said R. Yohanan, “He who goes out in public domain with a cloak folded over and lying on his shoulder on the Sabbath is liable to a sin-offering.”

4. III:6: Said R. Judah, “There was the case of Hyrcanus, the son of R. Eliezer b. Hyrcanus, who went forth on the Sabbath with a scarf on his shoulder, with a thread of it wound around his finger to keep it from falling off. And when the case came before sages, they said, “Even if a thread were not wrapped around his finger it would be o.k..”

5. III:7: Ulla visited the household of Assi bar Hini. They asked him, “What is the law on making a cape on the Sabbath?”

a. III:8: Gloss.

b. III:9: Case.

c. III:10: Case.

CXXVI. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 22:5-6

A. HE WHO BATHES IN CAVE WATER OR IN THE WATER OF TIBERIAS:

1. I:1: The Tannaite formulation treats cave water as equivalent to water of Tiberias. Just as the latter is hot, so the former refers to water of a hot spring. And the language that is used is, He who bathes, meaning, only after the fact, but not to begin with.

B. ...AND DRIED HIMSELF, EVEN WITH TEN TOWELS, MAY NOT THEN CARRY THEM IN HIS HAND. BUT TEN MEN DRY THEIR FACES, HANDS, AND FEET WITH A SINGLE TOWEL AND BRING IT ALONG IN THEIR HAND.

1. II:1: The opening clause tells us an innovative rule, and the later clause also tells us an innovative rule.

2. II:2: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: A person may dry himself with a towel and put it on the window sill, but he may not give it to the bath attendants, since they are suspect of that possibility wringing it out to give to other

people. R. Simeon says, “He may dry off with one towel and bring it home in his hand.”

a. II:3: Gloss. Said Abbaye to R. Joseph, “What is the decided law?”

4. II:4: Said R. Hiyya bar Abba said R. Yohanan, “Bath attendants may bring women’s bathing garments to the baths, on condition that in them they cover their heads and the greater part of their bodies using them as clothing.

C. THEY ANOINT AND MASSAGE THE STOMACH:

1. III:1: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: They anoint and massage the stomach of a sick person on the Sabbath, on condition that this not be done the way it is done on weekdays.

a. III:2: Gloss.

D. BUT THEY DO NOT HAVE IT KNEADED:

1. IV:1: Said R. Hiyya bar Abba said R. Yohanan, “It is forbidden to stand on the mud of Diomsit where there are warm springs, because it stimulates and loosens the bowels.”

a. IV:2: Gloss of a detail of the foregoing.

b. IV:3: Gloss of a detail of the foregoing.

I. IV:4: Gloss of a detail of the foregoing.

E. ...OR SCRAPED:

1. V:1: But they do not have it kneaded or scraped: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: They do not scrape with a scraper on the Sabbath. Rabban Simeon g. Gamaliel says, “If the feet were dirty with mud and shit, one may scape them down so that they won’t make his clothes dirty” (T. **Shab. 16:19**).

a. V:2: Case.

F. THEY DO NOT GO DOWN TO A MUDDY WRESTLING GROUND.

1. VI:1: How come? Because of sinking into the soil.

G. AND THEY DO NOT INDUCE VOMITING.

1. VII:1: Said Rabbah bar bar Hannah said R. Yohanan, “This has been taught only with reference to doing so with an emetic, but as to doing so by hand, that is permitted.”

H. AND THEY DO NOT STRAIGHTEN THE LIMB OF A CHILD OR SET A BROKEN LIMB.

1. VIII:1: Said Rabbah bar bar Hannah said R. Yohanan, “It is permitted to swaddle an infant on the Sabbath.”

2. VIII:2: Said R. Hana of Baghdad said Samuel, “The decided law is: one may reset a broken bone.”

a. VIII:3: Story.

I. HE WHOSE HAND OR FOOT WAS DISLOCATED SHOULD NOT POUR COLD WATER OVER THEM. BUT HE WASHES IN THE USUAL WAY. AND IF HE IS HEALED, HE IS HEALED.

1. IX:1: R. Avayya was in session before R. Joseph. His hand became dislocated. He said to him, “So what’s the rule for this case?”

CXXVII. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 23:1

A. A MAN ON THE SABBATH ASKS FOR JUGS OF WINE OR OIL FROM HIS FELLOW, PROVIDED THAT HE DOES NOT SAY TO HIM, “LEND THEM TO ME.”

1. I:1: A man on the Sabbath asks for jugs of wine or oil from his fellow, provided that he does not say to him, “Lend them to me”: Said Raba bar R. Hanan to Abbaye, “What differentiates the word choice ‘lend me for a long time’ from ‘lend me for a short time’ that the former may not be used, the latter may?”

2. I:2: Said Raba b. Hanin to Abbaye, “Did the rabbis say, ‘On a festival day, insofar as it is possible to do work in an unusual way, one should in fact do it in an unusual way’? For to the contrary, these women that is, our wives — when they fill up water pitchers on the festival day, they do not do it differently at all, yet we do not say a thing to them about it!”

a. I:3: And said Raba b. Hanin to Abbaye, “We have learned in the Mishnah: On a festival day they do not clap hands, slap the thigh or dance, lest they come also to play musical instruments (M. **Bes. 5: 2**). But now, when we see that people do this anyway, we do not say a thing to them!”

B. AND SO A WOMAN BORROWS LOAVES OF BREAD FROM HER NEIGHBOR:

1. II:1: On the Sabbath it is forbidden to do so, but on a weekday it’s quite all right. Therefore may we say that our Mishnah paragraph is not in accord with Hillel? For we have learned in the Mishnah: And so does Hillel say, “A woman should not lend a loaf of bread to her girl friend unless she states its value in money. For the price of wheat may go up, and the two women will turn out to be involved in a transaction of usury (M. **B.M. 5:9E-F**).

C. AND IF ONE DOES NOT TRUST THE OTHER, HE LEAVES HIS CLOAK WITH HIM AND SETTLES WITH HIM AFTER THE SABBATH.

1. III:1: It has been stated: As to a loan made on the festival — R. Joseph says, “It is not subject to claim.” Rabbah said, “It is subject to claim.”

D. AND SO IS THE CASE ON THE EVE OF PASSOVER IN JERUSALEM WHEN THAT DAY COINCIDES WITH THE SABBATH: ONE LEAVES HIS CLOAK WITH HIM AND TAKES HIS PASSOVER LAMB AND SETTLES WITH HIM AFTER THE FESTIVAL.

1. IV:1: Said R. Yohanan, “On the Sabbath one may designate as holy an animal for use for his Passover, and on the festival, an animal for use as his festal-offering.”

CXXVIII. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 23:2

A. A MAN MAY COUNT THE NUMBER OF HIS GUESTS AND THE FINGER FOOD PORTIONS ORALLY, BUT NOT BY WHAT IS WRITTEN DOWN.

1. I:1: How come? R. Bibi said, “It is a precautionary decree, lest he erase what is written down.” Abbaye said, “It is a precautionary decree, lest he read ordinary writings other than holy writings on the Sabbath.”

a. I:2: Tannaite recapitulation of the issue.

2. I:3: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: An inscription that runs under pictures or busts of rulers — they do not look at it on the Sabbath. Not only so, but on an ordinary day they do not look at the busts, since it is said, “Do not turn to idols or make for yourselves molten gods” (Lev. 19: 4) (T. Shab. 17:1-C).

B. AND HE CASTS LOTS WITH HIS CHILDREN AND THE MEMBERS OF HIS HOUSEHOLD AT THE TABLE TO DECIDE WHO GETS WHICH PORTION, ON CONDITION THAT HE NOT INTEND TO OFFSET A LARGER PORTION, AGAINST A SMALL ONE, BECAUSE OF THE PROHIBITION OF PLAYING WITH DICE ON THE SABBATH.

1. II:1: He may do so with his children and the members of his household, but not with outsiders? How come?

C. AND THEY CAST LOTS ON A FESTIVAL DAY FOR WHICH PRIEST GETS WHICH PART OF HOLY THINGS, BUT NOT FOR THE PORTIONS.

1. III:1: What is the meaning of but not for the portions?

a. III:2: Composition tacked on by reason of an attributive shared with the foregoing.

2. III:3: How do we know that the word lots means “lottery”?

D. FURTHER EXEGESIS OF “HOW ARE YOU YOU FALLEN FROM HEAVEN, DAY STAR, SON OF THE MORNING? HOW ARE YOU CUT DOWN TO THE GROUND, YOU WHO CAST LOTS THE SAME WORD AS OCCURS HERE OVER THE NATIONS” (ISA. 14:12)

1. III:4: “How are you you fallen from heaven, day star, son of the morning? How are you cut down to the ground, you who cast lots the same word as occurs here over the nations” (Isa. 14:12): Said Rabbah bar R. Huna, “This teaches that he cast lots over all the eminent men of the kingdom to find out which of them should be his mome for the day.”

2. III:5: And said R. Yohanan, “Throughout the entire life of that wicked man, nobody ever laughed, as it is said, ‘The whole world is at rest and is quiet, they break forth into singing’ (Isa. 14: 7), meaning, up to then there was no singing.”

3. III:6: And said R. Isaac said R. Yohanan, “One may not stand in that wicked man’s palace: ‘And satyrs shall dance there’ (Isa. 14:21).”

4. III:7: Continuation of the foregoing.

5. III:8: As above.

a. III:9: Extension of the theme.

b. III:10: Extension of the theme.

CXXIX. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 23:3

A. A MAN SHOULD NOT HIRE WORKERS ON THE SABBATH. AND A MAN SHOULD NOT ASK HIS FELLOW TO HIRE WORKERS FOR HIM.

1. I:1: And a man should not ask his fellow to hire workers for him: Well, what might be the difference between the man and his neighbor that we have to be told he may not ask the fellow to hire for him, since he cannot hire for himself?

2. I:2: And who then stands behind the Mishnah rule? It is R. Joshua b. Qorhah, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority: A man may not say to his fellow, “Well, we shall see whether you will join me to work for me in the evening.” R. Joshua b. Qorhah says, “A man may say to his fellow, ‘Well, we shall see whether you will join me to work for me in the evening’” (T. **Shab. 17:11**).

3. I:3: Said Rabbah bar bar Hannah said R. Yohanan, “The decided law accords with R. Joshua b. Qorhah.”

a. I:4: Gloss.

b. I:5: Continuation of the foregoing.

4. I:6: Said R. Judah said Samuel, “Reckoning minimal accounts and trivial matters is permitted on the Sabbath.”

B. THEY DO NOT WAIT AT TWILIGHT AT THE SABBATH LIMIT TO HIRE WORKERS, OR TO BRING IN PRODUCE.

1. II:1: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: There was a case of a certain pious man, in whose field a breach was made, so he decided to fence it. He remembered it was the Sabbath, and he didn’t do it. A miracle was done for him. A caperbush grew up on the spot, from which he and his entire household made a living.

2. II:2: Said R. Judah said Samuel, “It is permitted for someone to say to his fellow on the Sabbath, ‘Tomorrow I’m going to such and such a town,’ the reason being that, if there are way stations on the road within two thousand cubits of one another, he may make the trip anyhow.”

C. BUT ONE MAY WAIT AT THE SABBATH LIMIT AT TWILIGHT TO GUARD PRODUCE, AND AFTER NIGHTFALL HE BRINGS BACK THE PRODUCE IN HIS HAND.

1. III:1: And even though he did not recite the Prayer that Distinguishes the Sacred Day from Ordinary Days habdalah? But didn’t R. Eleazar b. Antigonus say in the name of R. Eliezer b. Jacob, “It is forbidden for someone to carry on his affairs before he has recited the Prayer that Distinguishes the Sacred Day from Ordinary Days habdalah”? And should you say that he recited that prayer in the Prayer recited as the last one on the Sabbath, didn’t R. Judah say Samuel said, “He who recites the Prayer that Distinguishes the Sacred Day from Ordinary Days in the Prayer itself has to say that same prayer over a cup of wine anyhow.” And should you say that he did recite it over a cup of wine, is a cup going to be available out in the field where he says the Prayer?

a. III:2: Secondary detail.

D. A GOVERNING PRINCIPLE DID ABBA SAUL STATE, “WHATEVER I HAVE THE RIGHT TO SAY TO ANOTHER PERSON TO DO, ON THAT ACCOUNT I HAVE THE RIGHT TO WAIT AT TWILIGHT AT THE SABBATH LIMIT.”

1. IV:1: To which clause of the Mishnah does Abba Saul make reference? Should I say that he makes reference to the first clause, namely, They do not wait at

twilight at the Sabbath limit to hire workers, or to bring in produce? 151A Then instead of the language, Whatever I have the right to say to another person to do, on that account I have the right to wait at twilight at the Sabbath limit, he should say, Whatever I do not have the right to say to another person to do, on that account I do not have the right to wait at twilight at the Sabbath limit! But if he makes reference to the second clause, namely, But one may wait at the Sabbath limit at twilight to guard produce, and after nightfall he brings back the produce in his hand, then what it should say is, Whatever I have the right to wait at twilight at the Sabbath limit, I have the right to say to another person to do, on that account!

2. IV:2: What does this governing principle serve to encompass in addition?

CXXX. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 23:4

A. THEY WAIT AT THE SABBATH LIMIT AT TWILIGHT TO ATTEND TO THE BUSINESS OF A BRIDE, AND THE AFFAIRS OF A CORPSE, TO BRING IT A COFFIN AND WRAPPINGS. A GENTILE WHO BROUGHT WAILING PIPES ON THE SABBATH — AN ISRAELITE SHOULD NOT MAKE A LAMENT WITH THEM,

UNLESS THEY CAME FROM A NEARBY PLACE.

1. I:1: What is the definition of a nearby place?

a. I:2: Gloss of a detail of the foregoing: What is the definition of a gentile of high estate?

B. IF THEY MADE FOR HIM A GENTILE A COFFIN AND DUG A GRAVE FOR HIM, AN ISRAELITE MAY BE BURIED THEREIN. BUT IF THIS WAS DONE FOR AN ISRAELITE, HE MAY NOT EVER BE BURIED THEREIN.

1. II:1: Why so? Here, too, let him wait a sufficient span of time for such things to have been made?

CXXXI. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 23:5A-J

A. THEY PREPARE ALL THAT IS NEEDED FOR A CORPSE. THEY ANOINT AND RINSE IT, ON CONDITION THAT THEY NOT MOVE ANY LIMB OF THE CORPSE.

THEY REMOVE THE MATTRESS FROM UNDER IT. AND THEY PUT IT ON COOL SAND SO THAT IT WILL KEEP. THEY TIE THE CHIN, NOT SO THAT IT WILL GO UP, BUT SO THAT IT WILL NOT DROOP FURTHER. AND SO IN THE CASE OF A BEAM WHICH BROKE — THEY SUPPORT IT WITH A BENCH OR THE BEAMS OF A BED, NOT SO THAT IT WILL GO UP, BUT SO THAT IT WILL NOT DROOP FURTHER.

1. I:1: But didn't R. Judah say Samuel said, "There was the case of a disciple of R. Meir who followed him into the bathhouse and wanted to swill the ground for him, but he told him, 'They don't swill the ground.' He wanted to oil the ground for him, but he said to him, 'They don't oil the ground'"?

2. I:2: They prepare all that is needed for a corpse: What does the word all encompass?

a. I:3: Scriptural proof text.

b. I:4: Further supplement.

CXXXII. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 23:5K-M

A. THEY DO NOT CLOSE THE EYES OF A CORPSE ON THE SABBATH, OR ON AN ORDINARY DAY AT THE MOMENT THE SOUL GOES FORTH. AND HE WHO CLOSES THE EYES OF A CORPSE AT THE MOMENT THE SOUL GOES FORTH, LO, THIS ONE SHEDS BLOOD.

1. I:1: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: He who closes the eyes of a dying man as the soul goes forth — lo, such a one sheds blood. The matter may be compared to a flame that is flickering out; if someone put his finger on it, it goes out at once.

2. I:2: It has been taught on Tannaite authority: Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel says, “He who wants the eyes of a corpse to be closed — let him blow wine into his nostrils and put oil between the two eyelids and hold the two big toes, and they will close on their own.”

3. I:3: It has been taught on Tannaite authority: Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel says, “For a day old infant they desecrate the Sabbath, for David, king of Israel, in death they don’t desecrate the Sabbath.”

a. I:4: Complement to the foregoing.

B. MISCELLANEOUS SAYINGS ON THE TOPIC OF DEATH

1. I:5: Said R. Pappa, “We have as a tradition: ‘A lion doesn’t attack two people together.’”

2. I:6: Said R. Hanina, “It is forbidden to sleep in a room all alone, and whoever sleeps in a room all alone — Lilith grabs him.”

3. I:7: And it has been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Simeon b. Eleazar says, “Act while you find the occasion and have the chance and the power to do it. And Solomon in his wisdom also said, ‘Remember also your creator in the days of your youth or ever evil days come’ (Qoh. 12: 1) — this refers to the time of old age; ‘and the years draw nigh when you shall say, I have no pleasure in them’ — this refers to the days of the Messiah, in which there is no longer any consideration of inherited merit or guilt.”

4. I:8: It has been taught on Tannaite authority: A person should always ask for mercy to be spared this measure, for if he doesn’t descend into poverty, his son will, if not his son, his grandson, ‘because for this thing’ (Deu. 15:10).”

5. I:9: Said R. Joseph, “We have it as a tradition that a neophyte rabbi is never in want.”

6. I:10: Said R. Hiyya to his wife, “When a poor person comes, bring him bread quickly, so that others will be quick to give bread to your children.”

7. I:11: It has been taught on Tannaite authority: Rabban Gamaliel b. Ribbi said, “‘And he shall give you mercy and have compassion on you and multiply you’ (Deu. 13:17) — whoever has mercy on other people will be shown mercy from Heaven, and whoever doesn’t show mercy to other people won’t be shown mercy from Heaven.”

8. I:12: “Or ever the sun and the light be darkened” (Qoh. 12: 2) — this refers to the forehead and the nose.

9. I:13: Said Samuel, “For tears, up to age forty one can recover, from that time, he can’t.”

a. I:14: Story.

C. SAYINGS AND STORIES ON OLD AGE

1. I:15: “In the day when the keeper of the house shall tremble, and the strong men shall bow themselves” (Qoh. 12: 2) — “In the day when the keeper of the house shall tremble”: This refers to the sides and the ribs.

2. I:16: Said Caesar to R. Joshua b. Hananiah, “How come you didn’t come to the celebration?” “The mountain is snow, surrounded by ice, the dog doesn’t bark, the grinders don’t grind.”

3. I:17: It has been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Yosé bar Qisma says, “Better are two than three, woe is for the one thing that goes and doesn’t come back.”

4. I:18: When R. Dimi came, he said, “Youth is a crown of roses, age, a crown of willow-rods.”

5. I:19: It has been taught on Tannaite authority in the name of R. Meir, “Chew well with your teeth and you will find it in your steps: ‘For then we had plenty of food and were well and saw no evil’ (Jer. 44:17).”

6. I:20: Said Samuel to R. Judah, “Sharp wit! Open your mouth and let your food come in. Until age forty food is better, then, drink is better.”

a. I:21: Story.

7. I:22: Said Rabbi to R. Simeon b. Halafta, “How come we didn’t receive you on the festival in the way in which my ancestors would receive yours?” He said to him, “You know, the rocks have gotten tall, what is near has gotten distant, two have become three, and the peacemaker of the household sexual relations has ceased.”

8. I:23: “And the doors shall be shut in the streets” (Qoh. 12: 4) — this refers to the holes of a man.

9. I:24: And so said Barzillai the Gileadite say to David, “I am today four score years old, can I discern between good and bad?” (2Sa. 19:35) — this shows that opinions of old men change.

a. I:25: Gloss of foregoing.

10. I:26: It has been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Ishmael b. R. Yosé says, “Disciples of sages, as they grow old, get more wisdom: ‘With aged men is wisdom and in length of days understanding’ (Job. 12:12). But when the ignorant get older, they get stupider: ‘He removes the speech of the reliable and takes away the understanding of elders’ (Job. 12:20).”

11. I:27: “Yes, they shall be afraid of that which is high” (Qoh. 12: 5) — even a little hill looks like a high mountain.

a. I:28: Illustrative story.

I. I:29: Topical continuation.

II. I:30:Topical continuation.

12. I:31: And said R. Isaac, “What is the meaning of the verse, ‘For youth and the prime of life are vanity’ (Qoh. 11:10)? What a man does in his youth blacken his face in old age.”

a. I:32: Other saying of the same authority.

b. I:33: Other saying of the same authority.

D. BEHAVIOR IN THE PRESENCE OF THE CORPSE. THE SOUL.

1. I:34: Said R. Judah, “In the case of a deceased for whom there is no survivor to be comforted, ten people go and sit in the place in which he died and do the obsequies.”

2. I:35: Said R. Abbahu, “Whatever they say in the presence of the deceased he knows until the sealing stone closes his grave.”

3. I:36: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: “And the dust return to the earth as it was and the spirit returns to God” (Qoh. 12: 7) — Give it back to him: Just as it was given to you, in purity, so give it back to him in purity.

4. I:37: It has been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Eliezer says, “The souls of the righteous are hidden away under the throne of glory: ‘Yet the soul of my lord shall be bound up in the bundle of life with the Lord your God’ (1Sa. 25:29). And those of the wicked are kept in prison. One angel stands at one end of the world, and another angel stands at the other end of the world, and they sling their souls from one to the other: ‘And the souls of your enemies, them shall he sling out, as from the hollow of a sling’ (1Sa. 25:29).”

5. I:38: Said R. Mari, “The righteous are destined to be dust: ‘And the dust return to the earth as it was’ (Qoh. 12: 7).”

6. I:39: Story about communication from the grave.

7. I:40: Said a Sadducee to R. Abbahu, “You people say, the souls of the righteous are hidden under the throne of glory. Then how did the necromancer working with bones bring up Samuel through his necromancy (1Sa. 28: 7)?”

8. I:41: Said R. Judah b. R. Samuel bar Shila in the name of Rab, “On the basis of the funeral eulogy of a person, it is known whether he is destined to the world to come or not.”

a. I:42: Gloss of foregoing.

9. I:43: R. Eleazar asked Rab, “Who is a person destined for the world to come?”

10. I:44: “And the mourners go about the streets” (Qoh. 12: 5) — The Galileans say, “Do things that will be lamented in front of your bier.” The Judeans say, “Do things that will be lamented behind your bier.”

11. I:45: We have learned in the Mishnah there: R. Eliezer says, “Repent one day before you die” (M. **Abot 2:10D**). His disciples asked R. Eliezer, “So does someone know just what day he’ll die?”

12. I:46: “Let your garments be always white and don’t let your head lack ointment” (Qoh. 9: 8) — said R. Yohanan b. Zakkai, “The matter may be compared to the case of a king who invited his courtiers to a banquet, but he didn’t set a time. The smart ones among them got themselves fixed up and waited at the gate of the palace, saying, ‘Does the palace lack anything?’ They can do it any time. The stupid ones among them went about their work, saying, ‘So is there a banquet without a whole lot of preparation?’ Suddenly the king demanded the presence of his courtiers. The smart ones went right before him, all fixed up, but the fools went before him filthy from their work. The king received the smart ones pleasantly, but showed anger to the fools. He said, ‘These, who fixed themselves up for the banquet, will sit and eat and drink. Those, who didn’t fix themselves up for the banquet, will stand and look on.’”

CXXXIII. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 24:1

A. HE WHO WAS OVERTAKEN BY DARKNESS ON THE ROAD GIVES HIS PURSE TO A GENTILE.

1. I:1: 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?

a. I:2: Clarification of foregoing.

B. IF THERE IS NO GENTILE WITH HIM, HE LEAVES IT ON AN ASS.

1. II:1: 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.

2. II:2: 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. The question was raised: If there are a deaf-mute and a minor, what is the rule?

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

a. II:4: Gloss of foregoing.

b. II:5: As above.

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

5. II:7: 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.”

a. II:8: Supplement to II:6. 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.”

C. WHEN HE REACHES THE OUTERMOST COURTYARD OF A TOWN, HE REMOVES FROM THE ASS THOSE UTENSILS WHICH MAY BE HANDLED ON THE SABBATH. AND AS TO THOSE UTENSILS WHICH ARE NOT TO BE HANDLED ON THE SABBATH, HE UNLOOSENS THE ROPES, AND THE BUNDLES FALL BY THEMSELVES.

1. III:1: 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.”

2. III:2: It has been taught on Tannaite authority: 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.”

a. III:3: Illustrative story.

b. III:4: As above.

l. III:5: Tannaite recapitulation of the dispute embedded in the foregoing story.

CXXXIV. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 24:2

A. THEY LOOSEN BUNDLES OF HAY IN FRONT OF CATTLE, AND THEY SPREAD OUT BUNCHES, BUT NOT SMALL BUNDLES. AND THEY DO NOT CHOP UP UNRIPE STALKS OF CORN OR CAROBS BEFORE CATTLE, WHETHER LARGE OR SMALL BEASTS. R. JUDAH PERMITS IN THE CASE OF CAROBS FOR SMALL BEASTS.

1. I:1: 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.” 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.”

CXXXV. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 24:3

A. THEY DO NOT STUFF FOOD INTO A CAMEL OR CRAM IT INTO ITS MOUTH. BUT THEY PUT FOOD INTO ITS MOUTH.

1. I:1: What is the meaning of they do not stuff food into a camel or cram it into its mouth?

B. AND THEY DO NOT FATTEN CALVES WITH FOOD AGAINST THEIR WILL, BUT THEY PUT FOOD INTO THEIR MOUTHS IN THE NORMAL WAY.

1. II:1: What is the meaning of “fattening” and what is the meaning of “putting food into their mouths”?

a. II:2: 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. II:3: Tannaite support for a position taken at II:1.

C. AND THEY FORCE-FEED CHICKENS. THEY PUT WATER INTO THE BRAN, BUT THEY DO NOT KNEAD IT, 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.

1. III:1: And they force feed chickens: Said Abbayye, “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.’”

2. III:2: Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: They do not mix mashed grain. Others say, “They do.”

a. III:3: Gloss of foregoing.

l. III:4: Illustrative story.

3. III:5: 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.’”

4. III:6: 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.”

5. III:7: 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.”

D. COMPOSITE ON ASTROLOGY. ATTACHED FOR FORMAL REASON “IT WAS WRITTEN IN THE NOTEBOOK OF “

1. III:8: 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.”

2. III:9: It has been stated: 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.” R. Yohanan said, “Israel is not subject to the stars.”

3. III:10: And so Rab takes the view that Israel is not subject to the stars. It is also the position of Samuel that Israel is not subject to the stars.

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

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

CXXXVI. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 24:4

A. THEY CUT UP GOURDS BEFORE CATTLE, AND CARRION MEAT BEFORE DOGS. R. JUDAH SAYS, “IF IT WAS NOT CARRION ON THE EVE OF THE SABBATH, IT IS PROHIBITED, BECAUSE IT IS NOT SOMETHING WHICH HAS BEEN MADE READY BEFORE THE SABBATH FOR USE ON THE SABBATH.”

1. I:1: It has been stated: 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.” 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.” 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.”

CXXXVII. Mishnah-Tractate Shabbat 24:5

A. THEY ABROGATE VOWS ON THE SABBATH.

1. I:1: **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. AND THEY RECEIVE QUESTIONS CONCERNING MATTERS WHICH ARE REQUIRED FOR THE SABBATH.

1. II:1: 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. THEY STOP UP A LIGHT HOLE. AND THEY MEASURE A PIECE OF STUFF AND AN IMMERSION POOL. 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.

1. III:1: Said R. Judah said Rab, “There was a small passage between two houses, with something unclean there, and a split barrel shaped defective roofing on top of them. 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.”

D. AND FROM THEIR DEED WE LEARNED THAT THEY STOP UP, MEASURE, AND TIE UP ON THE SABBATH.”

1. IV:1: 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?”

Points of Structure

1. DOES BABYLONIAN TALMUD-TRACTATE SHABBAT FOLLOW A COHERENT OUTLINE GOVERNED BY A CONSISTENT RULES?

While the tractate contains a number of compositions and composites formed around a program other than that of Mishnah-commentary and legal theory, the structure of the Talmud finds its framework in the Mishnah-tractate, and most sizable composites take shape around the work of Mishnah-commentary, exceptions being listed presently.

2. WHAT ARE THE SALIENT TRAITS OF ITS STRUCTURE?

The framers of the tractate consistently investigate the properties, formal and propositional, of the Mishnah-tractate; only when that work has been fully accomplished do they insert composites that address other concerns than those of Mishnah-exegesis, and, in that connection, they give priority to composites devoted to topics that intersect with those of the Mishnah or of Mishnah-exegesis over those that do not.

3. WHAT IS THE RATIONALITY OF THE STRUCTURE?

What imparts coherence to the tractate is the Mishnah's statements, read in sequence, and the tractate overall is devoted to the task of Mishnah-exegesis; the principle of cogency derives solely from that work.

4. WHERE ARE THE POINTS OF IRRATIONALITY IN THE STRUCTURE?

We find a variety of composites that originally coalesced around other topics than those introduced by the Mishnah, all the more so around other tasks than phrase-by-phrase Mishnah-exegesis. Some of these composites are formed around a common attributive formula, some around a common attributive formula and a common theme, many around a common theme or problem, and some few around the exegesis of successive verses of Scripture. In this tractate we find a number of composites made up of rules governing Sabbath observance; some of these exhibit a certain miscellaneous quality. Finally, some of the topical composites hold together by addressing a common theological proposition (few), or topic (many).

Seen all together, these diverse composites of an other-than-Mishnah-exegetical character form a sizable body but in no way affect the overall character of the tractate as organized around the Mishnah. Given the sheer volume of the Talmud, moreover, they do not vastly change the picture of the whole. The reason for that judgment is simple. We are able to specify the rules of agglutination (e.g., attributive formulas) or aggregation (e.g., topical coherence) that accounts for the formation of these anomalous composites, but, more to the point, we also are able to explain, case by case, why the framer of the Talmud found a place for a given anomalous composite. The upshot is, there are no "massive miscellanies" in our tractate, even though, viewed in their own terms, some of these anomalous composites do give the impression of a certain miscellaneous character. In the second rubric below we consider each item and its impact upon the tractate as a whole.

Points of System

1. DOES THE BABYLONIAN TALMUD-TRACTATE SHABBAT SERVE ONLY AS A REPRESENTATION OF THE MISHNAH-TRACTATE OF THE SAME NAME?

The tractate's framers have dealt with most, though not all, of the statements of the Mishnah; they have included a fair number of composites that form topical or formal supplements to their principal ones. For these two, contradictory reasons, the answer to the question is a qualified negative. The tractate serves mainly as a systematic representation of the Mishnah-tractate of the same name.

2. HOW DO THE TOPICAL COMPOSITES FIT INTO THE TALMUD-TRACTATE AND WHAT DO THEY CONTRIBUTE THAT THE MISHNAH-TRACTATE OF THE SAME NAME WOULD LACK WITHOUT THEM?

I present the account in three sections. On the left hand margin are important propositional composites that do not address the Mishnah's propositions but do affect them. Identifying these items and distinguishing them from those on the right hand margin involve a measure of subjectivity, and for that reason, I have tried to impose the most rigorous and narrowest possible definition of what is both free-standing and also affective of the rest. In the center I give those utterly anomalous composites that ignore the principle of propositional or at least topical cogency altogether. These often find cogency in a shared attributive formula, as indicated. At the right are the composites that complement the Mishnah's statements with topically relevant amplifications or that carry forward the Mishnah's principle to new data. Some of these entries complement a composite devoted to the Mishnah by taking up a subordinate theme and exploring that theme. Finally, I underline and also position in the center column large composites that strike me as entirely out of phase with the Mishnah, lacking all point of contact, whether topical or in principle or even theme, broadly construed. These items further do not link up to composites that relate to the Mishnah and therefore from the perspective of my claim that the tractate takes shape as Mishnah-commentary and further extends from that purpose to some other, are totally free-standing. We can often explain why a given item is parachuted down, but we cannot show a rational link of any compelling sort between that item and its context.

II.F COMPOSITE OF SAYINGS IN THE ATTRIBUTIVE,
AND SAID RABA BAR MEHASAYYA SAID
R. HAMA BAR GURIA SAID RAB

VI.J THE HANUKKAH LAMP.
THE FESTIVAL OF HANUKKAH
[attached to the discussion of the Sabbath Lamp:
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]

VI.L: HANUKKAH IN THE LITURGY

XI.B: TOPICAL APPENDIX: THE STATUS
OF THE BOOKS OF QOHELET AND PROVERBS
[The prior unit makes reference to pertinent verses,
which provide the slender basis for including
this sizable composite; the principle of composition is agglutinative;
a tangential reference then validates
the insertion of what amounts
to a ready-made appendix]

XI.C: ANSWER NOT A FOOL ACCORDING
TO HIS FOLLY. THE IMPORTANCE
OF HUMILITY. Whether or not this
item continues XI.B settles
the question of classification,
either as a continuation of the foregoing or as a
completely anomalous intrusion;
I am inclined to prefer the former alternative,
but it is surely a matter of judgment.

XI.D. MISCELLANY: THE STUDY OF
THE TORAH AND THE PRESENCE OF GOD.

However we classify the foregoing,
the present item must be treated as
miscellaneous and not really cogent,
and also as inserted for no clear
reason of a formal, let alone a
substantive, character.

XXX.M TAKING RESPONSIBILITY FOR
WHAT HAPPENS IN THE COMMUNITY
This item certainly glosses the one to which
it is attached, which says that one is responsible
for something that he could have prevented.

XXXIII.E: TOPICAL COMPOSITE ON THE THEME
OF WOMEN WHO INDULGE THEMSELVES IN LUXURY
The reference in the Mishnah to a woman's
carrying a perfume flask accounts
for the inclusion of this item.

XXXIV.C: DISCIPLES OF SAGES; TORAH STUDY
AND ITS VALUE.

The Mishnah's dispute on the status of weapons of
war provokes the insertion of this item, which
complements the discussion of what is ugly in man
with what is beautiful, thus, study of the Torah,
with special emphasis on conflict over the Torah,
as in the opening item, "Two disciples of sages
sharpen one another in law. Thus the insertion is

pointed and specific to its context and provides an important comment on the implications of sages' position in the Mishnah: appropriate conflict, which is for the sake of Heaven. Here there is a defensible claim that the composite forms a wry comment on the Mishnah and imparts to its rule a dimension otherwise absent.

XXXIV:E: THE SUSCEPTIBILITY TO
UNCLEANNES OF WOVEN MATERIAL

XXXIV.F: "AND WE HAVE BROUGHT
THE LORD'S OFFERING, WHAT EACH MAN HAS GOTTEN
OF JEWELS OF GOLD, ANKLE CHAINS,
AND BRACELETS, SIGNET RINGS AND
EAR RINGS AND ARMLETS" (NUM. 31: 50)

This is not completely out of
phase with the Mishnah's topical
program, but it hardly supplements
the Mishnah in any ordinary way.

XXXVIII.B: WHAT IS BAD, GOOD FOR HEALTH.

Includes a Common attributive:

Said Abin bar Huna said R. Hama bar Guria,
but that does not predominate throughout.

XLV.D: COMPOSITE ON
ANTIDOTES AND REMEDIES

XLVIII:D: UTILIZATION OF STONES
TO CLEAN UP AFTER DEFECATING.

This item adds another reason for
carrying stones on the Sabbath.

LIII:B: TOPICAL APPENDIX ON
THE REVELATION AT SINAI

LXIV:B: TOPICAL APPENDIX
ON CLAY UTENSILS

LXV:B: TOPICAL APPENDIX ON
THE WOOD-GATHERER OF NUM. 15:32.

This item complements
the Mishnah-amplification that precedes it.

LXV:D: THE BOARDS OF THE TABERNACLE IN THE WILDERNESS

Like the foregoing, this is integral to the Mishnah-exegesis
that invokes the generative analogy of
building the tabernacle in the wilderness.

LXXIV:C: TOPICAL APPENDIX ON THE MEANINGS
OF LETTERS OF THE ALPHABET

LXXVIII.B: TOPICAL COMPOSITE ON
MOURNING FOR A SAGE. Once more
we introduce to a general topic a
particular perspective deriving from
sages' concerns.

LXXIX: A. COMMENT ON AN
INTERSECTING MISHNAH-PASSAGE

This composite is inserted for essentially formal reasons

LXXXII: E: TOPICAL APPENDIX ON
MATERIALS USED FOR PHYLACTERIES

The question, What is the law on writing phylacteries
on the skin of a clean fish? is hardly required in context,
and so far as I can see, it also does not contribute
to a different perspective on the Mishnah's rule.

LXXXIII:C: TOPICAL APPENDIX
ON DISEASES AND THE
USE ON THE SABBATH
OF THEIR REMEDIES

Once we deal with materials used for healing,
the appendix is a natural next step

LXXXIX.B: COMPOSITE ON RUTH,
BEGINNING WITH HER PREPARATION
OF PROPER GARMENTS FOR THE SABBATH

The reason for including this composite
is made explicit in context. The connection
is substantive but still tangential to the aggregation
of the composite itself.

LXXXIX:C: FURTHER
ON PROPER DRESS
ON THE SABBATH

This propositional composite is integral
to the context of the Mishnah-rule.

XCI:A:FREE-STANDING DISCUSSION WHICH
INVOKES OUR MISHNAH-RULE AS A SUBORDINATED FACT
IN ITS ANALYTICAL ARGUMENT.

Because there is a clear point of intersection,
I do not see this item as irrational (within the
present sense of the word) but as peripheral.

XCII:C: THE PLEASURES OF THE SABBATH
AND THE REWARDS FOR OBSERVING ITS SANCTITY

This free-standing composite is one of several
to place into context the Mishnah-tractate's burden
of detailed rules, underscoring the main point of
Sabbath-observance.

XCII:D: A FURTHER MISCELLANY: ON
WHAT COUNT DO PEOPLE ACHIEVE MERIT
TO ENJOY OTHER BENEFITS;
FURTHER REWARDS FOR KEEPING
THE SABBATH. PUNISHMENT FOR
FAILURE TO KEEP THE SABBATH

XCVI: C: MISCELLANY ON DISPOSITION
ON THE SABBATH OF OBJECTS
IN THE HOUSEHOLD OF RABBI
I have no idea why this item is
introduced or placed where
it is.

CV:C: HOSPITALITY.
GIVING PEOPLE THE BENEFIT
OF THE DOUBT
The topic is introduced by
the Mishnah-rule, but is
treated in its own terms.

CVII:C: ON THE MATTER OF BLOODLETTING
This is a free-standing composite,
introduced because it intersects
with its context in the Talmud.

CVIII:C: THE IMPORTANCE OF CIRCUMCISION
Accommodated by the topical context.

CXIV:D: TOPICAL APPENDIX ON THE PROPOSITION
THAT THE TORAH IS DESTINED
TO BE FORGOTTEN IN ISRAEL:
This is invited by its context as an expansion
on the proposition, which is stated explicitly
in the immediately-preceding passage.

CXVI:B: COMPOSITE OF RULINGS
ON THE SABBATH IN HISDA'S NAME,
JOINED TO BEGIN WITH AS A GLOSS
TO THE FOREGOING

CXVIII: B: MISCELLANEOUS RULINGS
ON SABBATH CONDUCT
This composite has absolutely no
bearing on the Mishnah-paragraph
with which it is situated, in detail or
even in general.

CXXIII: C: FREE-STANDING COMPOSITION,
INSERTED BECAUSE IT INTERSECTS WITH
A SUBORDINATE DETAIL IN THE PRIOR COMPOSITION.

CXXVIII: D: FURTHER EXEGESIS OF
“HOW ARE YOU YOU FALLEN FROM HEAVEN,
DAY STAR, SON OF THE MORNING?
HOW ARE YOU CUT DOWN TO THE GROUND,
YOU WHO CAST LOTS THE SAME WORD
AS OCCURS HERE OVER THE NATIONS” (ISA. 14: 12)

CXXXII:B: MISCELLANEOUS
SAYING ON THE TOPIC OF DEATH.
Invited by the Mishnah’s topic.

CXXXII:C: SAYINGS AND
STORIES ON OLD AGE
Continues the foregoing, in a general way.

CXXXII.D: BEHAVIOR IN
THE PRESENCE OF
THE CORPSE. THE SOUL

CXXXV: D: COMPOSITE ON ASTROLOGY.
ATTACHED FOR FORMAL REASON
“IT WAS WRITTEN IN THE NOTEBOOK OF “

3. CAN WE STATE WHAT THE COMPILERS OF THIS DOCUMENT PROPOSE TO ACCOMPLISH IN PRODUCING THIS COMPLETE, ORGANIZED PIECE OF WRITING?

The three columns yield one conclusion. The tractate’s principal program of Mishnah-exegesis has not prevented the compilers from inserting a variety of composites that in no way contribute to the realization of the basic program. The composites that may impart to the Mishnah-tractate a meaning not present but invited through the proper juxtaposition of contrast or complement are few and typical, mostly invocations of the perspective on all things deriving from the sponsorship of the project, disciples of sages themselves. The composites that are inserted as topical appendices in no way change the character of the tractate overall. They really serve only to add to its bulk, but in that way they place the compilers well within the framework of everyday authors known through history, who for the sake of completeness write longer books than absolutely required. What I learn from the middle column is that available to the compilers, and occasionally utilized by them, were a number of composites framed for purposes other than those of Mishnah-commentary and expansion or legal inquiry; I do not see how these odd entries vastly change the face of the tractate. They attest only to lapses of judgment of compilers who, overall, have given us a Talmud remarkable for its cogency. Of these entries into the middle column, those framed around a common attributive prove easiest to accommodate within the theory of a coherent and purposeful Talmud; those formulated around a common theme or even proposition, curiously, the least cogent. In these latter cases, the difficulty we have in explaining why a given composite is located where it is and not somewhere else is telling. By contrast, we can answer the critical question of location of every composite and secondary composition in the entire tractate but for these few. And that makes the case.

The really interesting problem emerges when, these results in hand, we ask ourselves precisely where and how the framers speak for their own perspective and in their own

account and not merely as the extenuating voices of the Mishnah. We cannot identify their distinctive viewpoint at any point at which the compilers or writers propose to amplify the Mishnah's sense. That is by definition; and, I should claim, to make the case that the Mishnah-exegetes vastly revised the clear intent and program of the Mishnah will prove difficult indeed, if the data of this tractate (among many) are supposed to register. Not only so, but so vast a proportion of the tractate's compositions is devoted to Mishnah-exegesis that the framers or compilers clearly exhibit slight concern for leaving for themselves space for a free-standing message. Since it is the fact that the Judaic system put forth by the Talmud radically recasts the inherited one, we shall have for the moment to entertain the hypothesis that the work of formulating ideas that do not merely paraphrase those of the Mishnah went on elsewhere than in the circles that privileged the Mishnah and imposed its priority upon all other writings; or went on in these same circles, but only at another level of their writing.

Those other circles of writers, or those other opportunities of writing, then provided the occasion for stating ideas of a fresh and original character and not simply meant to recapitulate those of the Mishnah. Then, in the secondary results before us, in the extensions and supplements to the Mishnah in our Talmud, in the composites framed around propositions not supplied by the Mishnah and formulated for a purpose other than that of Mishnah-exegesis, these writers found their own voice. These the compilers then insinuated into their primary document, sometimes in autonomous settings, but mostly, in the very center of Mishnah-commentary itself.