

XXI.

BAVLI SHABBAT CHAPTER TWENTY-ONE

FOLIOS 141B-143A

21:1

- A. A man takes up his child, with a stone in [the child's] hand,
- B. or a basket with a stone in it.
- C. And they handle unclean heave-offering along with clean heave-offering or with unconsecrated food.
- D. R. Judah says, "Also: They take out the one part of heave-offering that has fallen into a hundred parts of unconsecrated food."

- I.1** A. [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."
- B. 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?! *Why shouldn't he be liable also on account of the child?*
- C. *Raba concurs with R. Nathan, who has said, "A living person carries his own weight."*
- D. *Well, let the purse be regarded as null on account of its being identified with the child. Haven't we learned in the Mishnah: 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]. [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. [If he took out] a corpse in a bed, he is liable [M. Shab. 10:5E-I]? In*

relationship to a living person, a bed is treated as null; but in relationship to a child, a purse is not treated as null.

- I.2** A. "...if it was a dead child with a purse around its neck, he is exempt"
B. *Why shouldn't be he liable on account of the child?*
C. *Raba accords with R. Simeon, who has said, "For performing on the Sabbath any form of labor that is not needed for its own sake one is exempt."*

- I.3** A. *We have learned in the Mishnah: **A man takes up his child, with a stone in [the child's] hand.***
B. *Said the household of R. Yannai, "This refers to a child who clings to his father."*
C. *If so, [142A] 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"?*
D. *With respect to a stone, if it fell off, the father will not end up retrieving it, but in the case of a coin, if it fell, the father will end up retrieving it.*
E. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority in accord with the position of Raba: He who carries out into public domain his clothing folded up and lying on his shoulder, or his sandals or rings on his hands, is liable; if he was wearing them, he is not liable. He who carries out into public domain a human being with his sandals on his feet and his rings on his hands, he is not liable. But it follows that if he carried them as is, he would be liable.*

- II.1** A. **Or a basket with a stone in it:**
B. *But why should this be the rule? Rather, let the basket be regarded as a stand for a forbidden article?*
C. *Said Rabbah bar bar Hannah said R. Yohanan, "Here we deal with a basket full of produce" [so the basket is a stand for a permitted object].*
D. *Well, why not throw out the produce and throw out the stone, and collect the produce by hand [and put it in the basket? Why permit carrying the stone?].*
E. *It accords with what R. Ilai said Rab said, "It speaks of produce that gets dirty, and here, too, we deal with produce that gets dirty [for example, figs and grapes].*

- F. *Then why not shake the basket around [and get the stone over to one side, and throw out the stone without throwing out the produce]?*
- G. *Rather, said R. Hiyya bar Ashi said Raba, "Here we deal with a broken basket, in which case the stone is serving as part of the wall for the basket [and that is why it may be carried]."*

III.1 A. And they handle unclean heave-offering along with clean heave-offering or with unconsecrated food:

- B. 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.*"
- C. *But if the clean were on the bottom too, he could as well throw out the unclean and take the clean?*
- D. *Said R. Ilai said Rab, "We deal with produce that gets dirty [so one couldn't do that]."*
- E. *An objection was raised: People may handle unclean food in the state of heave-offering along with clean, and along with unconsecrated food, whether the clean is on top and the unclean on the bottom, or the unclean is on top and the clean on the bottom. Doesn't this refute the position of R. Hisda?*
- F. *R. Hisda may say to you, "Our Mishnah passage speaks of a case in which the handling was because someone needed the thing itself, the external rule just now cited deals with a case in which someone handles it because he needs its place."*

G. *So what forced R. Hisda to assign the Mishnah to a case in which one needs the thing itself?*

H. Said Raba, "Our Mishnah paragraph when closely examined accords with his view, for the second clause states, **Coins which are on a pillow — one shakes the pillow, and they fall off [M. 21:2D-E]**. And in this connection said Rabbah bar bar Hannah said R. Yohanan, 'They taught this rule only in a case in which he needed the thing itself, but if he needed the place, one may carry the object even with the coins yet on it.' Now, since the latter part of the formulation speaks of a case in which he needs the thing itself, the former part likewise presumably speaks of a case in which he needs the thing itself."

- IV.1 A. R. Judah says, “Also: They take out the one part of heave-offering that has fallen into a hundred parts of unconsecrated food”:**
- B. *But why should this be the case? Lo, he is making the food fit for use?* [Freedman: This should be prohibited by a precautionary decree, lest one make it fit by means of an act of labor that is forbidden.]
- C. *R. Judah concurs with R. Eliezer, who has said, “Heave-offering is treated as a distinct commodity [since it is going to be removed, it is as though it is already set aside and removed]”* [Freedman: since one part is to be removed, it is as though the heave-offering were separate and distinct and therefore the whole mixture is fit for use in any case]. *For we have learned in the Mishnah: A seah of heave-offering which fell into a hundred [seahs of unconsecrated produce, and was thereby neutralized], and one lifted it out [took a new seah of heave-offering for the priest], and [the replacement heave-offering] fell into a different batch [of unconsecrated produce] — R. Eliezer says, “[That which falls into the second batch] imparts the status of heave-offering [to the produce with which it is mixed] as does true heave-offering.”* [Freedman: It is as though it were all heave-offering and therefore it can only be neutralized by a hundred times its quantity; thus he regards the heave-offering as distinct.] **But sages say, “It does not impart the status of heave-offering except in accordance with a calculation [of the percentage of the produce which is true heave-offering]” [M. Ter. 5:5].**
- D. *Well, now, I may well say that you have heard a tradition from him to that effect when it yields a strict ruling? But have you heard from him a counterpart tradition when it yields a lenient ruling? Rather, he rules in accord with R. Simeon, as we have learned in the Mishnah: A seah of heave-offering which fell into a hundred [seahs of unconsecrated produce, and so was neutralized], and which one had not lifted out [of the mixture] before a different [seah of heave-offering] fell [into that same produce] — lo, this [the batch of produce] is forbidden [for consumption by non-priests]. But R. Simeon permits [M. Ter. 5:8].* [It is assumed that his reason is that he regards the first seah of heave-offering as lying distinct and apart, and therefore the second alone is counted, and that, too, is neutralized.]
- E. *But why does this follow? Maybe this is what is at issue: The first Tannaite authority takes the view that, even though they fell in consecutively, it is as though they fell in all together, so that each falls into fifty; R. Simeon*

maintains that the first portion is neutralized in the hundred, and the second, in a hundred and one.

- F. *Rather, he rules in line with what R. Simeon b. Eleazar said, as has been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Simeon b. Eleazar says, "He looks to one side and eats at the other." [Freedman: He may decide to remove a seah from one side of the pile and then, without actually doing the removing, he may eat from the other side; removing is not required.]*
- G. *But does he concur with him? [142B] Lo, it has been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Judah says, "They remove the mixture of heave-offering in unconsecrated produce when one part is neutralized in a hundred and one parts [inclusive]." R. Simeon b. Eleazar says, "He looks to one side and eats at the other." [Judah wants the food actually removed.]*
- H. *R. Judah's ruling is still more extensive than that of R. Simeon b. Eleazar.*

21:2

- A. **A stone which is over the mouth of a jar —**
- B. **One tilts [the jar] on its side and [the stone] falls off.**
- C. **[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.**
- D. **Coins which are on a pillow —**
- E. **One shakes the pillow, and they fall off.**
- F. **[If] there was snot on it, one wipes it off with a rag.**
- G. **[If] it was made of leather, they pour water on it until it [the snot] disappears.**

I.1 A. **[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]."

II.1 A. **[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:**

- B. *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. *Said Rabbah bar bar Hannah said R. Yohanan, "It is Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel, for we have learned in the Mishnah: **He who picks out pulse on a***

festival day — the House of Shammai say, ‘He makes his selection of food and eats it [right away].’ But the House of Hillel say, ‘He makes his selection in his usual way’ [putting it down using] his lap, a basket, or a dish [M. Bes. 1:8A-C]. *And it has been taught on Tannaite authority?* Said Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel, ‘In what case does this apply, [that the Hillelites permit one to select pulse in the usual way, picking the refuse out of the pile of food]? When there is more food than refuse. But if there is more refuse than food, all concur that [as the Shammaites state] he picks out the food and leaves the refuse.’ *Now here it is comparable to a case in which what is edible is more than what is not edible*” [Freedman: for there is more trouble in lifting out the whole cask than in simply removing the stone].

- D. *Here too, since if he wants to, he cannot take the whole of the wine unless he lifts up the cask, it is analogous to a case in which what is not edible is more than what is edible* [Freedman: eventually he must lift out the cask and tilt it in order to get the wine at the bottom, so there is no more trouble in lifting it out now].

III.1 A. Coins which are on a pillow — one shakes the pillow, and they fall off:

- B. *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.”

III.2 A. Coins which are on a pillow — one shakes the pillow, and they fall off:

- B. 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].”
- C. Said Rabbah bar bar Hannah said R. Yohanan, “They taught this rule only in a case in which he needed the thing itself, but if he needed the place, one may carry the object even with the coins yet on it.”
 - D. *And so did Hiyya bar Rab of Difti teach as a Tannaite statement:* They taught this rule only in a case in which he needed the thing itself, but if he needed the place, one may carry the object even with the coins yet on it.

III.3 A. Coins which are on a pillow — one shakes the pillow, and they fall off:

- B. 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.”

- C. 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."
- D. Said R. Judah bar Shila said R. Assi, "Once they forgot a saddlebag full of money in the street, so they went and asked R. Yohanan, who said to them, 'Put on it a loaf of bread or a child and carry it.'"

E. *Said Mar Zutra, "The decided law is in accord with all of these traditions in the case in which one forgets."*

F. *R. Ashi said, "Even if one forgot, it is not permitted to do so. They made reference to the expedient of a loaf or child only in relationship to a corpse."*

III.4 A. *Abbaye 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.*

B. *Said R. Joseph, "How sharp are the rulings of these children! Granted that rabbis made such a ruling if one forgot, but have they ruled that it is permitted to do so to begin with?!"*

C. *Said Abbaye, "If it weren't that I'm an eminent authority, would I need a ladle on sheaves? Aren't they fit for reclining anyhow [so I can handle them one way or the other; I put a ladle there just to make sure that people treat the rule in a serious way]?"*

D. *Said Raba, "If it weren't that I'm an eminent authority, would I have to put a knife on a young dove? Surely it's perfectly fine for me as raw meat."*

E. *So if it weren't fit for raw meat, it might not be handled. May we then say that Raba concurs with R. Judah [who holds that what is fit for dog meat may not be handled by humans, since they won't use it for their own food]? But didn't Raba say to his servant, "Roast me a duck on the festival, and throw the guts to the cat?" [Freedman: Thus he permitted him to handle it, though it is unfit for human beings, since the guts are not eaten; still, on the prior day, before the festival, they would have been fit for human beings too.]*

F. **[143A]** *There since they would rot, even on the prior day he had formed an intention concerning them. And it stands to reason that Raba concurs with R. Judah. For Raba expounded, "[On a festival day] a woman may not enter the woodshed to take a brand [for use as a poker]. [This is because the wood only may be used for its set*

purpose, as fuel.] And a brand [previously used as a poker] that [on a festival day] shattered — it is forbidden to kindle it on a festival day, since [on a festival day] one may kindle with [whole] utensils, but may not kindle with broken ones.”

G. That proves the point.

21:3

- A. The House of Shammai say, “They take up bones and shells from the table.”
- B. And the House of Hillel say, “One removes the entire table and shakes it out.”
- C. They remove from the table crumbs less than an olive’s bulk in size,
- D. pods of chick-peas, and pods of lentils,
- E. because it is food for a beast.
- F. A sponge, if it has a handle —
- G. They wipe with it.
- H. And if not, they do not wipe with it.
- I. And sages say, “One way or the other, it is handled on the Sabbath.
- J. “And it does not receive uncleanness.”

I.1 A. 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.]

II.1 A. **They remove from the table crumbs less than an olive’s bulk in size:**
B. *That supports the view of R. Yohanan, for* said R. Yohanan, “Crumbs less than an olive in bulk still may not be wasted.”

III.1 A. **...Pods of chick-peas, and pods of lentils, because it is food for a beast:**
B. *It is R. Simeon, who rejects the principle that what may not be used may not be touched.*
C. *But see what’s coming:* **A sponge, if it has a handle — they wipe with it. And if not, they do not wipe with it.** *Now that accords with R. Judah, who takes the view, something that one does not intend to accomplish is nonetheless forbidden. [Freedman: The unintentional act is that in holding it without the handle, water is wrung out.]*

- D. *In that instance, even R. Simeon concurs, for Abbaye and Raba both say, “R. Simeon concedes in a case of ‘cut off his head but let him not die’” [that a labor performed incidentally in the course of doing a permitted deed is itself permitted, unless that labor follows inevitably from the latter, in which case it is equivalent to a forbidden labor; here, too, it must inevitably die when crushed (Freedman)].*

III.2 A. *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.*

B. *Samuel would handle them along with with bread.*

C. *Samuel is consistent, for said Samuel, “A person may do with bread anything that he needs to do.”*

D. *Raba would handle them along with a bowl of water.*

E. *R. Huna b. R. Joshua treated them as he would a pot of shit. [That is something that may be handled and moved.]*

F. *Said R. Ashi to Amemar, “So to begin with may you make a pot of shit?”*

G. *R. Ashi would throw them away, spitting them out with his tongue.*

H. *R. Pappa would throw them behind the couch.*

I. **They said of R. Zechariah b. Abeqoles [T.: Aqilas] that he turned his face toward the back of the couch and threw them out [T. [Shab 16:7C-D](#)].**