JUDAISM

The Talmud

Moed Katan

A massive, multi-volume compendium of rabbinic debates and commentary on the Torah that forms the basis of Jewish religious law, ethics, and practice. Presents all 37 tractates with Gemara, via Sefaria's William Davidson Talmud (the Koren Talmud Bavli translation, CC BY-NC), plus Avot and Eduyot (which have no Gemara) via Michael L. Rodkinson's 1896-1918 translation.

Presented by Earth's Sacred Texts — blackbetty.space

Contents

Moed Katan

Moed Katan

Chapter 1

[1] MISHNA: One may irrigate a field that requires irrigation on the intermediate days of a Festival as well as during the Sabbatical Year, both from a newly emerged spring that began to flow only during the Festival, and from a spring that did not just emerge and that has been flowing for some time. However, one may not irrigate a field with rainwater collected in a cistern, a procedure that requires excessive exertion, or with water drawn with a shadoof [kilon], a lever used to raise water with a bucket from deep down in a well.

[2] And one may not construct circular ditches around the bases of grapevines on the intermediate days of a Festival. Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya says: One may not construct a new water channel during the intermediate days of a Festival or during the Sabbatical Year. And the Rabbis say: One may construct a new water channel during the Sabbatical Year and one may repair damaged water channels during the intermediate days of a Festival.

[3] In addition to performing labor on one’s own property in order to avoid financial loss, it is also permitted to perform labor on the intermediate days of a Festival for the public welfare: One may repair damaged water cisterns that are in the public domain, and clean them out by removing the dirt and sediment that accumulated there; one may repair roads, streets, and ritual baths; and one may tend to all other public needs. So too, one may mark graves to inform the public of their ritual impurity, and inspectors may even go out to uproot the shoots of prohibited diverse kinds [kilayim] that grew in the fields during the rainy season.

[4] GEMARA: The Gemara begins by questioning the wording of the mishna: Now that it has been said that on the intermediate days of a Festival one may irrigate a field from a newly emerged spring, whose walls have not yet stabilized and are likely to collapse, necessitating laborious repairs, is it necessary to mention that one may irrigate a field from a spring that did not just emerge, whose walls have already stabilized and are therefore not likely to collapse?

[5] The Gemara answers: They say that it was necessary to mention the second case as well. For had the tanna taught us the halakha with regard to only a newly emerged spring, I would have said that here, in the case of a field that requires irrigation, yes, one is permitted to irrigate from such a spring, but in the case of a field that ordinarily suffices with rainwater, no, one is not permitted to do so, because it is likely to collapse. But with regard to a spring that did not just emerge, that is not likely to collapse, I might say that one may provide supplementary irrigation even in the case of a field that ordinarily suffices with rainwater.

[6] Therefore, the tanna teaches us that a newly emerged spring is no different from a spring that did not just emerge. In the case of a field that requires irrigation, yes, one may irrigate on the intermediate days of a Festival, while in the case of a field that ordinarily suffices with rainwater, no, one may not do so, even from an established spring.

[7] The Gemara raises a question with regard to a linguistic issue: And from where may it be inferred that this term, beit hashelaḥin, a field that requires irrigation, is a term denoting thirst, implying that supplementary watering is necessary? The Gemara answers: As it is written: “And you were faint and weary” (Deuteronomy 25:18). The term faint is referring to the thirst of the Israelites in the desert. And, in the standard Aramaic translation, we translate the verse as: And you were thirsty [meshalhei] and weary. The letters ḥet and heh are sometimes interchanged, and therefore the term beit hashelaḥin connotes a thirsty field.

[8] And from where may it be inferred that this term, beit haba’al, a field that suffices with rainwater, is a term denoting settlement, i.e., an established field that does not require extensive upkeep? As it is written: “For as a young man takes to himself [yiv’al] a virgin, so shall your sons take you to themselves” (Isaiah 62:5). And it is translated in the Aramaic translation: As a young man settles down with a virgin, so shall your sons become settled within you. Similarly, beit haba’al is referring to a settled field that suffices with rainwater.

[9] The Gemara begins to clarify the underlying principle of the mishna, asking: Who is the anonymous tanna of the mishna who maintains that labor performed to prevent a considerable loss, such as watering a field that requires irrigation, yes, it is permitted on the intermediate days of a Festival; but labor performed to increase one’s profit, such as watering a field that ordinarily suffices with rainwater, no, it is not permitted? Furthermore, even in a case involving loss, one may not excessively exert oneself, as the tanna of the mishna renders prohibited all cases of watering fields with collected rainwater or with water drawn with a shadoof, even in a field that requires irrigation.

[10] Rav Huna said: It is Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya’akov, as we learned in a mishna: Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya’akov says: In a field filled with trees, one may draw water via channels from tree to tree, provided that in doing so he does not water the entire field. As this field ordinarily suffices with rainwater, it is prohibited to water the entire field. Therefore, it is evident that Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya’akov renders prohibited work performed to increase profit on the intermediate days of a Festival.

[11] The Gemara challenges this comparison: Say that you heard that Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya’akov holds that labor performed only to increase profit is not permitted. But did you hear him prohibit excessive exertion in a case of considerable loss? This aspect of the mishna finds no expression in the words of Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya’akov.

[12] Rather, Rav Pappa said: In accordance with whose opinion is this mishna? It is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, as it is taught in a baraita: From a newly emerged spring one may irrigate even a field that ordinarily suffices with rainwater; this is the statement of Rabbi Meir. Rabbi Yehuda says: One may irrigate only a field requiring irrigation that dried up and needs water. Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya says: Neither the one nor the other. Furthermore, Rabbi Yehuda said: Owing to the exertion involved, one may not divert a water channel from its regular path in order to water his garden or his ruin, which is now being used for planting, during the intermediate days of a Festival.

[13] The Gemara first clarifies the case of the baraita: What does Rabbi Yehuda mean when he speaks of a field that is dried up? If we say that the field is literally dried up and the plants are already parched, why do I need to water it? Abaye said: It means that the one spring from which the field had been irrigated until now dried up, but in the meantime another spring emerged. If the field is not irrigated from this spring, it will be ruined.

[14] The Gemara explains the next clause of the baraita, which states: Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya says: Neither the one nor the other. By this he means that it is no different whether the original spring dried up or did not dry up. The guiding principle is: From a newly emerged spring one may not irrigate even a field that requires irrigation. In any event, Rabbi Yehuda seems to maintain an opinion that is like that of the mishna, i.e., that only a field that requires irrigation may be watered, but not a field that suffices with rainwater. And even in the case of a field that requires irrigation, excessive exertion is prohibited.

[15] The Gemara challenges this understanding: And from where do you conclude that the mishna reflects the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda? Perhaps Rabbi Yehuda stated that a field that requires irrigation, yes, one may irrigate it on the intermediate days of a Festival, and a field that suffices with rainwater, no, one may not do so, only with regard to a newly emerged spring,

[16] as it is likely to collapse. But in the case of a spring that did not just emerge, which is not likely to collapse because its walls have already stabilized, even a field that ordinarily suffices with rainwater may be irrigated.

[17] The Gemara asks: If that were so, then to whom, i.e., to which tanna, would you attribute the mishna? According to this interpretation, the mishna does not correspond to any opinion, while according to the previous interpretation, it corresponds to the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda. Rather, it must be that according to the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, a newly emerged spring is no different from a spring that did not just emerge. A field that requires irrigation, yes, it may be irrigated, while a field that suffices with rainwater, no, it may not be irrigated. And the baraita opted to teach this dispute in the case of a newly emerged spring in order to convey the far-reaching nature of the opinion of Rabbi Meir, which states that one may irrigate even from a newly emerged spring, and even a field that suffices with rainwater.

[18] § It was stated that the amora’im disputed the following question: With regard to one who weeds or one who waters seedlings on Shabbat, for what prohibited labor do we forewarn him? Judicial punishment may be administered to a sinner only if he has been forewarned by two witnesses prior to the commission of his offense. This forewarning must include the specific transgression being violated, and on Shabbat it must include the specific category of prohibited labor that the action involves. Rabba said: It is due to the prohibition against plowing. Rav Yosef said: It is due to the prohibition against sowing.

[19] Rabba said: According to my opinion it is reasonable. Just as the usual objective of plowing is to loosen the earth, so too, this, weeding or watering, loosens the earth. Rav Yosef said: According to my opinion, it is reasonable. Just as the usual objective of sowing is to cause the fruit to grow, here too, weeding or watering causes the fruit to grow.

[20] Abaye said to Rabba: According to your opinion, it is difficult, and according to the opinion of Rav Yosef, it is difficult. Abaye explains: According to your opinion, it is difficult: Is it true that for the prohibition against plowing, yes, he is forewarned, but for the prohibition against sowing, no, he is not forewarned? Similarly, according to the opinion of Rav Yosef, it is difficult: Can it be that for the prohibition against sowing, yes, he is forewarned, but for the prohibition against plowing, no, he is not forewarned? Everyone should agree that weeding and watering fall under the categories of both plowing and sowing.

[21] And if you say that anywhere that there are two possible categories of prohibited labor into which a particular action might fall, one is liable to be punished for only one of them, didn't Rav Kahana say: If one prunes the branches of a vine on Shabbat and he needs the wood for firewood or any other purpose, he is liable to bring two sin-offerings? He is liable to bring one sin-offering for violating the primary category of sowing, as pruning vines facilitates their growth, and so it is a sub-category of sowing. And he is liable to bring one sin-offering for violating the primary category of reaping, as the essence of reaping is detaching that which one needs from the ground. Since he needs the wood that he is detaching from the vine, his action is considered reaping. Consequently, one action that incorporates two prohibited labors causes liability for both.

[22] The Gemara concludes: Indeed, it is difficult according to both opinions.

[23] Rav Yosef raised an objection to the opinion of Rabba from what is taught in the following baraita: One who weeds in proximity to diverse kinds of seeds, or covers with earth the exposed roots of diverse kinds, is flogged for transgressing the prohibition against diverse kinds, i.e., tending different species of crops in one area of the same field, as it is stated: "You shall not sow your field with two kinds of seed" (Leviticus 19:19). Rabbi Akiva says: Even one who maintains in his field a mixture of species that he could have uprooted is flogged for violating the prohibition against diverse kinds of seeds.

[24] Rav Yosef explains: Granted, according to my opinion, that I say that one who weeds on Shabbat is forewarned for the prohibited labor of sowing, this is the reason he is liable to be punished with flogging for weeding diverse seeds: Sowing diverse kinds is prohibited. But according to you, who said that one who weeds on Shabbat is forewarned for plowing, why is one liable to be flogged for weeding in proximity to diverse kinds? Is plowing prohibited in connection with diverse kinds? At the time of plowing, there is no mixture of different species of crops, so plowing cannot be prohibited in this case.

[25] Rabba said to him: According to my opinion, one who weeds a field of diverse kinds is flogged not because he is guilty of plowing, but for violating the prohibition against maintaining a mixture of species in his field.

[26] The Gemara objects: However, from the fact that it teaches in the latter clause of the baraita that Rabbi Akiva says: Even one who maintains in his field a mixture of species is liable to be flogged, it may be inferred that according to the anonymous first tanna, the liability for weeding is not for maintaining diverse kinds, but for performing some other prohibited labor.

[27] The Gemara rejects this opinion: In fact, the entire baraita reflects the opinion of Rabbi Akiva, and it is stated in the style of what is the reason. The baraita should be understood as follows: What is the reason that one who weeds and one who covers the exposed roots of diverse kinds with earth is flogged? He is flogged for maintaining diverse kinds in his field, as Rabbi Akiva says: Even one who maintains in his field a mixture of species is flogged.

[28] With regard to Rabbi Akiva's opinion, the Gemara asks: What is the reason for Rabbi Akiva's opinion? How did he derive this prohibition from the verses? The Gemara answers: As it is taught in a baraita: "You shall not sow your field with mingled seed" (Leviticus 19:19). I have derived from this verse that only sowing diverse kinds is prohibited. From where is it derived that maintaining diverse kinds, which does not involve any positive action, is also prohibited?

[29] The verse states: “Diverse kinds, you shall not sow your field with mingled seed” (Leviticus 19:19). The prohibition against planting different species of a crop in one area of the same field is preceded in the verse by the prohibition against crossbreeding livestock: “You shall not let your cattle gender with a diverse kind.” A slight change in punctuation yields the phrase: Diverse kinds in your field, you shall not, indicating that merely preserving diverse kinds in one’s field is prohibited.

[30] § The Gemara returns to the original topic of discussion: We learned in the mishna: One may irrigate a field that requires irrigation on the intermediate days of a Festival as well as during the Sabbatical Year.

[31] The Gemara asks: Granted, with regard to the intermediate days of a Festival, where the prohibition against irrigation is due to the mandate to avoid excessive exertion on the Festival, in a case of considerable loss, the Sages permitted one to exert himself. However, during the Sabbatical Year, both according to the one who said that one who waters is liable due to the prohibition against sowing, and according to the one who said that one is liable due to the prohibition against plowing, are sowing and plowing permitted during the Sabbatical Year? How can these actions be permitted when the Torah explicitly renders prohibited working the land during the Sabbatical Year?

[32] Abaye said: The mishna is referring to the Sabbatical Year in the present time, when its prohibitions are only by rabbinic decree, and it is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi. As it is taught in a baraita that Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi says: When the verse states: “And this is the manner of the release, every creditor will release that which he has lent to his neighbor” (Deuteronomy 15:2), the verse speaks of two releases: One is the release of land, that one must refrain from working the land, and the other is the release of money, that one must refrain from collecting debts.

[33] This verse equates these two releases, indicating that when you are mandated by Torah law to release land, you must release money, and when you are not mandated to release land, you need not release money. This indicates that according to Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, at the present time, the release of land is not mandated by Torah law. Therefore, observance of the Sabbatical Year is mandated only by rabbinic law, and the Sages were lenient in a case of significant loss.

[34] Rava said: Even if you say that the mishna was taught in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis, who disagree with Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi and maintain that the observance of the Sabbatical Year, even at the present time, is mandated by Torah law, one can understand the leniency in the mishna. The reason for the leniency with regard to irrigation is because only primary categories of labor were prohibited by the Merciful One, i.e., by Torah law,

[35] whereas the subcategories of labor that are derived from them, e.g., watering, were not prohibited by the Merciful One, i.e., by Torah law, but only by rabbinic law; and in a case of loss the Sages were lenient. The source for this distinction is as it is written: “But in the seventh year shall be a sabbath of solemn rest for the land, a sabbath for the Lord: Your field you shall not sow, and your vineyard you shall not prune. That which grows of its own accord of your harvest you shall not reap, nor gather the grapes of your undressed vines” (Leviticus 25:4–5).

[36] Since pruning is included in the principal category of sowing, as its objective is to encourage the plant’s growth, and picking grapes is included in the principal category of reaping grain, as both involve removal of produce from a plant, for the purpose of teaching what halakha did the Merciful

One write them? Why did the Torah explicitly prohibit pruning and picking grapes, rather than sufficing with the general prohibitions against sowing and reaping?

[37] The Gemara answers that these were individually enumerated to say that only for these subcategories of labor is one liable to be flogged, while for other subcategories of labor, i.e., watering a field, one is not liable. Consequently, there are only four types of labor that are prohibited by Torah law during the Sabbatical Year: Sowing and its subcategory of pruning, as well as reaping and its subcategory of grape picking. All other subcategories of labor are prohibited only by rabbinic decree.

[38] The Gemara asks: And is there really no liability for other subcategories of labor? Isn't it taught in a baraita: "Your field you shall not sow, and your vineyard you shall not prune" (Leviticus 25:4). I have derived from here an explicit prohibition only against sowing and pruning. From where do I derive that weeding, i.e., uprooting weeds, hoeing, and cutting weeds, even without uprooting them, are also prohibited? The verse states: "Your field you shall not sow" and "your vineyard you shall not prune." This wording indicates that no labor may be performed in your field, and no labor may be performed in your vineyard.

[39] Similarly, from where is it derived that one may not prune trees, and one may not trim dry branches from trees, and one may not cut large branches [mefasegin] from trees? The verse states: "Your field you shall not sow" and "your vineyard you shall not prune," thereby teaching that no labor may be performed in your field, and no labor may be performed in your vineyard.

[40] Similarly, from where is it derived that one may not fertilize fields and vineyards, and one may not remove stones that surround the base of a tree and impede its growth, and one may not cover exposed roots with dust, and one may not fumigate a tree in order to exterminate worms? The verse states: "Your field you shall not sow" and "your vineyard you shall not prune," thereby indicating that no labor may be performed in your field, and no labor may be performed in your vineyard.

[41] The apparent conclusion from this is that all labor in a field or a vineyard is prohibited. One might have thought that one may also not hoe lightly under olive trees and one may not hoe under grapevines, and one may not fill cracks in the ground with water, and one may not construct circular ditches around the bases of grapevines in order to collect rainwater. Therefore, the verse states: "Your field you shall not sow."

[42] The Gemara explains the derivation: Sowing was included in the general prohibition against performing agricultural labors during the Sabbatical Year, as the verse states "But in the seventh year shall be a sabbath of solemn rest for the land" (Leviticus 25:4). Why was sowing singled out and mentioned explicitly? In order to compare other types of labor to it and to say to you: Just as sowing is unique in that it is labor performed both in the field and in the vineyard, so too, any other labor performed both in the field and in the vineyard is prohibited. However, labors performed only in the vineyard but not in the field, i.e., whose objective is merely to sustain the vines from year to year, such as the labors mentioned above, are permitted. In any case, this baraita indicates that many subcategories of labor are prohibited during the seventh year, and not just sowing and pruning, as Rava had stated.

[43] The Gemara rejects this opinion: These labors, with the exceptions of sowing, pruning, grape picking, and reaping, are all prohibited only by rabbinic law, and the verse that is cited as a source from the Torah is a mere support, and not a bona side source.

[44] Incidental to this discussion, the Gemara asks: Is light hoeing under olive trees in fact permitted during the Sabbatical Year? Isn't it written: "But the seventh year you shall let it rest and lie fallow" (Exodus 23:11), and it is taught with regard to this verse: "You shall let it rest" from light hoeing, "and lie fallow" from clearing the field of stones. This indicates that light hoeing is indeed prohibited during the Sabbatical Year.

[45] Rav Ukva bar Ḥama said: There are two types of light hoeing, one whose objective is to strengthen the trees, and another that is intended to seal cracks. There is a practical halakhic difference between them: Hoeing performed in order to strengthen the tree is prohibited, as it is similar to plowing in that it enhances the tree's growth. However, hoeing undertaken in order to seal cracks is permitted, as by doing so one prevents damage to the tree.

[46] § It was stated that Rabbi Yoḥanan and Rabbi Elazar disagreed with regard to one who plows during the Sabbatical Year. One said: He is flogged for doing so, while the other one said: He is not flogged. The Gemara suggests: Let us say that they disagree with regard to the principle that Rabbi Avin said that Rabbi Ile'a said, and one accepts this principle while the other does not. As, Rabbi Avin said that Rabbi Ile'a said: Wherever a generalization is stated in the Torah as a positive mitzva, and a detail relating to that generalization is stated as a negative mitzva, one does not apply the hermeneutical principle of a generalization, and a detail, and a generalization, according to which the halakha under discussion is expanded to all cases that resemble the detail.

[47] The Gemara explains: The one who said that one who plows during the Sabbatical Year is flogged does not accept the principle that Rabbi Avin said that Rabbi Ile'a said. Accordingly, he expounds the verses as follows: The verse "But in the seventh year shall be a sabbath of solemn rest for the land" (Leviticus 25:4) is a generalization stated as a positive mitzva. The continuation of the verse is "Your field you shall not sow," which is a detail stated as a negative mitzva. This is followed by another generalization: "For it shall be a year of rest for the land" (Leviticus 25:5). By applying the principle of a generalization, a detail, and a generalization, one can derive that there is a prohibition against performing any agricultural task that is similar to sowing, including plowing.

[48] And the one who said that one is not flogged for plowing holds in accordance with the ruling that Rabbi Avin stated in the name of Rabbi Ile'a. Therefore, the prohibition stated as a detail, i.e., the prohibition against sowing, is not extended to include any other labor. One who plows violates the positive command to let the land rest, but does not transgress a Torah law phrased as a negative mitzva, and therefore he is not flogged.

[49] The Gemara rejects this suggestion: No, one can say that everyone holds that the halakha is not in accordance with the principle that Rabbi Avin said that Rabbi Ile'a said. According to the one who said he is flogged, all is well, as he applies the hermeneutical principle of a generalization, a detail, and a generalization to derive a prohibition for plowing.

[50] And the one who said that he is not flogged could have said to you: Since pruning is included in the primary category of sowing, and grape picking is included in the primary category of reaping, for the purpose of teaching what halakha did the Merciful One write them? They were individually enumerated to say that only for these specific subcategories of labor is one liable to be flogged, but for performing other subcategories of labor one is not liable. According to this opinion, the verse comes to teach that one is not liable to be flogged for performing any labor not explicitly enumerated in the Torah, including plowing.

[51] The Gemara asks: And is there really no liability for other subcategories of labor? Isn't it taught in a baraita with regard to the verse "Your field you shall not sow, and your vineyard you shall not prune" that I have derived from here an explicit prohibition only against sowing and pruning? From where do I derive that weeding, hoeing, and cutting weeds are also prohibited? The verse states: "Your field you shall not sow and your vineyard you shall not prune" (Leviticus 25:4). By placing the word "not" immediately following the words "field" and "vineyard," the verse indicates that one may not perform any labor that is generally performed in your field, and one may not perform any labor that is generally performed in your vineyard.

[52] Similarly, from where is it derived that one may not prune trees, and one may not trim dry branches from trees, and one may not cut large branches from trees? The verse states: "Your field you shall not sow and your vineyard you shall not prune," indicating that any labor that is generally performed in your field may not be performed during the Sabbatical Year, and any labor generally performed in your vineyard may not be performed during the Sabbatical Year.

[53] From where is it derived that one may not fertilize fields and vineyards, and one may not remove stones from around the base of a tree that impede its growth, and one may not fumigate a tree in order to exterminate worms? The verse states: "Your field you shall not sow and your vineyard you shall not prune," thereby indicating that any labor that is generally performed in your field may not be performed during the Sabbatical Year, and any labor generally performed in your vineyard may not be performed during the Sabbatical Year.

[54] One might have thought that one may also not hoe lightly under olive trees and one may not hoe under grapevines, and one may not fill cracks in the ground with water, and one may not construct circular ditches around the bases of grapevines in order to collect rainwater. Therefore, the verse states: "Your field you shall not sow."

[55] Sowing was included in the general prohibition against performing agricultural labors during the Sabbatical Year. Why was sowing singled out and mentioned explicitly? In order to compare other types of labor to it and to say to you: Just as sowing is unique in that it is labor performed both in the field and in the vineyard, so too, any other labor performed both in the field and in the vineyard is prohibited. However, labor performed only in the vineyard, but not in the field, i.e., whose objective is merely to sustain the vines from year to year, is permitted. In any case, this baraita indicates that many labors are prohibited during the seventh year, and not just sowing and pruning.

[56] The Gemara rejects this opinion: These labors, with the exceptions of sowing, pruning, grape picking, and reaping, are all prohibited only by rabbinic law, and the verse that is cited as source from the Torah is a mere support, and not a bona side source.

[57] When Rav Dimi came from Eretz Yisrael to Babylonia, he stated a tradition he had heard from the Sages in Eretz Yisrael: One might have thought that one would be flogged for the addition, but a teaching states an exemption from lashes. Rav Dimi noted: But I do not know what teaching or what addition this tradition is referring to.

[58] The Sages disputed the meaning of this tradition. Rabbi Elazar said: The addition in question is plowing during the Sabbatical Year, for which there is no explicit prohibition in the Torah, and so it may be regarded as an addition to the labors explicitly enumerated in the Torah. And this is what it is saying: One might have thought that one would be flogged for plowing during the Sabbatical Year, as it is derived by way of the hermeneutical principle of a generalization, and a detail, and a

generalization that teaches that plowing is prohibited. But a teaching states an exemption from lashes for the labor of plowing.

[59] This is logical, because if one is flogged for plowing, why do I need all these details that were enumerated in the verse, i.e., pruning and picking grapes? Rather, one must certainly conclude that these were singled out in order to teach that one is flogged only for these specific labors, but not for any other.

[60] And Rabbi Yoḥanan said: This addition is referring to the extra days that the Sages added to the prohibition against performing agricultural labor, before Rosh HaShana of the seventh year, when the Sabbatical Year formally begins. And this is what it is saying: One might have thought that one would be flogged for working the land during the additional period prior to Rosh HaShana of the Sabbatical Year, as this prohibition is derived from the verse: “In plowing and in reaping you shall rest” (Exodus 34:21). This seemingly superfluous verse is understood as teaching that not only is working the land prohibited during the seventh year, but plowing a field during the sixth year to prepare the land for the seventh year, and reaping what grew in the seventh year during the eighth year are also prohibited. But a teaching states an exemption from lashes for these actions, as we are about to state below.

[61] The Gemara elaborates: What are the extra days before Rosh HaShana? As we learned in a mishna (Shevi’it 1:1): Until when may one plow an orchard on the eve of the Sabbatical Year? Beit Shammai say: One may plow so long as the plowing is beneficial for the fruit already on the trees. Once the plowing serves to benefit only the tree itself and the fruit it will produce the following year, it is prohibited. And Beit Hillel say: One may plow until Shavuot. The mishna notes: And the statement of these, Beit Shammai, is close to being like the statement of these, Beit Hillel; i.e., in practice, there is little difference between the dates established by the two opinions.

[62] The mishna (see Shevi’it 2:1) additionally states: And until when may one plow a white field, i.e., a grain field, on the eve of the Sabbatical Year? One may plow until the residual moisture in the fields from the rain ceases and so long as people continue to plow their fields in order to plant cucumbers and gourds, which are planted at the end of the winter.

[63] Rabbi Shimon says: If it is so that no set time was established, then the Torah has given an individual measure of time into the hands of each and every individual. One may plow until a self-determined time, as he can always claim that he is plowing in order to plant during the sixth year. Rather, a fixed time must be established: In a white field one may plow until Passover, in an orchard one may plow until Shavuot, and Beit Hillel say: Until Passover.

[64] And Rabbi Shimon ben Pazi said that Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said in the name of bar Kappara: Rabban Gamliel and his court discussed and then voted about the prohibitions of these two periods, i.e., from Passover or Shavuot until Rosh HaShana, and nullified them, thereby permitting plowing until Rosh HaShana, the actual beginning of the Sabbatical Year.

[65] Rabbi Zeira said to Rabbi Abbahu, and some say that it was Reish Lakish who said to Rabbi Yoḥanan: How could Rabban Gamliel and his court nullify an ordinance instituted by Beit Shammai and Beit Hillel, who were greater authorities than they were? Didn’t we learn in a mishna (Eduyyot 1:5): A court cannot nullify the ruling of another court unless it surpasses it in wisdom and in number?

[66] Rabbi Abbahu “was astonished for a while” (Daniel 4:16), and then said to him: Say that when Beit Shammai and Beit Hillel established their decree, they stipulated among themselves: Anyone who later wishes to nullify this decree may come and nullify it.

[67] The Gemara asks: Is this ordinance theirs? Did Beit Shammai and Beit Hillel institute the ordinance and as such have the authority to attach stipulations to it? It is a halakha transmitted to Moses from Sinai. As Rabbi Asi said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said in the name of Rabbi Neḥunya from the valley of Beit Ḥortan: The halakha of ten saplings, the mitzva of bringing willow branches to the Temple on Sukkot and standing them up around the altar, and the halakha of water libation on Sukkot are all halakhot transmitted to Moses from Sinai. Consequently, the prohibition against plowing on the eve of the seventh year is a not a rabbinic ordinance from the Second Temple period, but rather an oral tradition dating back to Moses at Sinai.

[68] Rabbi Yitzḥak said: When they learned this halakha as a tradition dating back to Moses at Sinai, the prohibition applied from only thirty days before Rosh HaShana. Afterward, these Sages of Beit Shammai and Beit Hillel came and instituted lengthier periods of restriction, from Passover and from Shavuot, respectively, but they stipulated among themselves: Anyone who later wishes to nullify this decree may come and nullify it. Rabban Gamliel and his court were therefore able to nullify extended restrictions instituted by Beit Shammai and Beit Hillel.

[69] The Gemara raises another question: Are these prohibitions of plowing before the Sabbatical Year really halakhot transmitted to Moses from Sinai? They are actually prohibitions based on explicit verses. As we learned in a baraita with regard to the verse “In plowing and in reaping you shall rest” (Exodus 34:21) that Rabbi Akiva says: It is unnecessary for the verse to speak about plowing and reaping during the Sabbatical Year, as it was already stated: “But in the seventh year shall be a sabbath of solemn rest for the land, a sabbath for the Lord; your field you shall not sow, and your vineyard you shall not prune” (Leviticus 25:4). This teaches that during the seventh year all agricultural labor is prohibited. Rather, the verse comes to prohibit plowing on the eve of the Sabbatical Year

[70] that entered into the Sabbatical Year, i.e., plowing in the sixth year that will benefit crops growing in the seventh year, and reaping the crops of the Sabbatical Year that continued into the conclusion of the Sabbatical Year, i.e., reaping seventh-year produce that continued to grow into the eighth year.

[71] Rabbi Yishmael says that this verse is to be understood as referring to Shabbat and not to the Sabbatical Year, in accordance with the straightforward meaning of the verse. It teaches as follows: Just as only optional plowing is prohibited on Shabbat, as there is no instance where plowing fulfills a biblical mitzva, so too, only optional reaping is prohibited, to the exclusion of the reaping of the omer offering, which is a mitzva, and consequently permitted on Shabbat. Nonetheless, the first opinion cited in the baraita, that of Rabbi Akiva, holds that the prohibition against plowing on the eve of the Sabbatical Year is derived from an explicit verse.

[72] Rather, Rav Naḥman bar Yitzḥak said: When we learned this as a halakha transmitted to Moses from Sinai, it was to permit plowing in the case of young saplings until Rosh HaShana. In contrast, the verses that were cited come to prohibit plowing in the case of mature and well-rooted trees thirty days before Rosh HaShana of the Sabbatical Year.

[73] The Gemara asks: But since the halakha transmitted to Moses from Sinai comes to permit plowing in the case of young saplings until Rosh HaShana, does it not automatically follow that in the case of

mature trees, plowing is prohibited before Rosh HaShana? Therefore, not only the allowance, but the prohibition as well was learned by tradition as a halakha transmitted to Moses from Sinai, and not from the verses.

[74] Rather, the halakha transmitted to Moses from Sinai is the basis of the prohibition against plowing on the eve of the Sabbatical Year according to the opinion of Rabbi Yishmael, who interprets the verse as referring to Shabbat, and not to the Sabbatical Year, whereas the verses are the basis of the prohibition according to the opinion of Rabbi Akiva.

[75] The Gemara previously cited Rabbi Yitzḥak, who explained how Rabban Gamliel's court nullified the extension to the prohibition against plowing before the Sabbatical Year that had been enacted by Beit Shammai and Beit Hillel. The Gemara now cites another opinion, which holds that Rabban Gamliel's court abolished the prohibition against plowing before the Sabbatical Year entirely. And Rabbi Yoḥanan said that Rabban Gamliel and his court nullified the restrictions on working the land on the eve of the Sabbatical Year based on a source written in the Torah.

[76] What is the reason? He derives it by means of a verbal analogy between the word Shabbat stated with regard to the Sabbatical Year in the verse: "But in the seventh year shall be a sabbath of solemn rest for the land" (Leviticus 25:4), and the word Shabbat stated with regard to the weekly Shabbat, which commemorates the Shabbat of Creation. Just as there, on Shabbat itself it is prohibited to perform labor, but before and after Shabbat it is permitted, so too here, in the case of the Sabbatical Year, during the Sabbatical Year itself it is prohibited to perform labor, but before and after the Sabbatical Year it is permitted.

[77] Rav Ashi strongly objects to this: If Rabban Gamliel and his court nullified the restrictions based on a verbal analogy, then according to the one who said that the prohibition against plowing thirty days before Rosh HaShana of the Sabbatical Year is a halakha that was transmitted to Moses from Sinai, can a verbal analogy come and uproot a halakha that was transmitted to Moses from Sinai? And similarly, according to the one who said that the prohibition against plowing is derived from a verse, can a verbal analogy come and uproot a verse?

[78] Rather, Rav Ashi said: Rabban Gamliel and his court held in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yishmael, who said that they learned this prohibition as a halakha transmitted to Moses from Sinai. But they learned this halakha only with regard to the time period when the Temple is standing. This is evidenced by the fact that it is similar to the other halakha stated along with it, that of the water libation, which was part of the service in the Temple. But when the Temple is not standing this halakha does not apply, and therefore Rabban Gamliel and his court nullified the prohibition after the destruction of the Temple.

[79] § It was taught in the mishna: However, one may not irrigate a field on the intermediate days of a Festival with rainwater collected in a cistern or with water drawn with a shadoof. The Gemara asks: Granted, irrigating a field with water drawn with a shadoof involves excessive effort, and so it is prohibited on the intermediate days of a Festival. But what excessive effort is involved in irrigating a field with rainwater? Rainwater collects on its own and one merely has to channel it to where it is needed.

[80] Rabbi Ile'a said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: A rabbinic decree was enacted with regard to rainwater due to its similarity to water drawn with a shadoof. Rav Ashi said: Rainwater itself will come to be

like water drawn with a shadoof. Once the level of the collected rainwater drops, it will become necessary to draw it with a bucket, a procedure involving excessive effort.

[81] The Gemara comments: Rabbi Ile’a and Rav Ashi disagree with regard to the ruling issued by Rabbi Zeira, as Rabbi Zeira said that Rabba bar Yirmeya said that Shmuel said: With regard to streams that draw water from pools of collected water, one is permitted to irrigate his field from them on the intermediate days of a Festival, because the flow of water is steady.

[82] One Sage, Rav Ashi, is of the opinion that the ruling is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Zeira, as he prohibits only irrigating with rainwater, because the supply might come to an end, but he does not prohibit watering from a source whose flow is steady. And one Sage, Rabbi Yoḥanan, is not of the opinion that the ruling is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Zeira, as he prohibits irrigating with rainwater due to its similarity to water drawn with a shadoof. This applies regardless of whether the level of the rainwater will drop, and therefore Rabbi Yoḥanan would prohibit using collected water even if a stream flows through it and it will not dry up.

[83] After mentioning the statement of Rabbi Zeira in the course of the previous discussion, the Gemara examines the matter itself. Rabbi Zeira said that Rabba bar Yirmeya said that Shmuel said: With regard to streams that draw water from pools of water, one is permitted to irrigate his field from them on the intermediate days of a Festival.

[84] Rabbi Yirmeya raised an objection to Rabbi Zeira from what is taught in the mishna: However, one may not irrigate a field on the intermediate days of a Festival with rainwater collected in cisterns or with water drawn with a shadoof. This indicates that whenever there is a concern that the water might run out, it is prohibited to irrigate from this water source. Consequently, Rabbi Yirmeya wanted to know why this concern did not exist in the case of the pools of water as well. Rabbi Zeira said to him: Yirmeya, my son, these pools in Babylonia are like water that does not stop flowing. Therefore, there is no concern that the water level in these pools might go down to such an extent that it will become necessary to draw the water with buckets.

[85] The Sages taught in a baraita: With regard to temporary pools and regular pools that were filled with water on the eve of a Festival, it is prohibited for one to irrigate his field from them on the intermediate days of the Festival, lest they run out of water and he will come to exert himself and bring water from elsewhere. But if a water channel passes between them so that water flows from the one to the other, it is permitted.

[86] Rav Pappa said: And this allowance applies only when the majority of that field can be irrigated from that water channel, such that most of the field can be irrigated at the same time. In this case, there is no concern that when the water runs out, he will come to exert himself and irrigate the rest of the field from another source of water. Rav Ashi said: It applies even though the majority of that field cannot be irrigated from that water channel at the same time. Since the channel continuously draws water, constantly replenishing its supply, even if it does so at a slow rate, one will say to himself that even if the entire field cannot be irrigated from that water channel on a single day, it can be irrigated from it over the course of two or three days. Accordingly, he will not find it necessary to exert himself to quickly irrigate that portion of the field that did not already receive its water.

[87] The Sages taught in a baraita: With regard to a pool that receives drips of water from this field that requires irrigation, which itself receives water from a spring, one is permitted to irrigate from this pool another field situated below it that requires irrigation.

[88] The Gemara asks: But isn’t the pool likely to stop flowing, which will force him to exert himself and draw water from somewhere else? Rabbi Yirmeya said: The case is where the upper field is still trickling water into the pool and does not stop. Abaye said: And this allowance applies only when the water from the first spring that irrigates the upper field has not stopped flowing. Only in that case can one rely on the water trickling from the upper field and consequently irrigating the lower field from the pool.

[89] It is taught in a baraita that Rabbi Shimon ben Menasya says: With regard to two garden beds located one above the other, one may not draw water from the channel supplying the lower garden bed in order to irrigate the upper garden bed, due to the excessive exertion involved. Furthermore, Rabbi Elazar bar Shimon said: Even in the case of a single garden bed, half of which is lower and half of which is higher, one may not draw water from the channel supplying the lower area to irrigate the upper area, even though they are two parts of the same garden bed.

[90] The Sages taught in a baraita: One may draw water and irrigate vegetables in order to eat them on the intermediate days of a Festival. But if he does this in order to improve their growth and to enhance their appearance it is prohibited, as he is considered to be unnecessarily exerting himself on the Festival.

[91] The Gemara relates that Ravina and Rabba Tosefa’a were once walking along the road when they saw a certain man that was drawing water with a bucket on the intermediate days of a Festival. Rabba Tosefa’a said to Ravina: Let the Master come and excommunicate him for transgressing the words of the Sages. Ravina said to him: But isn’t it taught in a baraita: One may draw for vegetables in order to eat them, and so he has not committed a transgression. Rabba Tosefa’a said to him: Do you maintain that what is meant by one may draw [madlin] is that one may draw water in order to irrigate the vegetables? This is not so. Rather, what is meant by

[92] one may draw is that one may pull out some of the vegetables that are growing densely together. The baraita comes to teach that one is permitted to thin out a garden bed on the intermediate days of a Festival in order to eat on the Festival those that he removes, but he is prohibited to do so in order to enhance the appearance of those that remain. As we learned in a mishna (Pe’a 7:5): One who thins out [meidel] the vines in his vineyard, just as he may thin out his own vines, so too, he may thin out the vines set aside for the poor. Since he is doing it for the sake of the vines, he may also thin out what he leaves for the poor; this is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda. Rabbi Meir disagrees and says: His own vines he is permitted to thin out, but he is not permitted to thin out the vines set aside for the poor. This mishna indicates that the term meidel can be used to mean thinning out and does not refer only to drawing water.

[93] Ravina said to Rabba Tosefa’a: But wasn’t it explicitly taught in a baraita: One may draw water to irrigate vegetables in order to eat them? Rabba Tosefa’a said to him: If it is taught explicitly in a baraita, the halakha is as it is taught, and I retract my statement.

[94] § It was taught in the mishna: And one may not construct circular ditches [ugiyyot] around the bases of grapevines on the intermediate days of a Festival. The Gemara asks: What are ugiyyot? Rav Yehuda said: They are what are called in Aramaic binkei, circular ditches around vines. The Gemara notes that this is also taught in a baraita: These are ugiyyot: Bedidin, circular ditches around the bases of olive trees and around the bases of grapevines.

95 The Gemara asks: Is that so? Is it prohibited to dig circular ditches on the intermediate days of the Festival? Didn’t Rav Yehuda permit the family of bar Tzitai to construct circular ditches for their vineyards on the intermediate days of a Festival? The Gemara answers: This is not difficult. This source, i.e., the mishna that renders the practice prohibited, is referring to digging new ditches. That other source, i.e., Rav Yehuda’s ruling that permits the digging of such ditches, is referring to old ones, which merely need to be cleared.

96 § It was taught in the next clause of the mishna that Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya says: One may not construct a new water channel during the intermediate days of a Festival or during the Sabbatical Year. The Gemara asks: Granted, it is prohibited for him to do so on the intermediate days of a Festival, because in so doing he excessively exerts himself on the Festival. But what is the reason that this is prohibited during the Sabbatical Year, when only labors that enhance the growth of plants are prohibited?

97 The Gemara answers: Rabbi Zeira and Rabbi Abba bar Memel disagreed with regard to this issue. One of them said: It is prohibited because it appears to others as if he were hoeing his field. As onlookers do not know that he is merely digging a water channel, they suspect him of working his land during the Sabbatical Year. And the other one said: It is prohibited because he thereby prepares the channel’s banks for planting, for when he digs out the channel, he piles the fresh soil that is fit for planting on its two banks.

98 The Gemara asks: What is the practical halakhic difference between them? The Gemara answers: There is a practical halakhic difference between them in a case where water comes into the channel immediately after he digs it out. According to the one who said that digging a water channel is prohibited because he thereby prepares its banks for planting, there is still a prohibition, as here too, he piles the fresh soil on the channel’s banks. But according to the one who said it is prohibited because it appears as if he were hoeing, there is no prohibition here, as the immediate entry of water makes it obvious that he is digging a water channel.

99 The Gemara asks: But according to the one who said that digging a water channel is prohibited because it appears as if he were hoeing, let him be concerned that the digger thereby prepares the channel’s banks for planting and render digging prohibited in this case as well. Rather, the matter must be explained differently, such that there is a practical difference between them in a case where he takes the earth that he excavates from the channel and throws it a considerable distance outside. According to the one who said that it is prohibited because he thereby prepares the channel’s banks for planting, there is no prohibition here, as he does not prepare them for planting. But according to the one who said it is prohibited because it appears as if he were hoeing, there is a prohibition here, as here too, it appears as if he were hoeing.

100 The Gemara asks: But according to the one who said that digging a water channel is prohibited because he thereby prepares its banks for planting, let him be concerned that the digger appears as if he were hoeing. The Gemara answers that this is not a concern, because it is also true of one who hoes that when he takes up a clump of earth, he puts it down again in its place. Consequently, since one throws the dug-up earth far away, it is immediately apparent that he is not engaged in hoeing but is rather digging a water channel.

101 Ameimar would teach this mishna as stating explicitly that Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya says that one may not dig a new water channel during the Sabbatical Year because it appears as if he were hoeing

his field, and he therefore found a difficulty between this statement of Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya and another statement of Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya. The difficulty is as follows: Did Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya actually say that any action that causes him to appear as if he were hoeing is prohibited?

[102] One may raise a contradiction to this assertion from a mishna (Shevi'it 3:3) that states: A person may pile his manure in his field during the Sabbatical Year so that it becomes a storage heap, and there is no cause for concern that it may appear as if he were fertilizing his field. Rabbi Meir prohibits this unless he deepens the storage area for the manure three handbreadths below the ground or raises it three handbreadths above the surface of the ground, so that it does not appear as if he were fertilizing his field. If he already had a small amount of manure in that heap from before the Sabbatical Year, he may continue to add to it, and there is no need for concern.

[103] Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya prohibits piling his manure in his field unless he deepens the storage area for the manure three handbreadths below the surface of the ground, or he raises it three handbreadths above the surface, or he places it on a rock. In any event, it seems that according to Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya, it is permitted for him to dig a hole in the ground in order to deposit his manure there, even though he might appear to be hoeing the ground.

[104] Rabbi Zeira and Rabbi Abba bar Memel both offered resolutions to this difficulty: One of them said: The case in this second mishna is one where he had already deepened the three-handbreadth pit during the sixth year. And the other one said: His pile of manure is proof that he intends merely to bury the manure and not to hoe the field.

[105] § It was taught in the mishna that the Rabbis say: One may repair a damaged water channel during the intermediate days of a Festival. What is meant by a damaged water channel? Rabbi Abba said that if it was now a handbreadth deep because it had become filled with sediment, he may dredge it out until he sets it at its original depth of six handbreadths.

[106] Based on this ruling, the Gemara clarifies several practical issues: It is obvious that if the channel is half a handbreadth deep and he wants to restore it to a depth of three handbreadths, since water does not flow through a three-handbreadth-deep channel in sufficient quantity, it is nothing at all and it is certainly prohibited to exert oneself with work that provides insignificant benefit. So too, if the channel is two handbreadths deep and he wants to deepen it to twelve handbreadths, even though he preserves the same ratio as in Rabbi Abba's case, since it involves excessive exertion, no, this is also not permitted.

[107] However, in a case where the channel is two handbreadths deep and he wants to deepen it to seven handbreadths, what is the halakha? The Gemara explains the two sides of the question of whether this can be compared to the case in the mishna: Here, in the case of dredging a one-handbreadth-deep channel to restore its depth of six handbreadths, he deepens the channel by five handbreadths, and similarly here, in the case of deepening the channel from two to seven handbreadths, he likewise wants to deepen it by five handbreadths, and therefore it should be permitted. Or perhaps, since there is an extra handbreadth of depth, then bending over to dig that additional handbreadth involves greater effort, which is unnecessary, and so possibly it should be prohibited. The Gemara states that the dilemma shall stand unresolved.

[108] It was related that Abaye permitted the people of Bar Hamdakh to remove the branches of the trees from the river on the intermediate days of a Festival. Rabbi Yirmeya permitted the people of Sekhavta to dredge out a river that had become blocked. Rav Ashi permitted his townsmen, the

people of Mata Meḥasya, to clean out the nearby Burnitz River. He said: Since the public drinks from it, it is considered like a public need, and we learned in the mishna that one may tend to all other public needs on the intermediate days of a Festival.

[109] § It was taught in the mishna: During the intermediate days of a Festival one may repair

[110] damaged water cisterns in the public domain and clean them out by removing the dirt and sediment that has accumulated in them. The Gemara infers: Cleaning out the cisterns of dirt and sediment during the intermediate days of a Festival is indeed permitted, but digging a new cistern is not permitted.

[111] Rabbi Ya’akov said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: They taught that it is prohibited to dig new cisterns only when the public does not need them; but if the public needs them, even digging new cisterns is permitted.

[112] The Gemara asks: And when the public needs them, is digging really permitted? But isn’t it taught in a baraita: One may clean out cisterns, ditches, and caves of an individual during the intermediate days of a Festival, and, needless to say, one may clean out those of the public. But one may not dig new cisterns, ditches, or caves of the public during the intermediate days of a Festival, and, needless to say, one may not dig those of an individual. What, is it not so that this baraita is referring to a case where the public needs them, but nevertheless digging new cisterns, ditches, and caves is prohibited?

[113] The Gemara rejects this opinion: No, this baraita is referring to a case where the public does not need them.

[114] The Gemara raises a difficulty: It would follow that in the corresponding situation with regard to the cisterns of an individual, the baraita is referring to a case where the individual does not need them. But in that case, is cleaning them out really permitted? Isn’t it taught in a baraita: One may gather water into the cisterns, ditches, and caves of an individual, but one may not clean them out or plaster their cracks; but for those of the public, one may indeed clean out and plaster their cracks? This indicates that on the intermediate days of a Festival, unneeded cisterns belonging to an individual may not even be cleaned out.

[115] The Gemara rejects this difficulty: Rather, to what case does the first baraita refer? Is it referring to a case where the individual needs the cisterns? If so, then in the corresponding situation with regard to cisterns of the public, the baraita would be referring to a case where the public needs them. But in that case, is digging new cisterns really prohibited? Isn’t it taught in yet another baraita: One may gather water into cisterns, ditches, and caves of an individual, and one may clean them out, but one may not plaster their cracks, clear earth into them in order to fill in the cracks, or lime them with lime so that they hold water. But with regard to those of the public, one may even dig them out and lime them with lime. Therefore, in a case where the public needs them, it is permitted to dig out public cisterns.

[116] But if so, the first baraita, which states that one may not dig new cisterns even for the public, is difficult, as it is contradicted by this last baraita. The Gemara explains: Answer the difficulty and explain the first baraita as follows: One may clean out cisterns, ditches, and caves of an individual during the intermediate days of a Festival when the individual needs them; and needless to say, one

may clean out those of the public when the public needs them, as even digging new cisterns is permitted when the public needs them.

[117] But one may not dig cisterns, ditches and caves for the public when the public does not need them. And needless to say, one may not dig them for an individual, as when an individual does not need the cisterns on the intermediate days of a Festival, even cleaning them out is prohibited. In this way all of the seemingly contradictory sources can be reconciled.

[118] Rav Ashi said: The wording of the mishna is also precise, indicating that when there is a public need for such cisterns, they may be dug even on the intermediate days of a Festival. As it teaches: One may tend to all other public needs. What does the word all come to add that was not stated explicitly? Does it not come to add the digging of cisterns, which is permitted?

[119] The Gemara rejects this opinion: No, the word all comes to add that which is taught in the following baraita: On the intermediate days of a Festival, agents of the court go out to clear thorns from the road, and to repair the city streets and highways [isterata'ot], and to measure the ritual baths to ascertain that they have the requisite quantity of water. And if any ritual bath does not contain forty se'a, the minimal measure for ritual purification, they direct [margilin] a stream of water into it, such that it flows over the ground before entering the bath, so as not to disqualify the water as drawn water until it holds forty se'a of water.

[120] And from where is it derived that if agents of the court did not go out and do all these repairs, that with regard to any blood that is shed there on account of their negligence, the verse ascribes to them guilt as if they had shed it? The verse states with regard to the cities of refuge that offer protection to someone who committed inadvertent manslaughter: "That innocent blood be not shed in your land, which the Lord your God gives you for an inheritance, and so blood be upon you" (Deuteronomy 19:10). The Gemara maintains that the mishna uses the word all to allude to the cases mentioned in this baraita, and not to the digging of public cisterns.

[121] The Gemara questions this: But these additional cases are explicitly taught in the mishna: One may repair the roads, streets, and ritual baths, and one may tend to all other public needs. What does this last phrase come to add? Does it not come to add the digging of cisterns needed by the public? The Gemara agrees: Conclude from this that the mishna means to permit the digging of new cisterns when they are needed by the public.

[122] § It was taught in the mishna: One may mark graves on the intermediate days of a Festival so that passersby will know to avoid them and not become ritually impure. Rabbi Shimon ben Pazi said: Where is there an allusion in the Torah to the marking of graves? The verse states: "And when they that pass through shall pass through the land, and any see a man's bone, then shall he set up a sign by it" (Ezekiel 39:15). Ezekiel prophesies that at some future time, the Jewish people will erect signs over the strewn remains of the dead so that others will know to avoid ritual impurity.

[123] Ravina said to Rav Ashi: Before the prophet Ezekiel came and alluded to this obligation, who said that graves must be marked? Even before the time of Ezekiel, people were careful with regard to ritual impurity. Rav Ashi responded: And according to your reasoning, that Ezekiel was introducing a new halakha, the same question can be raised with regard to this statement that Rav Ḥisda said. As Rav Ḥisda said with regard to the halakha that one who is uncircumcised or an apostate may not serve in the Temple: This matter we did not learn from the Torah of Moses our teacher, but rather, we learned it from the words of the prophet Ezekiel ben Buzi, who said of such individuals: "No

stranger, uncircumcised in heart, or uncircumcised in flesh, shall enter into My Sanctuary to serve Me” (Ezekiel 44:9).

[124] Here too, one can ask: Before Ezekiel came, who said that such individuals cannot serve in the Temple? Rather, you must say that originally they learned it as a tradition and it was an accepted halakha for generations, and then Ezekiel came and based it on a verse. Here too, with regard to the obligation to mark graves, they originally learned it as a tradition, and then Ezekiel came and based it on a verse.

[125] Rabbi Abbahu said: An allusion to the marking of graves may be derived from here: “And the leper in whom the plague is, his clothes shall be rent, and the hair of his head shall go loose, and he shall cover his upper lip, and shall cry: Impure, impure” (Leviticus 13:45). This verse teaches that impurity cries out to the passerby and tells him: Remove yourself. The leper must inform others of his status so that they know not to come into contact with him and thereby maintain their ritual purity. So too, in our case, graves must be marked so that others will know to avoid them and prevent contracting ritual impurity. And similarly, Rabbi Uzziel, grandson of Rabbi Uzziel the Great, said: Impurity cries out to the passerby and tells him: Remove yourself.

[126] The Gemara asks: But with regard to this verse, does it come to teach this idea? That verse is needed for that which is taught in the following baraita: “And he shall cry: Impure, impure”; this teaches that the leper must inform the public of his distress, and the public will pray for mercy on his behalf.

[127] The Gemara answers: If it is so that the verse comes to teach only one idea, let it write: And he shall cry: Impure. What is to be derived the repetition of impure, impure? Learn from this reiteration two ideas: First, that the leper must inform the public of his pain so that others will pray on his behalf, and second, that he must warn the public to stay away so that they avoid coming into contact with him and contracting ritual impurity.

[128] Abaye said: An allusion to the marking of graves may be learned from here, as it is written: “You shall not put a stumbling block before the blind” (Leviticus 19:14). Rav Pappa said the obligation is alluded to in the verse: “And He will say: Pave, pave, clear the way, take up the stumbling block out of the way of My people” (Isaiah 57:14), which indicates that roads must be cleared of all obstacles and hazards.

[129] Rav Ḥinnana said: This may be derived from the end of that very same verse: “Take up the stumbling block from the way of My people” (Isaiah 57:14). Rabbi Yehoshua, son of Rav Idi, said: This may be derived from the verse: “And you shall show them the way in which they must walk” (Exodus 18:20), i.e., you must properly repair the roads, which includes marking graves.

[130] Mar Zutra said that an allusion to this obligation is found in the verse “Thus you shall separate the children of Israel from their impurity” (Leviticus 15:31), which indicates that people must be warned to stay away from that which could cause them to become ritually impure. Rav Ashi said it is derived from the verse: “And you shall keep My charge” (Leviticus 18:30), which means that you must establish a safeguard for My charge, i.e., protective measures must be enacted to prevent people from transgressing halakha, a task that includes distancing people from ritual impurity by marking off graves, so that they not come to convey ritual impurity to teruma or other consecrated items.

131 And finally, Ravina said: This obligation is alluded to by the verse “And to him who orders his way, I will show the salvation of God” (Psalms 50:23), meaning that one must mark the pathways that are ritually pure and upon which it is appropriate to walk.

132 With regard to the verse from Psalms cited above, Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said: Whoever appraises his ways in this world and contemplates how to act in the most appropriate way possible merits seeing the salvation of the Holy One, Blessed be He, as it is stated: “And to him who orders his way.” Do not read it as vesam, who orders; rather, read it as vesham, and appraises. With this reading, the verse indicates that one who appraises his ways, him will I show the salvation of God.

133 Rabbi Yannai had a certain student who would raise difficulties with his teachings every day as they were learning. On Shabbat of a Festival, when the broader public would come to hear the lesson, the student would not raise any difficulties, lest Rabbi Yannai lack an immediate answer and suffer embarrassment.

134 Rabbi Yannai read this verse about him: “And to him who orders his way, I will show the salvation of God” (Psalms 50:23), for he considered his conduct and determined when it was inappropriate to challenge his master.

135 § With regard to the halakhot of marking graves, the Sages taught the following baraita: The courts do not mark the area of an olive-bulk of a corpse; nor of a bone that is the size of a barleygrain-bulk; nor of any item that imparts impurity only through physical contact but does not impart ritual impurity by means of a tent to an individual or object that it overshadows, or that is overshadowed by it, or that is found together with it under the same structure. But they do mark the area of the spine of a corpse, the skull, or the bones that comprise the majority of the skeletal structure or the majority of the number of bones in the body.

136 And furthermore, they do not mark the area of certain ritual impurity, i.e., a place that is known to all as ritually impure, but they do mark a place of uncertain ritual impurity. And these are the places of uncertain ritual impurity: Overhanging boughs, protrusions, and a beit haperas. And they do not erect the marker directly over the site of the ritual impurity, so as not to cause a loss of ritually pure food items, as one who is carrying such food might inadvertently walk up to the site of ritual impurity and only then notice the marker, after the food has already contracted impurity. Similarly, they do not distance the marker from the actual site of ritual impurity, so as not to cause a loss of Eretz Yisrael, i.e., so as not to increase the area into which individuals refrain from entering.

137 The Gemara begins to analyze this baraita by asking: Is it really so that an olive-bulk of a corpse does not impart ritual impurity by means of a tent? But didn’t we learn in a mishna (Oholot 2:1): These are the items that impart ritual impurity by means of a tent, and among other items this list includes an olive-bulk of a corpse?

138 Rav Pappa said: Here, we are dealing with a case where the piece of flesh is exactly an olive-bulk, which, as it decays, will ultimately diminish in size to less than an olive-bulk. Accordingly, it is preferable that teruma and consecrated items be burned because of it for the time being, in a case where one inadvertently encounters this impurity because it was not marked and consequently one must burn any teruma or consecrated items that became ritually impure, and not be burned because of it forever afterward. After some time the piece of flesh will be less than an olive-bulk, yet if the area is marked, people will continue to burn teruma or consecrated items because of it, as, due to the marking, they will assume that ritual impurity was imparted by means of a tent.

[139] The Gemara continues to explicate the baraita: And these are the places of uncertain ritual impurity: Overhanging boughs, and protrusions, and a beit haperas.

[140] The Gemara explains: Overhanging boughs is referring to a tree that hangs over the ground next to a cemetery, and under one of its branches there might be a corpse. If there is a corpse there, the branch overhanging it creates a tent and therefore imparts ritual impurity to anyone who passes underneath it.

[141] Protrusions is referring to protruding stones that jut out from a wall and are not flush with it, under which there might be a corpse. Once again, if the stones protrude over a corpse, they create a tent and impart ritual impurity to anyone who passes underneath.

[142] The definition of a beit haperas is as we learned elsewhere in a mishna (Oholot 17:1): One who plows a field containing a grave, thereby raising concern that bones may have become strewn throughout the field, renders the field a beit haperas. And how much of the field does he render a beit haperas? The full length of a furrow, which is a hundred cubits.

[143] The Gemara asks: Does a beit haperas really impart ritual impurity by means of a tent? But didn't Rav Yehuda say that Shmuel said: If a person is carrying ritually pure items or wishes to remain ritually pure so that he may consume consecrated items, yet he must cross a beit haperas, he may blow upon the earth in the beit haperas before each step to clear away any small bones that may have become strewn across the field and proceed to walk across the area, thereby remaining ritually pure. This indicates that there is no concern about contracting ritual impurity by means of a tent in a beit haperas; otherwise, it would be prohibited to cross in this way, as it is possible that in the course of blowing one may already have contracted ritual impurity by leaning over the bones or by passing over bones that are buried beneath the surface.

[144] Similarly, Rav Yehuda bar Ami said in the name of Ulla: A beit haperas that was trampled, i.e., a well-trodden beit haperas, is ritually pure, as passersby have certainly cleared away any bones with their feet. If a beit haperas were to impart ritual impurity by means of a tent, there should be a concern that the bones may have been trampled upon and buried in the ground. Both these sources prove that a beit haperas does not impart impurity by means of tent, posing a contradiction to the mishna.

[145] Rav Pappa said: It is not difficult, as a distinction can be made between different types of beit haperas: Here, where the baraita states that a beit haperas must be marked because it imparts tent impurity, it is referring to a field in which a grave was lost, i.e., a field that was known with certainty to contain a grave, though its precise location can no longer be recalled. There, where it ruled that a beit haperas does not convey tent impurity, it is a case of a field where a grave was plowed and it is not at all clear whether there are bones strewn across the field. In that case ritual impurity is not imparted by means of a tent, and so it need not be marked.

[146] The Gemara asks: But is a field where a grave was plowed called a beit haperas, such that one must be concerned about its ritual impurity? The Gemara answers: Yes, and so we learned in a mishna (Oholot 18:2–4): There are three types of beit haperas through which those who eat teruma and consecrated items are prohibited to walk: A field in which a grave was lost and its precise location is no longer known, a field in which a grave was plowed and bones may have been scattered about, and a weepers' field.

147 The Gemara asks: What is meant by a weepers’ field? Rav Yehoshua bar Abba said in the name of Ulla: A field where those escorting the deceased would take leave of the deceased, handing the corpse over to those who would perform the actual interment.

148 And what is the reason that one must be concerned about ritual impurity in a weepers’ field? Avimi said: It is due to the possible despair by the owners of recovering bones that the Sages touched upon it. There is a concern that in transporting the deceased from far away, a loose limb may have fallen from the corpse into the field, and unseen by those transporting the deceased, it was abandoned there. Since over time many corpses passed through this weepers’ field, it is assumed that ritual impurity might be found in many places throughout the field.

149 The Gemara asks: And does a field in which a grave was plowed not require marking? But isn’t it taught in a baraita: If one encountered a field that was marked due to ritual impurity, and it is no longer known what the nature of the ritual impurity was, if there are trees in the field, it is known that a grave was plowed in it, as it is permitted for one to plant trees in such a field. If there are no trees in the field, it is known that a grave was lost in it, as it is prohibited for one to plant trees in such a field. If a field is suitable for planting trees and yet there are none, clearly it is because a grave was lost in it.

150 Rabbi Yehuda says: We do not rely on these signs unless there is an Elder or a rabbinic scholar who can testify about the subject, as not all are experts in this matter, and perhaps the field was not plowed at all. In any case, this baraita teaches that a field in which a grave was plowed is also marked.

151 The Gemara answers: Rav Pappa said: When that baraita concerning a marked field is taught, it is taught with regard to a field where a grave was certainly lost and they immediately marked it. However, if there are trees in the field, it is known that a grave was later plowed in it, i.e., it was forgotten that a grave had been lost in the field and so it was inappropriately plowed and prepared for planting. But if there are no trees in the field, we know that a grave was lost in it and it was not later plowed.

152 The Gemara raises a question about this ruling: But let us be concerned that perhaps the trees were located inside the field and the grave was located outside of it, and the actual site of the grave was never plowed but simply lost? How then can one rely on the presence of trees to indicate that the grave had been plowed in the field?

153 The Gemara answers: It is as Ulla said elsewhere. This is a case where the trees are standing along the field’s boundaries, next to a public domain, as the grave is certainly not outside the trees in the public domain, since people do not bury a corpse in the public thoroughfare. Rather, the grave must be between the trees, and was therefore plowed. Here too, then, this is a case where the trees are standing along the borders.

154 The Gemara asks: But perhaps the ritual impurity was on the inside and the trees were on the outside, and only the area between the trees was plowed, while the inner portion of the field with the grave was not plowed?

155 The Gemara answers: The case is where the trees are scattered throughout the entire field, so that it is likely that the entire field was plowed. And if you wish, say instead: This is not a concern, as we said earlier that one does not distance the marker too far from the actual site of ritual impurity, so as

not to cause a loss of Eretz Yisrael. As the marker is located near the trees, presumably the trees are close to the actual site of the grave, and the site of the grave was plowed.

[156] It is taught in the baraita that Rabbi Yehuda says: One relies on these signs only when there is an Elder or a rabbinic scholar who can testify about the matter, as not all are well versed in this matter, and perhaps the field was not plowed at all. Abaye said: Learn from this statement of Rabbi Yehuda that when there is a Torah scholar in the city, all affairs of the city are thrust upon him, i.e., are his responsibility. Consequently, he is expected to know what has happened in the city.

[157] § The Gemara continues its discussion of marking graves. Rav Yehuda said: If one found a single marked stone, this indicates that the ground underneath it is ritually impure. If he found two marked stones, the following distinction applies: If there is lime on the ground between them, this indicates that the area between them is ritually impure and the two stones mark the boundaries of the impure area; and if there is no lime on the ground between them, this indicates that the area between them is ritually pure and each stone marks a separate area of ritual impurity.

[158] The Gemara asks: And is the area between them deemed ritually pure even though there is no sign of plowing having taken place between the stones? But isn't it taught otherwise in a baraita as follows: If one found a single marked stone, this indicates that the ground underneath it is ritually impure. If he found two marked stones, then the following distinction applies: If there is evidence of plowing having taken place between them, the area between the two stones is ritually pure; and if not, the area between them is ritually impure.

[159] Rav Pappa said: The contradiction can be resolved by explaining that here, in the baraita, the case is where the lime used as a marker of ritual impurity had been poured on top of the stones, and it is spread thinly this way and that. In this case, if there is evidence of plowing having taken place between the stones, the area between them is ritually pure, as one can say that the lime was peeled off from the stones due to the plowing; originally the lime was only on top of the stones, to indicate that there is ritual impurity underneath them, but then fell into the area between them during the plowing. But if there is no evidence of a plow having passed between them, then it is most likely that the lime was meant to mark the ground between the stones, and the entire area between them is ritually impure.

[160] Rabbi Asi said: If only one border of a field is marked, it is assumed that the border itself is ritually impure while the entire rest of the field is ritually pure. If two borders are marked, it is assumed that they are both ritually impure while the entire rest of the field is ritually pure. If three borders are marked, it is assumed that the three of them are ritually impure while the entire rest of the field is ritually pure. If all four borders are marked, the borders themselves are ritually pure, while the entire field enclosed by the borders is ritually impure.

[161] As the Master said in the baraita: One does not distance the marker from the actual site of ritual impurity, so as not to cause a loss of Eretz Yisrael, i.e., not to increase the area into which people refrain from entering. Consequently, they marked all of the borders to indicate that the entire field is ritually impure.

[162] § It is taught in the mishna: And inspectors even go out on the intermediate days of a Festival to uproot the shoots of prohibited diverse kinds [kilayim] that grew in the fields during the rainy season.

163 The Gemara asks: Do they go out to uproot diverse kinds during the intermediate days of a Festival? The Gemara raises a contradiction from another mishna (Shekalim 1:1), which states: On the first of Adar the court issues a proclamation concerning the collection of the shekels, i.e., the yearly half-shekel contribution to the Temple treasury made by each adult male for the purpose of buying communal offerings. And the court also issues a proclamation with regard to the obligation to uproot diverse kinds from the fields.

164 On the fifteenth of Adar the Megilla, the Scroll of Esther, is read in the walled cities, and they go out to clear thorns from the roads, to repair the city streets, and to measure the ritual baths to ascertain that they have the requisite quantity of water. And they tend to all other public needs, and they mark graves with lime, and they go out to uproot the shoots of diverse kinds. If they already went out in Adar to uproot the diverse kinds, why would they go out again on the intermediate days of the festival of Passover?

165 Rabbi Elazar and Rabbi Yosei bar Ḥanina disagreed about this issue: One said: Here, in the mishna that states that they go out on the fifteenth of Adar, it is referring to the early crop, while there, in the mishna that states that they go out on the intermediate days of the Festival, it is referring to the late crop, which isn't clearly recognizable until the intermediate days of Passover. And one said: Here, in the mishna that states that they go out on the fifteenth of Adar, it is referring to grains that are sown in the winter and have already grown tall by Adar, while there, in the mishna that states that they go out on the intermediate days of the Festival, it is referring to vegetables, which only grow later in the season.

166 Rabbi Asi said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: They taught that court messengers go out to uproot diverse kinds in the middle of the month of Adar only in a case where the blossom was not yet recognizable at an earlier date, so it was still impossible to determine whether or not the seedling was from diverse kinds of seeds. But if the blossom was already recognizable at an earlier date, they go out at that time to uproot the shoots of diverse kinds of seeds.

167 The Gemara asks: What is different about the intermediate days of a Festival that we specifically go out to uproot shoots of diverse kinds of seeds during that week? Rabbi Ya'akov said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: It is due to the wages paid to the workers hired by the court to uproot the diverse kinds. On the intermediate days of the Festival it is prohibited for them to perform ordinary labor, and so they reduce their rates for us, i.e., for public works, as otherwise they would have no income at all.

168 Rav Zevid said, and some say that it was Rav Mesharshiyya who said: Learn from this explanation that when we give the workers who uproot the diverse kinds their wages, we give it to them from the funds of the collection of the Temple treasury chamber. Since they are paid with consecrated money, an attempt is made to minimize the expenses. As, if it enters your mind that we pay them from theirs, i.e., the court forces the owners of the fields where the diverse kinds are found to pay the workers who uproot them, what benefit would we derive from saving the expense? However much the workers desire, they should pay them.

169 Concerning the issue of uprooting diverse kinds, the Gemara asks: And how much of another species must be mixed in with a crop in order to be considered diverse kinds that must be uprooted by these workers? Rav Shmuel bar Yitzḥak said: The amount is like that which we learned in the mishna (Kilayim 2:1): Any se'a of seeds that contains

[170] a quarter-kav or more of seeds of a different type, i.e., one twenty-fourth of the mixture is a type of seed other than the main type, one must reduce the other type of seeds in the mixture by uprooting the shoots.

[171] With regard to the halakha that inspectors must go out and uproot the shoots of diverse kinds of seeds that grew in the fields, the Gemara asks: But isn't it taught in a baraita that the Sages ordained that they should pronounce the crop of the entire field in which diverse kinds was found ownerless, rather than uprooting the diverse kinds? The Gemara responds: This is not difficult. Here, in the mishna, where it says that the inspectors go out and uproot the diverse kinds, it is referring to the time before the institution of the new ordinance; there, in the baraita, where it says that the entire field is pronounced ownerless, it is referring to the time after the institution of that ordinance.

[172] The Gemara explains this ordinance as it is taught in another baraita: At first, the agents of the court would uproot the diverse kinds and cast them before the livestock belonging to the owners of the fields. However, the property holders would rejoice for two reasons: One, that the agents of the court weeded their fields for them when they uprooted the plants of the other type; and another one, that they cast the diverse kinds before their livestock, thereby saving them from having to feed them. Accordingly, the field owners took no steps to keep their fields free of diverse kinds of seeds.

[173] The Sages, therefore, ordained that the agents of the court should uproot the diverse kinds and cast them on the roads. Yet the property holders would still greatly rejoice that the agents of the court weeded their fields free of charge. Finally, the Sages ordained that they should pronounce the crop of the entire field in which diverse kinds was found ownerless.

[174] MISHNA: Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya'akov says: In a field that is filled with trees, one may draw water via channels from one tree to another tree on the intermediate days of a Festival because trees are in dire need of water. And this is permitted provided that in doing so he does not water the entire field. With regard to plants that were not watered prior to the Festival, one may not water them on the intermediate days of the Festival because they do not need the water. But the Rabbis permit watering in this case, i.e., trees, and that case, i.e., plants.

[175] GEMARA: Rav Yehuda said: If the field was moist [metunenet] before the Festival but in the meantime it dried up, it is permitted to water the entire field even according to Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya'akov. That ruling is also taught in a baraita: When they said that it is prohibited to water them on the intermediate days of a Festival, they said this only with regard to plants that were not watered at all before the Festival. However, with regard to plants that were already watered before the Festival and had begun to grow, it is permitted to water them on the intermediate days of the Festival because failure to water them would lead to substantial financial loss.

[176] And if the field was moist before the Festival, it is permitted to water it even if the field had not been watered prior to the Festival. And one may not water a dry field on the intermediate days of a Festival. But the Rabbis permit watering this and that, i.e., plants that were not watered before the Festival and a dry field.

[177] Ravina said: Learn from here that one is permitted to sprinkle a garden [tarbitza] with water on the intermediate days of a Festival. Ravina explains how he arrived at this conclusion: What is the reason that the Rabbis permit one to water a dry field despite the fact that the plants will not die from a lack of moisture? This is because watering the field in advance turns a late crop into an early crop. It can be understood from this that the late ripening of a crop is considered a substantial financial loss

that serves as a reason to permit labor that would otherwise be prohibited on the intermediate days of a Festival. Here too, in the case of a garden, sprinkling it with water turns a late crop into an early crop, and so it is permitted on the intermediate days of a Festival.

178 The Sages taught the following baraita: One may sprinkle water in a field of grain during the Sabbatical Year, but not on the intermediate days of a Festival.

179 The Gemara asks: But isn't it taught in another baraita: One may sprinkle water in a field of grain both on the intermediate days of a Festival and during the Sabbatical Year? Rav Huna said: This is not difficult. This baraita that prohibits sprinkling water in a field of grain on the intermediate days of a Festival is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya'akov, who prohibits watering an entire field. That baraita that permits it is in accordance with the more lenient opinion of the Rabbis.

180 It is taught in another baraita: One may sprinkle water in a white field on the eve of the Sabbatical Year so that vegetables will sprout during the Sabbatical Year; and not only that, but one may sprinkle water in a field of grain even during the Sabbatical Year itself, so that vegetables will sprout upon the conclusion of the Sabbatical Year. Since sprinkling water is not regarded as full-fledged agricultural labor, it is permitted as long as the sprinkling and the sprouting of the vegetables do not both occur during the Sabbatical Year itself.

181 MISHNA: One may trap moles [ishut] and mice in an orchard and in a field of grain in his usual manner, i.e., as he would trap them all year round, both on the intermediate days of a Festival and during the Sabbatical Year. But the Rabbis say: In an orchard he may trap them in his usual manner, but in a field of grain, where there is no danger of substantial financial loss, he may only trap them in a way that is not his usual manner.

182 And one may seal a breach in the wall of his garden on the intermediate days of a Festival, and during the Sabbatical Year one may even build a wall in his usual manner, as this is not considered an agricultural labor. Consequently, despite the fact that this benefits the garden by offering it protection, it is not prohibited during the Sabbatical Year.

183 GEMARA: The Gemara asks: What is meant by the term ishut? Rav Yehuda said: An ishut is a creature that has no eyes, a rodent that digs holes in the ground and can cause damage to roots and vegetables. Rava bar Yishmael said, and some say that it was Rav Yeimar bar Shelamya who said: What is the verse that indicates the identity of the ishut? "As a snail that melts and disappears; like the fall of a young mole [eshet] that has not seen the sun" (Psalms 58:9). It is understood that this creature has not seen the sun because it does not have eyes.

184 The Gemara expands upon the halakha recorded in the mishna. The Sages taught the following baraita: One may trap moles and mice in a field of grain and in an orchard in his usual manner, and one may destroy ant holes so that the ants will cause no damage. How does one destroy ant holes? Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel says: One brings soil from this ant hole and places it in that ant hole, and since the ants from the two nests are not familiar with each other, they strangle each other.

185 Rav Yeimar bar Shelamya said in the name of Abaye: And this advice works only in certain circumstances: When the ant holes are located on two opposite sides of a river, when there is no bridge connecting the two sides, when there is not even a plank bridge over the water, and when there is not even a rope stretched taut across the river. If there is any connection whatsoever between the two sides of the river, the ants from the two nests are likely to recognize each other and not fight.

[186] Up to what distance are the ant holes considered to be adjacent such that a river is required in order to separate between them? Up to a parasang [parsa].

[187] § We learned in the mishna that Rabbi Yehuda says: In an orchard one may trap moles and mice in his usual manner, but in a field of grain, he may trap them only in a way that is not his usual manner. The Sages taught the following baraita: How does one trap in his usual manner? He digs a hole in the ground and hangs a trap in it. How does one trap in a way that is not his usual manner? He inserts a spit into the ground where the rodents are suspected of hiding, strikes it with a spade, and removes the earth from beneath it until he finds and kills the rodents.

[188] It is taught in a baraita that Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar says: When they said that one may trap moles and mice in a field of grain on the intermediate days of a Festival only in a way that is not his usual manner, they spoke only with regard to a field of grain that is adjacent to the city, where the damage is limited to that field and is not extensive. But in a field of grain that is adjacent to an orchard, one may trap even in his usual manner, lest the moles and mice leave the field of grain and destroy the trees in the adjacent orchard, causing great damage.

[189] § It is taught in the mishna: And one may seal a breach in the wall of his garden on the intermediate days of a Festival. The Gemara asks: How does one seal such a breach? Rav Yosef said: With palm branches [hutza] and the branches of a bay tree [dafna], which do not create a significant partition, but simply a temporary barrier.

[190] It was taught in a baraita: One fills in the breach with stone, but he does not plaster the stones with clay. Rav Ḥisda said: They taught that he may seal a breach but not build a wall in his usual manner only with regard to the wall of a garden, as no significant loss will be suffered if he delays building until after the Festival. However, with regard to the wall of a courtyard, which prevents the entry of strangers who are likely to steal from him, he may build a wall in his usual manner even on the intermediate days of a Festival.

[191] The Gemara suggests: Let us say that the following baraita supports Rav Ḥisda's statement: With regard to a wall that is leaning [goḥeh] toward the public domain and is likely to fall, one may demolish and rebuild it in his usual manner on the intermediate days of a Festival, due to the danger that it poses to passersby. The Gemara rejects this opinion: There, the reason is as the baraita explicitly teaches, i.e., it is due to the danger that the wall poses to passersby, and not due to the protection that it affords the courtyard.

[192] And some say that this baraita was cited not to support Rav Ḥisda's opinion but in order to refute it, as follows: Come and hear that which is taught in a baraita: With regard to a wall that is leaning toward the public domain and is likely to fall, one may demolish and rebuild it in his usual manner, due to the danger that it poses to passersby. The Gemara explains: The baraita indicates that if the need to build the wall is due to the danger that it poses, yes, he is permitted to rebuild the wall, but if the reason is not due to the danger, no, he is not permitted to do so. Shall we say that this is a conclusive refutation of the opinion of Rav Ḥisda, who says that one may build the wall of his courtyard in his usual manner, even if no danger is present?

[193] The Gemara answers: Rav Ḥisda could have said to you: There, in the case where the existing wall poses a danger, he is even permitted to demolish the wall and build it from scratch. Here, in the case of an ordinary wall enclosing a courtyard, he is permitted to build the breached wall in the usual manner, but not to demolish it.

194 The Gemara asks: There too, in the case of the leaning wall, let us say that he is permitted to demolish it and thereby remove the danger, but not to rebuild it until after the Festival. The Gemara answers: If so, he might refrain even from demolishing it, as demolishing the wall would leave his courtyard unprotected. Therefore, to eliminate the danger posed by the leaning wall, he is permitted not only to demolish it, but to rebuild it as well.

195 Rav Ashi said: The wording of the mishna is also precise and indicates that it is referring to the wall of a garden, as understood by Rav Ḥisda, as it teaches: During the Sabbatical Year one may even build in his usual manner.

196 The Gemara clarifies: Where is the wall to which the mishna refers? If we say that the mishna is referring to the wall of a courtyard, need it be said that it may be built during the Sabbatical Year? Only agricultural labors are prohibited during the Sabbatical Year, but construction is permitted. Rather, is it not referring to the wall of a garden, and it was necessary to state that this wall may be built during the Sabbatical Year to indicate that even though he appears as one who is building a protection for his produce, he is nevertheless permitted to do so. This proves that the mishna's discussion pertains to building the wall of a garden. The Gemara concludes: Learn from this that Rav Ḥisda's interpretation is indeed the correct understanding of the mishna.

197 MISHNA: When symptoms of leprosy appear, they must be examined by a priest, who determines whether or not the symptoms qualify as leprosy. Rabbi Meir says: A priest may initially examine an individual showing symptoms of leprosy on the intermediate days of a Festival in order to be lenient, i.e., he may pronounce the individual to be free of leprosy, but not in order to be stringent; he may not pronounce the individual to be impure. The individual does not become ritually impure until the priest pronounces him to have leprosy, and therefore the priest may remain silent and thereby prevent causing the afflicted individual distress during the Festival. And the Rabbis say: The priest may not examine the symptoms in order to be lenient or in order to be stringent.

198 GEMARA: It is taught in a baraita: Rabbi Meir says: A priest may examine an individual showing symptoms of leprosy on the intermediate days of a Festival in order to be lenient, but not in order to be stringent. Rabbi Yosei says: The priest may not examine the symptoms to be lenient or to be stringent. The reasoning behind Rabbi Yosei's opinion is that if you attend to the individual with the symptoms of leprosy to be lenient, you must attend to him even to be stringent. If the priest sees that the symptom is in fact leprosy, he must declare the affected person ritually impure rather than remain silent. Consequently, in order to avoid declaring that he has leprosy on the Festival, the priest should not examine him at all.

199 Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi said: The statement of Rabbi Meir appears to be correct with regard to the case of a quarantined leper. In this case, the priest may reexamine him at the end of the week even on the intermediate days of a Festival, because if he declares the individual to be pure, he will cause him to rejoice, and if he declares that the individual must be quarantined for another week, his situation is no worse than it was previously. On the other hand, the statement of Rabbi Yosei appears to be correct with regard to the case of a confirmed leper, one who has already been declared conclusively impure by a priest. The Gemara (7b) will explain the reason for this statement.

200 Rava said: With regard to an individual with symptoms of leprosy who is still ritually pure, i.e., who has not yet been examined by a priest, everyone agrees that the priest does not examine him, as his status can only worsen due to the examination. With regard to a suspected leper who is in his first

week of quarantine, everyone agrees that the priest examines him, as the priest may declare him pure if his symptoms have subsided, and even if his symptoms remained as they were, he will simply be quarantined for another week. When they disagree

[201] it is with regard to a suspected leper who is already in his second week of quarantine. One Sage, Rabbi Meir, holds that the matter depends upon the discretion of the priest; if he is found ritually pure, the priest declares him pure, and if he is found ritually impure, the priest can remain silent. As long as the priest does not declare the affected individual ritually impure, he does not become impure. And one Sage, Rabbi Yosei, holds that since it is written: "This is the law of the plague of leprosy…to pronounce it pure or to pronounce it impure" (Leviticus 13:59), the priest is not permitted to be silent; just as he is obligated to declare him pure when that is the case, so too, he is bound to declare him impure when his symptoms indicate impurity.

[202] The Gemara proceeds to analyze the baraita. The Master said that Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi said: The statement of Rabbi Yosei appears correct with regard to a confirmed leper, and the statement of Rabbi Meir appears correct with regard to a quarantined leper. The Gemara raises an objection: But isn't the opposite taught in a different baraita, namely, that Rabbi Yosei's statement appears correct with regard to the case of a quarantined leper, while Rabbi Meir's statement appears correct with regard to the case of a confirmed leper?

[203] The Gemara answers: This is a dispute between tanna'im in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi. One Sage, the author of the latter baraita, holds that the company of the world at large is preferable to the leper. Consequently, the priest may examine a confirmed leper during the Festival because the priest will either decide that the leper's symptoms are still present, in which case the leper's situation will be no worse than before, or the priest will declare that his symptoms have subsided, in which case the leper may reenter the community, which will bring him joy.

[204] And one Sage, the author of the baraita (7a), holds that the company of his wife is preferable to the leper. Consequently, the priest may not examine a confirmed leper on the Festival, because if he declares that his symptoms have subsided, the leper will begin his seven day purification process, during which time he is prohibited from engaging in conjugal relations with his wife. Due to the distress that this causes him, it is preferable that the priest not examine him at all during the Festival.

[205] The Gemara asks: Is this to say that a confirmed leper is permitted to engage in conjugal relations with his wife? The Gemara answers: Yes, and so too it is taught in a baraita: With regard to a leper who is counting his seven days, it is written: "But he shall remain outside his tent seven days" (Leviticus 14:8). This verse teaches that the leper is prohibited from engaging in conjugal relations, as the words his tent refer only to his wife, as it is stated: "Go, say to them: Return again to your tents" (Deuteronomy 5:27). Rabbi Yehuda says: The verse states: "And after he is cleansed, they shall count for him seven days" (Ezekiel 44:26), indicating that he is prohibited from having conjugal relations during the days of his counting, but not during the days of his confirmed leprosy.

[206] Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Yehuda, says: Since the verse indicates that the prohibition to engage in conjugal relations applies during the seven days of his counting before becoming ritually pure, it follows based on an a fortiori inference that the prohibition should also apply during the days of his confirmed leprosy, when his impurity is more severe.

[207] And Rabbi Ḥiyya said: I deliberated this matter before Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi and said: Have you not taught us, our teacher, that King Jotham was only born to Uzziah, the king of Judah, during the

days of his confirmed leprosy? This would indicate that a confirmed leper is permitted to engage in conjugal relations. Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi said to him: I too said this; I am also of the opinion that a confirmed leper is permitted to engage in conjugal relations, in contrast to the opinion of Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Yehuda.

[208] The Gemara asks: With regard to what principle do they disagree? The Gemara explains that Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Yehuda, holds: The Merciful One revealed the prohibition of conjugal relations with one's wife during the days of his counting; and all the more so the prohibition applies during his days of confirmed leprosy, when his ritual impurity is more severe. And one Sage, Rabbi Yehuda, maintains: That which the verse revealed, it revealed, but that which it did not reveal, it did not reveal; the prohibition is not interpreted in a way that adds an extra stringency beyond what is stated explicitly in the Torah.

[209] § The Gemara returns to the original dispute with regard to the priest's examination of the symptoms of leprosy. Is this to say that the matter depends upon the discretion of the priest, i.e., the priest can decide whether to declare the affected person ritually pure or impure or whether to examine the leprous symptoms or not? The Gemara answers: Yes, and so too it is taught in a baraita: The verse states: "But on the day it appears in him" (Leviticus 13:14), from which it may be inferred that there is a day when you examine the symptoms found in him and there is a day when you do not examine those symptoms.

[210] From here they stated: With regard to a bridegroom upon whom leprous symptoms came into being, we give him the seven days of the wedding feast before the examination that determines ritual purity or impurity. This ruling applies whether the leprous symptoms appeared upon him, upon his house, or upon his clothing. Similarly, if the symptoms of leprosy appeared upon an individual during a pilgrimage Festival, we give him the seven days of the Festival in order to avoid causing him distress during that time; this is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda.

[211] Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi says: The ruling is correct, but there is no need to prove it from this verse, as a much simpler proof can be brought from a different source. It says: "Then the priest shall command that they empty the house before the priest goes into it to see the plague, so that all that is in the house be not made unclean" (Leviticus 14:36). If we delay the priest's examination of the house in order to give the owner time to remove his utensils and prevent them from contracting ritual impurity, which is merely an optional matter, all the more so should we delay his examination for a matter of mitzva, e.g., so as not to detract from the bridegroom's joy or from the joy of a Festival.

[212] The Gemara asks: What is the practical difference between them, whether the source of the halakha is one verse or another? Abaye said: There is no practical difference between the opinions; rather, the interpretation of the meaning of the verses is the difference between them, as each has a different interpretation of the verse from which the other derived this halakha. And Rava said: There is in fact a practical difference between them with regard to whether or not one delays the examination of leprous symptoms found on an individual's body for an optional matter. Rabbi Yehuda holds that one delays the examination only for the sake of a mitzva, while Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi holds that one may delay it even for the sake of an optional matter.

[213] The Gemara asks: And according to the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, why is it not permitted to delay the priest's examination of leprous symptoms on an individual's body for an optional matter, just as with regard to leprous symptoms on one's house? The Gemara answers: We do not learn a halakhic

principle from there because the halakha of leprosy of houses is itself a novelty, a unique biblical law from which one cannot extrapolate to other cases.

214 The Gemara explains that the halakha of leprous symptoms on a house constitutes a novelty, as by Torah law, wood and stones are generally not susceptible to ritual impurity, yet here in the case of house leprosy they are susceptible to ritual impurity.

215 And Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi said: It was necessary for the Torah to state both verses: “But on the day it appears in him” (Leviticus 13:14), as well as: “Then the priest shall command that they empty the house” (Leviticus 14:36). As, if the Merciful One had written only: “But on the day it appears in him,” I would have said that for a matter of mitzva, yes, one may delay the priest’s examination of the leprous symptoms, but for an optional matter, no, one may not, in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda. Therefore the Merciful One wrote: “Then the priest shall command,” in order to teach that one may delay his examination even for an optional matter.

216 And conversely, if the Merciful One had written only: “Then the priest shall command,” I would have said that for these utensils that are found in the house, yes, one may delay the priest’s examination, as this is not a case of impurity of the individual’s body but only that of his possessions; but in a case of impurity of the individual’s body, I would say that the priest must examine it immediately. Therefore, it is necessary for the Torah to state that even in this case, one may delay his examination.

217 § The Gemara proceeds to analyze the aforementioned baraita. The Master said that as the verse states: “But on the day it appears in him,” it may be inferred that there is a day when you examine the symptoms found in him and there is a day when you do not examine those symptoms.

218 The Gemara asks: From where in this verse may it be inferred? Abaye said: If it were so that the priest must always examine the symptoms immediately, the Merciful One should have written simply: On the day it appears in him. What is implied by the actual formulation of the verse: “But on the day”? Learn from here, i.e., from the seemingly superfluous word “but” at the beginning of the phrase, that this is not an absolute halakha, but a conditional one, depending upon other factors: There is a day when you examine the leprous symptoms found in him and there is a day when you do not examine those symptoms.

219 Rava offered a different explanation and said: The entire phrase “but on the day,” is superfluous. As, if it were so that the priest must always examine the symptoms immediately, the Merciful One should have written simply: And when it appears. What is the meaning of the additional words “but on the day”? Learn from here that the issue is dependent upon other factors, as there is a day when you examine the symptoms of leprosy in him and there is a day when you do not examine them.

220 The Gemara explains: And according to Abaye, who derives the halakha from the word “but,” why does the verse include the phrase “on the day”? That phrase is necessary in order to teach that the priest examines the symptoms of leprosy only during the day, but not at night.

221 The Gemara asks: And from where does Rava derive the halakha that the examination is performed during the day but not at night? The Gemara answers: He derives it from the verse: “As far as the priest’s eyes can see” (Leviticus 13:12), which indicates that the priest must be able to carry out a careful examination of the leprous symptoms; this cannot be done at night, when his

vision is limited. And Abaye could say that this verse is necessary to exclude a priest who is blind in one eye from inspecting symptoms of leprosy, as it says “eyes,” in the plural.

222 The Gemara asks: But Rava also requires this verse to teach this halakha, i.e., that a priest who is blind in one eye is unfit to examine symptoms of leprosy. The Gemara answers: Yes, it is indeed so; he agrees that this verse is the source of the halakha concerning a priest who is blind in one eye, and it is not the source of the halakha that the priest may only view leprous symptoms by day.

223 If so, from where does Rava derive the halakha that a priest examines leprous symptoms during the day but not at night? The Gemara answers: He derives it from the verse that quotes a homeowner saying to a priest: “There seems to me as it were a plague in the house” (Leviticus 14:35), which emphasizes that the leprous symptom is seen by me, and not by way of my light, i.e., that this takes place during the day. When the next verse states that the priest comes to view the leprous symptom, it means that this also takes place by day.

224 And why does Abaye require the proof that he adduces when it would seem that the verse that Rava brings offers sufficient proof? The Gemara explains: According to Abaye, if the source was derived from there, I would have said that this halakha, that one must wait until the light of day to examine the symptom, applies only to leprous symptoms on a house, which is an impurity that is not related to the individual’s body. However, in a case of impurity of the individual’s body, perhaps the priest may conduct his examination even by artificial light, as it is a more severe impurity. Therefore the verse teaches us: “But on the day,” to indicate that even in the case of impurity of the body the priest may perform the examination only during the day by natural sunlight, and not by any artificial light.

225 MISHNA: Rabbi Meir also stated another leniency concerning the halakhot of the intermediate days of a Festival: A person may gather the bones of his father and mother from their temporary graves on the intermediate days of a Festival. In ancient times, it was customary to first bury a corpse in a temporary grave. After the flesh had decomposed, the bones would be collected, placed in a coffin, and buried in a vault together with the bones of the deceased individual’s ancestors. This is permitted on the intermediate days of a Festival because the fact that one merited to bring the bones of his deceased parents to the graves of their ancestors is a source of joy for him.

226 Rabbi Yosei says: One does not gather these bones on the intermediate days of a Festival, because it is a source of mourning for him. Even though he is happy to be able to bury his parents’ bones in their ancestral graves, he is still pained by the memory of their death.

227 And all agree that a person may not arouse [ye’orer] lamentation for his deceased relative, and he may not eulogize him during the thirty days before a pilgrimage Festival.

228 GEMARA: The Gemara raises a contradiction to Rabbi Meir’s opinion that gathering the bones of one’s parents is considered an occasion of joy, based on what is taught in a baraita: One who gathers the bones of his father or his mother mourns for them the entire day, but he does not mourn for them in the evening. And Rav Ḥisda said: And even in a case where he does not gather the bones from a temporary grave, but where he had them bundled up in his sheet, when he buries them he mourns for them all day. This indicates that gathering one’s parents’ bones is an occasion of mourning rather than joy.

229 Abaye said: Say that Rabbi Meir means that collecting and reinterring the bones of one’s parents is permitted on the intermediate days of a Festival, not because it causes one joy, but rather because the joy of the pilgrimage Festival is upon him. The pain of gathering the bones of his parents is overpowered by the joy of the Festival.

230 § It is taught in the mishna: One may not arouse lamentation for his deceased relative during the thirty days before a Festival. The Gemara asks: What is meant by: One may not arouse lamentation for his deceased relative? Rav said: In the West, Eretz Yisrael, whenever a professional eulogizer would circulate and ply his trade, they would say: Let all those of bitter heart weep with him. When they would say this, all those who had recently suffered losses would recall their pain and lament their losses.

231 It is taught in the mishna that one may not arouse lamentation or eulogize his relative for thirty days before a pilgrimage Festival. The Gemara asks: What is different about thirty days, that it is prohibited for one to lament the dead for specifically that amount of time before the Festival?

232 Rav Kahana said that Rav Yehuda said that Rav said: There was an incident involving a certain man who saved up money to ascend to Jerusalem for the pilgrimage Festival. A professional eulogizer came and stood at the opening to his house and the man’s wife took the money that he had saved and gave it to the eulogizer for his services. As a result, the man did not have enough money and he refrained and did not ascend to Jerusalem for the Festival. At that time, they said: One may not arouse lamentation for his deceased relative, nor may he eulogize him during the thirty days before a pilgrimage Festival.

233 And Shmuel said:

234 It is because the dead is not forgotten from the heart and put out of mind for thirty days, and therefore, when one laments the loss of a deceased relative within thirty days before a Festival, the pain is still remembered on the Festival. The Gemara asks: What is the practical difference between the two reasons? The practical difference between them is in a case where the eulogizer performs the eulogy free of charge. In that case there is no worry that money that had been set aside for the Festival will be spent, but there is still room for concern about the lingering pain that will be felt on the Festival.

235 MISHNA: One may not dig crypts or graves on the intermediate days of a Festival in preparation for those who are still alive, but one may adjust previously dug crypts on the intermediate days of a Festival in order to receive a particular corpse. And one may also construct a laundry pond on the intermediate days of a Festival as it does not involve excessive effort. And one may also prepare a coffin if he is together with the corpse in the same courtyard, as in that case everyone knows that he is preparing the coffin for the deceased. Rabbi Yehuda prohibits making the coffin unless one has wooden boards with him that had already been cut before the Festival and that need only to be attached.

236 GEMARA: The Gemara asks: What are crypts and what are graves, and what is the difference between them? Rav Yehuda said: Crypts are constructed by digging and graves are constructed by building. The Gemara adds: That is also taught in the following baraita: These are crypts and these are graves: Crypts are constructed by digging and graves are constructed by building.

[237] It is taught in the mishna: But one may adjust previously dug crypts on the intermediate days of a Festival. The Gemara asks: How does one adjust a crypt? Rav Yehuda said: If the crypt was longer than the corpse, he shortens it. With regard to this issue it was taught in a baraita: He lengthens the crypt and widens it to make it the right size for the particular corpse.

[238] It was further taught in the mishna: And one may also construct a laundry pond on the intermediate days of a Festival. The Gemara asks: What is a laundry pond? Rav Yehuda said: This is a ditch dug in the ground for washing clothes. The Gemara raises a difficulty: Isn't it taught in a baraita: A laundry pond and a laundry ditch, which indicates that they are different from one another? Abaye said, and some say that it was Rav Kahana who said: A pond and a small pond, i.e., the only difference between them is their size; a laundry pond is larger than a laundry ditch.

[239] It was taught in the mishna: And one may also prepare a coffin on the intermediate days of a Festival if he is together with the corpse in the same courtyard. The Gemara comments: We already learned this, as the Sages taught in the following baraita: One may tend to all the needs of the deceased on the intermediate days of a Festival: One may cut the deceased's hair for him if it was too long, and one may wash his clothing, i.e., his shrouds, for him, and one may construct a coffin for him from boards that had already been cut from the eve of the Festival. Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel says: One may even bring timber and discreetly cut it into boards in the privacy of his house.

[240] MISHNA: One may not marry a woman on the intermediate days of a Festival, not virgins and not widows, and one may not perform levirate marriage with his sister-in-law, if his brother died childless, because it is a joyous occasion for him. However, one may remarry his divorced wife on the intermediate days of a Festival, as this is not as great a joy for him.

[241] And a woman may engage in all her usual cosmetic treatments to enhance her physical appearance on the intermediate days of a Festival. Rabbi Yehuda says: She may not apply lime to her skin because it is temporarily a disgrace to her, as she is unattractive before the lime is peeled off and will therefore be distressed during the Festival. The mishna continues: A layman, who is not a skilled tailor, may sew in his usual manner if necessary for the Festival, whereas a craftsman may form only temporary stitches. And one may interweave the cords attached to the frames of beds upon which a mattress is placed. Rabbi Yosei says: One may only tighten the cords but not interweave them.

[242] GEMARA: It was taught in the mishna that one may not marry a woman on the intermediate days of a Festival, because it is a source of joy for him. The Gemara asks: And if it is a source of joy for him, what of it? Isn't there is a mitzva to rejoice on a Festival? Rav Yehuda said that Shmuel said, and, so too, Rabbi Elazar said that Rabbi Oshaya said, and some say that Rabbi Elazar said that Rabbi Ḥanina said: The reason that one may not get married on the intermediate days of a Festival is because one may not mix one joy with another joy, as each requires its own celebration. Rabba bar Rav Huna said: The reason is because he forsakes the rejoicing of the pilgrimage Festival and occupies himself with rejoicing with his wife.

[243] Abaye said to Rav Yosef: This statement of Rabba bar Rav Huna is actually a statement of Rav, as Rav Daniel bar Ketina said that Rav said: From where is it derived that one may not marry a woman on the intermediate days of a Festival? As it is stated: "And you shall rejoice in your Festival" (Deuteronomy 16:14). This verse emphasizes that you must rejoice in your Festival and not in your wife.

[244] Ulla said: The reason one may not marry on the intermediate days of a Festival is due to the excessive exertion that the wedding preparations demand, which is prohibited during the Festival. Rabbi Yitzḥak Nappaḥa said: The reason is due to the neglect of the mitzva to be fruitful and multiply. If it were permissible to get married during the intermediate days of a Festival, people would delay getting married until then in order to save money by avoiding the necessity of preparing separate feasts for the Festival and for the wedding. In the meantime they would neglect the mitzva of procreation.

[245] The Gemara raises an objection from the following baraita: All those whom the Sages said are prohibited to marry on the intermediate days of a Festival

[246] are permitted to marry on the eve of the pilgrimage Festival. This poses a difficulty to all of the opinions, as a wedding celebration ordinarily extends for seven days, and the majority of the celebration will coincide with the Festival.

[247] The Gemara answers: This is not difficult, as this baraita can be reconciled with all of the opinions. According to the one who said that one may not get married on the intermediate days of a Festival because of joy, i.e., because one must not mix one joy with another, or because one may not put aside the rejoicing of the Festival and occupy himself with rejoicing with his wife, this is not difficult, as the primary joy of a wedding is only one day, and after that, the joy of the wedding will not affect the joy of the Festival.

[248] And according to the one who said that one may not marry on the intermediate days of a Festival due to the excessive exertion that the wedding preparations demand, it is not difficult, as the primary exertion is only one day. After the wedding, excessive exertion is not required. And according to the one who said that the reason is due to the neglect of the mitzva to be fruitful and multiply, there is no room for concern: Since there is only one day, the eve of the Festival, when he can get married and save money on the feast, a man will not delay his wedding in order to get married then, lest some unforeseen circumstance arise that will prevent him from getting married on that day. Therefore, according to all the reasons offered, there is no need to prohibit weddings on the eve of a Festival.

[249] § The Gemara asks: With regard to the principle that one may not mix one joy with another joy, from where do we derive it? The Gemara explains that the source is as it is written with regard to the dedication of the Temple: “So Solomon held the feast at that time, and all Israel with him, a great congregation, from the entrance of Hamath to the Brook of Egypt, before the Lord our God, seven days and seven days, fourteen days” (I Kings 8:65). And if it is so that one may in fact mix one joy with another joy, he should have waited until the festival of Sukkot, which was the second set of seven days, and made a feast of seven days for this and for that, i.e., for the dedication of the Temple and for the festival of Sukkot together. The fact that he did not do so indicates that one must not mix one joy with another.

[250] The Gemara raises a question: Perhaps, however, it may be derived from here only that we may not delay a wedding to be on a Festival, just as King Solomon did not delay the Temple dedication to be on the Festival, but nevertheless, where it happens to occur that way, we may indeed prepare a feast to celebrate both occasions together. The Gemara answers: If this were permitted, Solomon should have left a small part of the Temple unfinished until the Festival, and thereby arranged for a joint celebration of the dedication of the Temple and the festival of Sukkot.

[251] The Gemara responds: One may not leave any part of the building of the Temple undone, as a mitzva should be completed as quickly as possible. The Gemara modifies its previous opinion: Solomon should have left the cubit-wide plates with spikes, which were designed to eliminate the ravens, unfinished. The roof of the Temple was fitted with sharp metal spikes to deter the ravens, who were attracted by the smell of the sacrificial meat, from perching there. Although this was not considered a part of the building itself, delaying its installation would have allowed Solomon to delay the celebration of the Temple dedication.

[252] The Gemara rejects this opinion as well: The cubit-wide plates with spikes to eliminate the ravens was a necessary element in the building of the Temple, and consequently Solomon could not delay its construction either. Rather, the proof is from the redundancy in the verse. Since it is written "fourteen days," why do I need the verse to specify "seven days and seven days"? Learn from it that these seven days of celebrating the Temple dedication must be discrete, and similarly, these seven days of celebrating the Festival must be discrete, due to the principle that one may not mix one joy with another.

[253] § Apropos the discussion of the celebration at Solomon's dedication of the Temple, the Gemara relates that Rabbi Parnakh said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: That year, the Jewish people did not observe Yom Kippur, as the seven-day celebration of the dedication of the Temple coincided with Yom Kippur and all seven days were celebrated with feasting. And the people were worried and said: Perhaps the enemies of the Jewish people, a euphemism for the Jewish people themselves, have become liable to be destroyed for the transgression of eating on Yom Kippur, which is punishable by karet. A Divine Voice issued forth and said to them: All of you are designated for life in the World-to-Come.

[254] The Gemara asks: What derivation led them to conclude that it was permitted for them to eat on Yom Kippur? The Gemara explains that they based their ruling on an a fortiori inference: If at the dedication of the Tabernacle, whose sanctity is not a permanent sanctity, an individual's offering, i.e., an offering of one of the tribal princes, overrides the prohibition of Shabbat, as the princes' offerings were brought every day including Shabbat despite the attendant transgression of a prohibition that is punishable by stoning; then with regard to the dedication of the Temple, whose sanctity is a permanent sanctity and the offerings brought there were communal offerings, is it not all the more so clear that the dedication of the Temple overrides the prohibition of Yom Kippur, a violation that is punishable by the less severe punishment of karet?

[255] The Gemara asks: But if they had firm basis for their behavior, why were they worried? The Gemara answers that one can refute this a fortiori inference as follows: There, at the dedication of the Tabernacle, Shabbat was desecrated only for the necessities of the Temple service to God on High, i.e., by sacrificing offerings. Here, at the dedication of the Temple, they desecrated Yom Kippur by eating and drinking, which was for the need of common mortals. Based on this distinction the Gemara suggests: Here too, at the dedication of the Temple they should have performed the rites of the sacrificial offerings and they should not have eaten or drunk. The Gemara answers: There is no complete rejoicing without eating and drinking.

[256] With regard to the proof itself, the Gemara asks: And from where do we derive that the offerings brought at the dedication of the Tabernacle overrode Shabbat? If we say it is as it is written with regard to the offerings brought by the tribal princes: "On the first day" (Numbers 7:12) and "on the

seventh day” (Numbers 7:48), this is not a conclusive proof, as perhaps this refers not to the seventh day of the week but to the seventh day of sacrificial offerings. Perhaps they skipped Shabbat and did not sacrifice offerings connected to the dedication of the Tabernacle on that day. Rav Naḥman bar Yitzḥak said: The verse also states: “On the day of the eleventh day” (Numbers 7:72). The repetition of the word day indicates that just as a day is all one continuous period of time, so too, the eleven days were all one continuous period of time, with no break in the middle, even for Shabbat.

257 The Gemara asks: But perhaps this refers only to days that are fit for an individual’s offerings, i.e., the offerings were sacrificed on eleven consecutive days that were suitable for sacrificing the offerings of an individual, but not on Shabbat. The Gemara answers: In another verse it is written: “On the day of the twelfth day” (Numbers 7:78), indicating that just as a day is all one continuous period of time, so too, the twelve days were all one continuous period of time.

258 The Gemara asks again: But perhaps here too this is referring to days that are fit for sacrificing the offerings of an individual? The Gemara rejects this opinion: If so, why do I need two verses, the verse with regard to the eleventh day and the verse with regard to the twelfth day, to teach the same principle? The fact that the Torah uses repetitive phraseology in both verses indicates that all the days were consecutive, without a break for Shabbat.

259 The Gemara asks: And from where do we derive that the feasting at the time of the dedication of the Temple overrides Yom Kippur, so that the people did not have to fast? If we say it is derived from that which is written: Fourteen days, perhaps this is referring to days that are fit for feasting, to the exclusion of Yom Kippur. The Gemara answers: This is derived by means of a verbal analogy between the word “day” mentioned in this context and the word “day” mentioned there, with regard to the dedication of the Tabernacle. Just as there the days were consecutive, without a break for Shabbat, so too here, the days were consecutive, without a break for Yom Kippur.

260 It was stated above that a Divine Voice issued forth and said to them: All of you are designated for life in the World-to-Come. The Gemara asks: And from where do we derive that God pardoned them for this sin? The Gemara answers: The Sage Taḥlisa taught in a baraita that the verse states: “On the eighth day he sent the people away, and they blessed the king, and went to their tents joyful and glad of heart for all the goodness that the Lord had done for David His servant and for Israel His people” (I Kings 8:66).

261 This verse may be expounded as follows: The words “to their tents” indicate that they went and found their wives in a state of purity, as the terms tent and house often denote one’s wife. The term “joyful” is referring to the fact they had enjoyed the splendor of the Divine Presence, as there was a revelation of the Divine Presence when the offerings were sacrificed in the Temple. The phrase “and glad of heart” refers to the fact that each of their wives conceived a male child. The words “for all the goodness” indicate that a Divine Voice issued forth and said to them: All of you are designated for life in the World-to-Come, which is the ultimate good.

262 The aforementioned verse stated: “For all the goodness that the Lord had done for David His servant and for Israel His people.” The Gemara asks: Granted, when the verse mentions the goodness that God did for Israel His people, this is referring to the fact that He pardoned them the sin of eating on Yom Kippur that year; but what is the goodness that God performed for David His servant?

263 Rav Yehuda said that Rav said: When Solomon sought to bring the Ark into the Temple the gates clung together and could not be opened. Solomon uttered twenty-four songs of praise, and his prayer

was not answered. He began and said: “Lift up your heads, O you gates, and be lifted up, you everlasting doors; and the King of glory shall come in” (Psalms 24:7), but once again his prayer was not answered, and the Temple gates remained closed.

264 Once he said: “Now therefore arise, O Lord God, into your resting place, You, and the Ark of Your strength; Let your priests, O Lord God, be clothed with victory and let Your pious ones rejoice in goodness. O Lord God, do not turn away the face of Your anointed; remember the faithful love of David Your servant” (II Chronicles 6:41–42), he was immediately answered. At that moment the faces of David’s enemies turned dark like the charred bottom of a pot, and all knew that the Holy One, Blessed be He, forgave him for that sin involving Bathsheba, as they saw that it was only in his merit that the gates of the Temple opened.

265 The Gemara relates that Rabbi Yonatan ben Asmai and Rabbi Yehuda, son of converts, studied the portion dealing with oaths in the study hall of Rabbi Shimon ben Yoḥai. After completing their studies, the disciples took leave of their master in the evening, but did not yet leave the city. In the morning they went back and took leave of him a second time. He said to them: Did you not already take leave of me yesterday in the evening?

266 They said to him: You have taught us, our teacher, that a disciple who takes leave of his teacher and then stays overnight in the same city must take leave of him an additional time, as it is stated at the conclusion of the dedication of the Temple: “On the eighth day he sent the people away, and they blessed the king” (I Kings 8:66), and elsewhere it is written: “And on the twenty-third day of the seventh month he sent the people away” (II Chronicles 7:10). The eighth day in the verse is referring to the Eighth Day of Assembly, the twenty-second of the month of Tishrei, yet it says that he sent the people away on the next day, the twenty-third of the month.

267 Rather, it can be derived from here that a disciple who takes leave of his teacher and then stays overnight in the same city must take leave of him an additional time, just as the Jewish people took leave of Solomon an additional time on the day after the Festival, on the twenty-third of Tishrei.

268 Rabbi Shimon ben Yoḥai said to his son: These two people, Rabbi Yonatan ben Asmai and Rabbi Yehuda, son of converts, are men of noble form [tzura] i.e., wise and learned individuals; go to them so that they will bless you. He went and found them deep in discussion, raising apparent contradictions between verses as follows: It is written: “Make level the path of your feet, and let all your ways be established” (Proverbs 4:26), indicating that when one has the opportunity to perform more than one mitzva, he must evaluate which of them is most important. And elsewhere it is written: “Lest you level out the path of life,” (Proverbs 5:6), indicating that one must perform each mitzva as the opportunity arises, without considering its relative importance.

269 They explained that it is not difficult: Here, in the first verse cited above, it is discussing a mitzva that can be done by others, and therefore one must consider what is most worthwhile for him to perform himself and what he will leave to others.

270 There, in the other verse, it is referring to a mitzva that cannot be done by others, and therefore, one must not consider its relative importance, but rather do it immediately.

271 The two scholars, Rabbi Yonatan ben Asmai and Rabbi Yehuda, son of converts, once again sat and raised the following dilemma: In one place it is written in praise of the Torah: “She is more precious than rubies; and all of your desires are not to be compared to her” (Proverbs 3:15). One can

infer from here that all human desires cannot be compared to the Torah, but the desires of Heaven, i.e., mitzvot, can indeed be compared to her. And elsewhere it is written: “For wisdom is better than rubies; and all the things that may be desired are not to be compared to it” (Proverbs 8:11), which indicates that even mitzvot cannot be compared to the Torah.

272 They resolved this contradiction by stating that here, in the second verse, it is discussing a mitzva that can be done by others. In that case, even mitzvot cannot be compared to the Torah, and accordingly, one who is engaged in Torah study should not interrupt his studies in order to perform another mitzva. However, there, in the first verse, it is discussing a mitzva that cannot be done by others. In that case Torah study is not more important than the mitzva, and one should interrupt his studies in order to perform the mitzva.

273 When Rabbi Yonatan ben Asmai and Rabbi Yehuda, son of converts, noticed Rabbi Shimon ben Yoḥai’s son, they said to him: What do you want here? He said to them: Father told me: Go to them so that they should bless you. They said to him as follows: May it be God’s will that you should sow and not reap, that you should bring in and not take out, that you should take out and not bring in, that your house should be destroyed and your lodging place should be inhabited, that your table should become confused, and that you should not see a new year.

274 When he came back to his father, he said to him: Not only did they not bless me, but they even caused me pain with their negative words. His father said to him: What exactly did they say to you? He answered: They said to me such and such. Rabbi Shimon ben Yoḥai said to his son: These are all blessings, uttered in a cryptic manner, and this is what they meant: When they said that you should sow and not reap they meant that you should bear sons and they should not die. Their statement that you should bring in and not take out means that you should bring in brides for your sons and your sons should not die, which would cause their wives to leave. When they said you should take out and not bring in they meant that you should have daughters and their husbands should not die, which would cause your daughters to return to you.

275 When they said that your house should be destroyed and your lodging place should be inhabited, this should be interpreted allegorically. As this world is compared to your lodging place, and the World-to-Come is compared to your house, as it is written: “Their inward thought [kirbam], is that their houses shall continue forever” (Psalms 49:12), and the Sages said: Do not read it as “their inward thought [kirbam]”; rather read it as their graves [kivram]. According to this reading, one’s grave is considered his permanent house. The Sages gave Rabbi Shimon ben Yoḥai’s son a blessing that he should dwell in his temporary home rather than his permanent home, i.e., he should live a long life.

276 When they said that your table should become confused, they meant that you should be blessed with many sons and daughters, so that there will be noise and confusion at your table. When they said that you should not see a new year, they meant your wife should not die and as a result you should not have to marry another woman, about which it says: “When a man has taken a new wife, he shall not go out to war, neither shall he be charged with any business; he shall be free at home for one year” (Deuteronomy 24:5).

277 Apropos a blessing with an obscure meaning, the Gemara relates: Rabbi Shimon ben Ḥalafta took leave of Rav. His father said to him: Go to him so that he should bless you. When Rabbi Shimon ben Ḥalafta returned to him for a blessing, Rav said to him: May it be God’s will that you should not

shame others and that you should not feel ashamed. He came home to his father, who said to him: What did he say to you? He said to him: Mere words he said to me, i.e., he did not say anything of significance.

278 After Rabbi Shimon ben Ḥalafta repeated what Rav had said, his father said to him: He blessed you with the blessing with which the Holy One, Blessed be He, blessed Israel and then repeated the blessing, indicating that is a very great blessing, as it is written: “And you shall eat in plenty, and be satisfied, and praise the Name of the Lord your God, who has dealt wondrously with you; and My people shall never be ashamed. And you shall know that I am in the midst of Israel, and that I am the Lord your God, and there is none else; and My people shall never be ashamed” (Joel 2:26–27).

279 § It was taught in the mishna: And a woman may engage in all of her usual cosmetic treatments on the intermediate days of a Festival. The Sages taught in a baraita: These are the cosmetic treatments of women that are permitted: She may paint her eyelids, she may remove unwanted hair [pokeset], and she may put rouge on her face. And some say: She may pass a comb over her lower face, i.e., she may remove the hair from her pubic area.

280 The Gemara relates that Rav Ḥisda’s wife would adorn herself on the intermediate days of a Festival in the presence of her daughter-in-law, i.e., when she already had a married son. Rav Huna bar Ḥinnana sat before Rav Ḥisda, and he sat and said: They taught only that a woman is permitted to engage in cosmetic treatments on the intermediate days of a Festival only with regard to a young woman, as such treatments bring her joy, but in the case of an old woman, no, the treatments are not permitted, as she does not need them.

281 Rav Ḥisda said to him: By God! Even your mother, and even your mother’s mother, and even a woman so old that she is standing at the edge of her grave are all permitted to adorn themselves. As people say in the popular adage: A woman of sixty years, like one of six, runs at the sound of the timbrel [tavla], implying that women of all ages are young in spirit; since they all take pleasure in their adornments, they are allowed to adorn themselves, regardless of age.

282 § It was taught in the mishna that Rabbi Yehuda says: She may not apply lime to her skin because it renders her temporarily unattractive and she will be distressed during the Festival. It is taught in a baraita: Rabbi Yehuda says: A woman may not apply lime to her skin on the intermediate days of a Festival because it is temporarily a disgrace to her, as she appears unattractive until it is peeled off. But Rabbi Yehuda concedes that with regard to lime that she can peel off during the Festival, she may apply it on the intermediate days of the Festival, as even though she is distressed now, as the lime renders her appearance unattractive, she will be happy afterward, when the lime is removed and she sees the results.

283 The Gemara asks: But does Rabbi Yehuda accept this reasoning that it is permitted, despite the fact that it causes distress, because it will cause joy later? Didn’t we learn elsewhere in a mishna (Avoda Zara 2a): On the three days before the holidays of idolaters, it is prohibited to do business with them, so as not to cause them to thank their idols for their success. Similarly, it is prohibited on these days to lend to them, to borrow from them, to repay a debt to them, or even to collect a debt from them.

284 Rabbi Yehuda says: One may collect a debt from them during this period, due to the fact that the gentile is distressed when he makes the payment. The Rabbis said to him: Even though he is distressed now, he will be happy afterward, as he is relieved of the debt, and therefore, it is prohibited

to collect a debt from him during the three days before his holiday. In this mishna, Rabbi Yehuda considers only the immediate distress and does not consider the joy that will be experienced after some time.

285 Rav Naḥman bar Yitzḥak said: Leave aside the halakhot governing a Festival, which cannot be compared to other areas, as all of the labors that are permitted on a Festival are permitted because even though one is distressed by them now, he will be happy about them afterward. For example, cooking and baking are permitted even though preparing food involves effort and trouble, because eating the food after it is prepared provides pleasure and enjoyment.

286 Ravina said a different explanation: According to Rabbi Yehuda, with regard to repaying a debt, a gentile is always distressed, even after he repays a debt. However, in general, even Rabbi Yehuda accepts the principle of taking into account the joy that will be experienced at a later time.

287 With regard to applying lime to one's body, Rav Yehuda said: The daughters of Israel who reached physical maturity, but had not yet reached the age of majority, i.e., girls that were less than twelve years of age, and therefore embarrassed by their precocious physical development, would seek to remove the excess hair from their bodies. The poor among them would smear their skin with lime in order to remove the hair. The wealthy ones would smear themselves with fine flour for this purpose, and the daughters of kings would smear themselves with shemen hamor. As it is stated with regard to the women who were brought to King Ahasuerus: "Six months with shemen hamor" (Esther 2:12).

288 The Gemara asks: What is shemen hamor? Rav Huna bar Ḥiyya said: This is the perfume called setaket. Rav Yirmeya bar Ami said: It is olive oil extracted from an olive that has not yet reached one-third of its growth; the acidic oil is effective as a depilatory.

289 It is taught in a baraita that Rabbi Yehuda says: Wherever the Mishna mentions anpikinon, it is referring to olive oil from an olive that has not yet reached one-third of its growth. And why do women spread it on the body? It is due to the fact that it removes the hair and pampers the skin.

290 It was related that Rav Beivai had a daughter, and he spread lime on her limb by limb, which caused her hair to fall out and her skin to whiten. She became so beautiful that when marrying her off, he took four hundred dinars for her. There was a certain gentile in his neighborhood who also had a daughter and wanted to do this as well. He spread her entire body with lime all at once, and she died. That gentile said: Beivai killed my daughter. Rav Naḥman said: Rav Beivai, who regularly drinks beer, his daughters require that they be smeared with lime, as beer causes hair growth, but we who do not drink beer, our daughters do not require that they be smeared with lime, as they have little hair even without this treatment.

291 § It was taught in the mishna: A layman, who is not a skilled tailor, may sew in his usual manner on the intermediate days of a Festival. The Gemara asks: What are the circumstances in which an individual is considered a layman? The Sages of the school of Rabbi Yannai said: Anyone who cannot deftly pull a full needle of stiches through the fabric at the same time is considered a layman. Rabbi Yosei bar Ḥanina said: Anyone who cannot form a straight seam on the hem [ḥefet] of his shirt is considered a layman.

292 § It was further taught in the mishna: A craftsman, however, may form only temporary stitches [makhliv]. The Gemara asks: What is meant by forming temporary stitches? Rabbi Yoḥanan said: He

does not sew all the stitches that are necessary, but rather he skips certain stitches in the middle (Rabbeinu Hananel). Rabba bar Shmuel said: He sews stitches that are like the teeth of a dog. He does not sew all the stitches in a straight line, so that they resemble the teeth of a dog, which also are not straight.

293 § It was also taught in the mishna: One may interweave the cords attached to the frame of a bed. Rabbi Yosei says: One may only tighten the cords. The Gemara asks: What is meant by interweaving, and what is meant by tightening? When Rav Dimi came from Eretz Yisrael to Babylonia, he said: Rabbi Ḥiyya bar Abba and Rabbi Asi disagree about the matter, and both of them reported their opinions in the name of Ḥizkiyya and Rabbi Yoḥanan. One Sage said: Interweaving involves placing and tying the cords of the bed both lengthwise and widthwise, whereas tightening means arranging the cords only lengthwise and not widthwise. And one Sage said: Interweaving involves arranging the cords only lengthwise and not widthwise, while tightening means that if a cord became loose, he may tighten it but he may not tie any new cords.

294 The Gemara asks: Is that so? Didn't Rav Taḥlisa bar Shaul teach the following baraita: And both Rabbi Meir and Rabbi Yosei agree that one may not braid cords anew on the intermediate days of a Festival? Granted, according to the one who said that interweaving means tying the cords lengthwise and widthwise, and tightening means tying them only lengthwise and not widthwise, this explanation is consistent with that which Rav Taḥlisa taught: And they both agree that one may not braid cords anew, as even though one is permitted to arrange the cords of the bed, he is not permitted to produce new cords.

295 However, according to the one who said that interweaving means tying the cords only lengthwise and not widthwise, while tightening means that if a cord became loose, he may tighten it, there is a difficulty. Now that you said that tying the cords lengthwise and widthwise, no, it is not permitted even though the cords are readily available, is it necessary to say that braiding cords anew is prohibited? The Gemara comments: Indeed it is difficult.

296 Rav Naḥman bar Yitzḥak said to Rabbi Ḥiyya bar Avin: Is there one who says that interweaving means tying the cords lengthwise, but not widthwise? Didn't we learn in a mishna (Kelim 16:1) that Rabbi Meir says: A bed is considered a utensil and becomes susceptible to ritual impurity from when one interweaves three rows of meshes in it, i.e., three rows lengthwise and widthwise? It is clear from here that interweaving a bed involves tying its cords lengthwise and widthwise.

297 Rather, when Ravin came from Eretz Yisrael to Babylonia he stated a different version of the tradition: With regard to interweaving, everyone agrees that it is referring to tying the cords of a bed lengthwise and widthwise. When they disagree it is only about the meaning of tightening. One Sage holds that tightening means arranging the cords only lengthwise and not widthwise. And one Sage holds that it means that if a cord became loose, he may tighten it.

298 The Gemara raises an objection from the following baraita: One may interweave the cords attached to the frame of a bed on the intermediate days of a Festival, and needless to say one may tighten those cords; this is the statement of Rabbi Meir. Rabbi Yosei says: One may only tighten the ropes but not interweave them. And some say: One may not tighten them at all.

299 Granted, according to the one who said that tightening means tying the cords only lengthwise and not widthwise, this is why the opinion presented as: Some say, comes to disagree and says that one may not tie the cords at all, even only lengthwise. However, if the cords became loose, all agree that

they may be tightened. But according to the one who said that tightening means that if a cord became loose he may tighten it, then according to the opinion presented here as: Some say, may he not even tighten the cords of his bed? How, then, would he be able to sleep on it?

300 The Gemara answers: Yes, indeed, according to this opinion, it is prohibited even to tighten the cords of one's bed. Since it is possible for him to fill the depression in his bed with clothing, so that he can sleep there, he may not exert himself during the week of the Festival and fix the bed in a more permanent manner.

301 MISHNA: One may set up an oven, a stove, and a mill on the intermediate days of a Festival. Rabbi Yehuda says: One may not chisel millstones for the first time on the intermediate days of a Festival.

302 GEMARA: The Gemara asks: What is meant by chiseling millstones? Rav Yehuda said: Cutting grooves into the millstones. As the millstones wear down over time and become smooth, one must occasionally cut grooves into the stones so that they can grind properly. Rav Yeḥiel said: Cutting out an eyehole in the upper millstone, through which the grain can pass, so that it can be ground between the two millstones.

303 The Gemara raises an objection from a baraita: One may set up an oven and a stove on the intermediate days of a Festival, provided that he does not fully complete the labor; this is the statement of Rabbi Eliezer. But the Rabbis say: He may even complete the labor. Rabbi Yehuda says in the name of Rabbi Eliezer: One may set up a new millstone and one may chisel an old millstone. And some say: One may not chisel a millstone at all.

304 Granted, according to the one who said that chiseling a millstone means cutting grooves into the millstones, this is how you can find this activity relevant to an old mill. But according to the one who said it means cutting out an eyehole, why does an old millstone need an eyehole to be cut out? It must have one already. The Gemara answers: This is referring to a case where he wants to widen the hole a little more.

305 The Gemara relates that Rav Huna once heard a certain man cutting grooves into his millstone on the intermediate days of a Festival. He said: Who is this? May his body be desecrated, for he desecrates the intermediate days of a Festival. The Gemara comments: Rav Huna holds in accordance with the statement cited as: Some say, that one is not permitted to roughen his millstones at all.

306 Rav Ḥama taught as follows: One may cut grooves into millstones on the intermediate days of a Festival. In the name of Rabbi Meir he said: Even with regard to the horse that one rides upon and the donkey that he rides upon, he is permitted to trim their hooves on the intermediate days of a Festival so that they do not suffer when they walk.

307 However, with regard to the hooves of a donkey that turns the millstones, no, they may not be trimmed. This is unnecessary on the intermediate days of a Festival, as one may only grind grain that one needs to use on the Festival itself, and the donkey can perform this task even if its hooves are not trimmed.

308 Rav Yehuda permits one to trim the hooves of the donkey that turns a mill, to set the stones of a mill in their place, to build the base of a mill, to construct a water channel to carry water that drives a

mill, and to build a stable for horses on the intermediate days of a Festival. Rava permitted one to groom a horse, to build a trough, and to build a bench on the intermediate days of a Festival.

309 Rava also permitted one to let the blood of an animal for medical purposes on the intermediate days of a Festival. Abaye said to him: A baraita is taught that supports you: One may let blood from an animal, and one does not withhold any medical treatment from an animal on the intermediate days of a Festival.

310 Rava further permitted one to scrub garments as part of the laundry process. What is the reason? It is the work of a layman and not the work of a craftsman, which is prohibited on the intermediate days of a Festival. Rav Yitzḥak bar Ami said that Rav Ḥisda said: Tying sleeves to create pleats is prohibited. What is the reason? It is the work of a craftsman and is consequently prohibited on the intermediate days of a Festival.

311 § Rava said: With regard to one who clears the ground on the intermediate days of a Festival, the following distinction applies: If his intention is to prepare a threshing floor, it is permitted, but if his intention is to prepare the ground for planting, it is prohibited.

312 The Gemara asks: What are the circumstances of each case? The Gemara explains: If he casts earth from one mound [mulya] onto another mound, or from one furrow into another furrow [natza], it is clear that he is doing this with the intention of preparing a threshing floor, as his sole interest is the level area in the middle and not the ground that surrounds it. However, if he takes earth from a mound and casts it into a furrow, he is presumably doing this with the intention of preparing the ground for planting, which is prohibited on the intermediate days of a Festival due to its similarity to the prohibited labor of plowing.

313 And Rava said: With regard to one who clears his field from twigs on the intermediate days of a Festival, the following distinction applies: If his intention is to use the twigs it is permitted, but if his intention is to prepare the ground for planting, it is prohibited. The Gemara asks: What are the circumstances of each case? The Gemara explains: If he takes the large twigs and leaves the small ones, it is clear that he is doing this with the intention of using the twigs. But if he takes both the large twigs and the small ones, it appears as though that he is doing so with the intention of preparing the ground, and it is prohibited.

314 And Rava further said: With regard to one who opens the gates of a water channel running through his land on the intermediate days of a Festival, the following distinction applies: If his intention is to catch the fish that come along with the water, it is permitted, but if his intention is to water the ground, it is prohibited.

315 The Gemara asks: What are the circumstances of each case? The Gemara explains: If he opens two gates in the water channel, one above his field and one below, so the water that flows in also flows out, it is clear that he is doing this with the intention of catching fish, as the water will flow out and only the fish will remain in the indentations in his field. But if he opens only one gate, he is presumably doing this with the intention of watering the ground, as it is evident that he wants the channel to fill and the water to overflow into the field.

316 And Rava also said: With regard to one who cuts the branches of his date palm on the intermediate days of a Festival, the following distinction applies: If he does this with the intention of feeding his animals, it is permitted, but if he does it with the intention of enhancing the growth of his

date palm, it is prohibited. The Gemara asks: What are the circumstances of each case? The Gemara explains: If he takes all of the branches from one side of the tree, he is doing this with the intention of feeding the branches to his animals, as it is evident that he is not concerned with the damage to the date palm. However, if he takes the branches from this side of the tree and also from the other side, it appears as though he is doing so with the intention of enhancing the growth of the date palm, and it is prohibited.

317 And Rava further said: With regard to these unripe dates, cutting them into pieces in order to render them fit for eating is permitted on the intermediate days of a Festival, but preserving them is prohibited, as they will not be ready for use until after the Festival. Rav Pappa said: Since they are likely to become infested with worms if they are not properly attended to, they are treated like merchandise that will be lost, and it is permitted to preserve them on the intermediate days of a Festival.

318 § And Rava also said: Any commerce is prohibited on the intermediate days of a Festival. Rabbi Yosei bar Avin said: But with regard to a matter that, if left unattended, will result in significant loss, it is permitted. The Gemara relates that Ravina once had a joint business venture that could have been sold for six thousand dinars, but he delayed selling it until after the intermediate days of a Festival, and he sold it then for twelve thousand dinars.

319 It is further related that Ravina had lent money to the residents of the fortress of Shanvata. He came before Rav Ashi and said to him: What is the halakha with regard to going to them now, on the intermediate days of the Festival, to collect my debt? Rav Ashi said to him: Since it is now that you will find them, whereas on other days you will not find them, as during the year these people would travel from place to place to earn their livelihood, this is treated like merchandise that will be lost, and it is therefore permitted.

320 The Gemara adds: So too, it is taught in a baraita with regard to idol worship like this case: One may go

321 to a fair of pagan gentiles held on a day they have designated for idol worship and buy animals, slaves, maidservants, houses, fields, and vineyards from them. And he may write the necessary deeds and confirm them in their courts [arkaot] by verifying the signatures on the documents to prevent the sellers from appealing and retracting the sale. Although this behavior might be construed as a display of respect for the gentiles and their idols, it is nevertheless permitted because it is as if he were rescuing his property from their hands, as he would not have another opportunity to acquire these items. This indicates that time-sensitive transactions are considered like cases where one might suffer financial loss, and are permitted.

322 It was related that Rav permitted Ḥiyya bar Ashi to weave simple traps [oharei] on the intermediate days of a Festival. The Gemara explains: What is the reason for this? It is because it is the work of a layman. However, complex nets [izlei] are prohibited. What is the reason? It is the work of a craftsman, which is prohibited on the intermediate days of a Festival.

323 It was further related that Rav Yehuda permitted Ami the oven maker to construct ovens on the intermediate days of a Festival and Rabba bar Ashabi to craft sieves. The Gemara asks: Is that really so? Didn’t Rabba bar Shmuel teach the following baraita: And they all agree that one may not construct a new oven on the intermediate days of a Festival. The Gemara answers that this is not difficult: Here, where Rav Yehuda permitted constructing an oven, he was referring to the summer,

i.e., when the weather is hot and dry, so the oven can dry out and already be fit for use on the Festival; there, where the baraita prohibits constructing an oven, it is referring to the rainy season, i.e., when the weather is such that the oven will not be ready for use on the Festival.

[324] MISHNA: One may construct a railing for a roof or a balcony if it is done in a nonprofessional manner, as the work of a layman, but not if it is done skillfully, as the work of a craftsman. One may plaster the cracks in an oven and roll over them with a roller, a wooden tool used to smooth out clay, with a hand or a foot, but not with a presser, a tool that is specially designed for this task.

[325] With regard to the hinge of a door, and the cylinder of the hinge, and the cross beam that holds the door, and a lock and a key that broke, one may fix them on the intermediate days of a Festival as these items are essential for the Festival and their repair cannot be delayed. This is permitted, provided that he does not intend ahead of time to do his labor on the Festival and delay it until that time.

[326] And with regard to all preserved food from which one can eat on the Festival, since they become ready to be eaten in a short amount of time, he may preserve them on the intermediate days of a Festival.

[327] GEMARA: The Gemara asks: What are the circumstances in which a railing is considered the work of a layman? Rav Yosef said: When it is made with palm branches and the branches of bay trees, which do not create a permanent structure. It was taught in a baraita that he fills in the space with stone but he does not plaster the stones with clay.

[328] It was taught in the mishna: One may plaster the cracks in an oven and roll over them with a roller, with a hand or a foot, but not with a presser. The Gemara asks: Now that you said that it is permitted to roll over the cracks with a roller, is it necessary to say that one may plaster the cracks with a hand or a foot? The Gemara answers that this is what the mishna is saying: One may plaster the cracks in an oven and roll over them as if with a roller, meaning with a hand or a foot, but not with a presser, which is a craftsman’s tool made especially for this.

[329] It was taught in the mishna: With regard to the hinge of a door, and the cylinder of the hinge, and the cross beam that holds the door, and a lock and a key that broke, one may fix them on the intermediate days of a Festival. The Gemara raises a contradiction to this from a different mishna (Ma’aser Sheni 5:15): Until the days of Yoḥanan the High Priest, workmen’s hammers would beat in Jerusalem on the intermediate days of a Festival. One can deduce from this mishna that until his days, yes, the workmen’s hammers would beat, but from then on, no, because Yoḥanan the High Priest banned such work. This seems to contradict the mishna here that permits fixing certain items on the intermediate days of the Festival.

[330] The Gemara answers: This is not difficult: There, when it is prohibited, it is referring to the work of smiths, which generates a great deal of noise; here, where it is permitted, it is referring to the work of carpenters, which is much quieter.

[331] Rav Ḥisda strongly objects to this: If so, people will say that a loud noise is prohibited, but a soft noise is permitted. Rather, Rav Ḥisda said that the apparent contradiction is not difficult for a different reason: This mishna that permits labor is referring to sickles, as sickles emit no noise at all; whereas that mishna that prohibits labor is referring to chisels. Rav Pappa said: Here in the mishna it

is referring to the period before the decree of Yoḥanan the High Priest; whereas there in the other mishna it is referring to the period after the decree.

[332] Rav Ashi said: That mishna, which prohibits this labor, was taught in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda; while this mishna was taught in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei. As Rabbi Yitzḥak bar Avdimi said: Who is the tanna who taught that all labor performed on the intermediate days of a Festival must be done with a change, i.e., in an altered manner, even with regard to a matter that will be lost if timely action is not taken? It is not in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei, as Rabbi Yosei permits doing labor that will prevent financial loss even when it is done in the usual manner.

[333] Ravina said: In accordance with whose opinion do we now lift the lintel above the door in order to drive in the nails that had loosened on the intermediate days of a Festival in the usual manner? In accordance with whose opinion is this done? It is done in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei, who permits labor that will prevent financial loss even when it is done in the usual manner.

[334] § It was taught in the mishna: With regard to all preserved food from which he can eat on the Festival, he may preserve them on the intermediate days of a Festival. The Gemara relates that the Bedita River once overflowed, depositing large quantities of fish in small water deposits on the river bank on the intermediate days of a Festival. Everyone went and trapped and brought home fish, and Rava permitted them to salt some of the fish.

[335] Abaye said to him: Didn’t we learn in the mishna: With regard to all preserved food from which he can eat on the Festival, he may preserve them on the intermediate days of a Festival? In this case it was impossible to eat that much fish on the Festival, and therefore preserving them should have been prohibited. Rava said to him: Since they initially brought these fish with the intention of eating them on the Festival, and it only became clear afterward that they had brought too many, and if one would leave them without salting them they would be ruined, they are treated like merchandise that will be lost, and therefore preserving them is permitted.

[336] And some say that it did not happen in this manner, rather, Rava permitted them to trap the fish, to bring them home, and to salt them. Abaye said to him: Didn’t we learn in the mishna: With regard to all preserved food from which he can eat on the Festival, he may preserve them on the intermediate days of a Festival? These fish were heavily salted and consequently could not be eaten until they thoroughly dried out.

[337] Rava said to him: These fish that were just salted can also be eaten now, by pressing out the salt and brine, and therefore, they too are fit to be eaten on the Festival, as in that case of Shmuel, where they prepared recently salted fish for him by pressing it sixty times and he ate the fish. The Gemara relates that Rava happened to come to the house of the Exilarch and they prepared freshly salted fish for him by pressing it sixty times, and he ate it.

[338] Apropos eating fish in various ways, the Gemara relates that Rav once happened to come to the house of Rav Shapir, and they brought before him a certain fish, of which one- third was cooked, one-third was salted and made edible via pressing, and one-third was broiled.

[339] Rav said: Adda the fisherman told me that a fish that has sat for some time and is close to spoiling is at its best. And Rav also said: Adda the fisherman told me: With regard to a fish, broil it with its brother, i.e., with salt, which, like fish, also comes from the sea; place it in its father, i.e., in

water; and eat it with its son, i.e., with fish brine which comes from it; and drink after it its father, i.e., water.

[340] And in addition Rav said: Adda the fisherman told me: After eating fish, cress, and milk, let the body carry them and let not the bed carry them, i.e., it is advisable to go for a walk after eating them, rather than immediately going to sleep. And Rav said: Adda the fisherman told me: After eating fish, cress, and milk, it is better to drink water and not beer, and if he has no water, he should drink beer and not wine, in order to avoid harming his body.

Chapter 2

[1] MISHNA: The mishna discusses one who had already turned over his olives as part of the process of preparing them for pressing, and mourning for a close relative befell him and as a result he was prohibited from engaging in work, or some other unavoidable accident occurred, or his workers misled him, promising to come but failing to do so, so that he could not press his olives before the Festival. Under these circumstances, during the intermediate days of the Festival, he may place the olives in the press and load the beam with weights for the initial pressing of the olives and leave it this way until after the Festival; this is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda.

[2] Rabbi Yosei says: He may press the olives and complete the process and then plug each barrel of oil in its usual manner. Since delay can entail financial loss, the Sages did not require him to alter the normal process of extracting the oil.

[3] GEMARA: The Gemara asks: The tanna opens the mishna with a case of mourning and ends it with the halakhot of the intermediate days of the Festival, leaving the connection between them unclear. Rav Sheisha, son of Rav Idi, said: That is to say: Actions that are permitted on the intermediate days of a Festival are prohibited during the days of one’s mourning. Therefore, if a mourning period befell one before the Festival, and he could not prepare properly for the Festival due to the prohibition against performance of labor by a mourner, he is permitted to perform labor during the intermediate days of the Festival to avoid financial loss.

[4] Rav Ashi said that the tanna of the mishna is speaking utilizing the didactic style of: It is not necessary, and he is teaching two separate halakhot, one about mourning and the other about the Festival: It is not necessary to state that during the days of his mourning, when the prohibition against labor is rabbinic, it is permitted to perform labor that, if delayed, could cause serious loss; but even on the intermediate days of the Festival, when the prohibition against performing labor is by Torah law, performing such labor is permitted because in a case of a loss the Sages permitted it.

[5] The Gemara comments: It is taught in a baraita in accordance with the opinion of Rav Sheisha, son of Rav Idi: These are actions that others perform for the mourner during the days of his mourning: If his olives have already been turned over, they may load them for him into the olive press, and likewise if his cask needs to be plugged, or if his flax needs to be lifted out of the soaking pool where it will rot if not removed in time, or if his wool needs to be lifted from the cauldron into which it was placed for dyeing, they perform all these actions for him. They also irrigate his field when his turn for water arrives, as in many places, each field would receive water in turn according to a prearranged schedule. If one does not utilize the water when his turn arrives, he loses that water. This

supports Rav Sheisha’s opinion that the prohibition against performing labor is waived in cases of loss only on the Festival. Under such circumstances, labor is prohibited to a mourner and in cases of loss may only be performed for him by others.

[6] The baraita continues: Rabbi Yehuda says: They also sow for him a plowed field or a field set aside for flax, where the time of sowing is critical. If the field is sown later, it will cause a loss. The Sages said to him: If that field is not sown in the early season, it can be sown in the later season; and similarly, if it is not sown with flax, it can be sown with another species. Therefore, this is not considered a great loss, and the Sages did not permit it.

[7] Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel says: If his olives have already been turned over and there is no skilled worker available who knows how to press them properly but him, or his cask needs to be plugged and there is no skilled worker available but him, or his flax needs to be lifted out of the soaking pool, or his wool needs to be lifted from the cauldron, and there is no skilled worker available but him, he may perform all of these actions himself in private.

[8] Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel said further: If this mourner was a craftsman who serves the public, providing a necessary service, or a barber or a bath attendant for the public, and the time of the Festival arrived, i.e., it was the eve of a Festival, and there is no other skilled worker available but him, then he may perform the labor even in public, as the needs of the public takes precedence over the mourning of an individual.

[9] The baraita continues: Tenant farmers, who farm others’ land in exchange for a certain percentage of the crop, and leasers, who work the land in exchange for a fixed amount of the crop, and contractors, who work the land in exchange for a set amount of money, are included amongst those for whom others may perform their labor when they are in mourning. In contrast, donkey drivers, camel drivers, and sailors are those for whom others may not perform their work during their mourning periods. However, if they or their animals were leased or hired out to others, then they may perform work, because they were hired personally and cannot be replaced without loss. A day laborer, even if he is in a different city where his mourning status is not public knowledge, may not perform his work. If a commission for others was his responsibility, even if it was by contract and he was paid not by the day but upon its completion, he may not perform that labor.

[10] The statement in the baraita that one may not perform a task for others even if it was by contract implies that it is not necessary to state that if it was not by contract the work is prohibited to a mourner. The Gemara asks: On the contrary, when he works by contract it is considered as though it were his own work, since he simply receives payment for the completed task. Non-contracted labor, where he is paid for the time he works, is not viewed as his own and it is conceivable that it would be permitted during his mourning period. The Gemara concludes: Rather, emend the text and say that the baraita should read: If a commission for others was his responsibility, whether by contract or not by contract, he may not perform it.

[11] The baraita continues: If he commissioned others to perform his work, then if it was in his house they may not perform the work, but if it was in another house they may perform it.

[12] The Gemara relates that Maryon, son of Ravin, and Mar, son of Rav Aḥa, son of Rava, held a team of two oxen in partnership between them, one ox apiece. An event, i.e., a death in the family, befell Mar, son of Rav Aḥa, son of Rava, and he detached his ox from the team, preventing any work from being performed by the team, because he did not want work performed with his animal during his

days of mourning. Rav Ashi said: A distinguished man like Mar, son of Rav Aḥa, is behaving this way? Granted, he is not concerned about his own loss, but is he not concerned about the loss of others, i.e., his partner? Isn’t it taught in the baraita cited above: If they or their animals were hired out or leased to others, then they may perform their work? In that case, why not allow the partner to work with the animal of Mar, son of Rav Aḥa?

[13] The Gemara explains: But Mar, son of Rav Aḥa, maintains: An important person is different. Even if strictly speaking something is permitted, an important person must be more rigorous with himself, so that people learn not to take the halakha lightly.

[14] § Shmuel said: With regard to gentile contractors, who are paid for the completed job rather than by the day, it is prohibited for them to work for a Jew within the boundaries of the Shabbat limit on a day that it is prohibited for the Jew to work. It looks like the Jew assigned work for them to do on that day, even though they in fact make their own schedule. Outside the Shabbat limit, where Jews will not see the work being done, it is permitted.

[15] Rav Pappa said: And even outside the Shabbat limit, we said only that it is permissible to let them work when there is no other city in close proximity to there, but if there is another city in close proximity to there, it is prohibited, since the work is likely to be seen by a Jew.

[16] Rav Mesharshiyya said: And even when there is no other city in close proximity, we said that it is permissible for gentile contractors to work for a Jew only on Shabbatot and Festivals, when Jewish people do not routinely go there, i.e., to the place where the work is being performed. However, on the intermediate days of a Festival, when Jewish people routinely come and go from there and see the work being done, it is prohibited.

[17] The Gemara relates about Mar Zutra, son of Rav Naḥman, that gentile contractors built a mansion [apadana] for him outside the Shabbat limit. Rav Safra and Rav Huna bar Ḥinnana happened to come there, but they did not enter it, because it had been built on Shabbat in a prohibited manner. And there are those who say: Even he, Mar Zutra himself, did not enter it.

[18] The Gemara asks: But didn’t Shmuel say: With regard to gentile contractors, within the boundaries of the Shabbat limit, it is prohibited to let them work on Shabbat, but outside the Shabbat limit it is permitted? The Gemara answers: An important person is different and must behave in a stricter manner. And there are those who say: He provided them with assistance with straw for making the bricks. Consequently, they were not fully independent contractors, and therefore it was prohibited for them to work on Shabbat, even outside the Shabbat limit.

[19] The Gemara relates that Rav Ḥama permitted the bath attendants [abunagrei] of the Exilarch’s house to work for them, i.e., the Exilarch and his household, on the intermediate days of a Festival. He said in explanation of this leniency: Since they do not take payment for working during the week of the Festival, they are merely conferring a favor on the Exilarch. Therefore, it is not viewed as actual labor, and we have no problem with it.

[20] The Sages taught in a baraita: Gentiles may receive contract work on the intermediate days of a Festival in order to execute it after the Festival, but it is prohibited to execute it during the Festival week itself. The principle of the matter is: Any action that a Jew may perform himself, he may tell a gentile to perform, and any action that he may not perform himself, he may not tell a gentile to perform. It is taught in another baraita: A gentile may receive contract work on the intermediate days

of a Festival in order to execute it after the Festival, provided that he does not measure, weigh, or count, in order to plan the work, in the same manner as he does on an ordinary weekday.

[21] The Sages taught in a baraita: One may not breed an animal, i.e., coax or compel a male to mate with a female, on the intermediate days of a Festival, as this is similar to prohibited labor. Similarly, one may not breed a firstborn animal, nor an unfit consecrated animal. It is prohibited to ever work these animals because of their sanctified status, and breeding them resembles working them.

[22] It is taught in another baraita: One may not breed an animal on the intermediate days of a Festival. Rabbi Yehuda says: If a she-donkey yearns for a mate because she is in heat, one may breed her with a male, lest she cool off, i.e., lest her estrus cycle pass without her mating, which will cause a significant loss. With regard to all other animals that are in heat, they are merely brought into corrals in which there are males, there being no need for further human intervention.

[23] The Sages taught in a baraita: One may not enclose livestock in particular areas of a field, in order to fertilize that area with their manure, on Shabbatot, or on Festivals, or on the intermediate days of a Festival. But if the animals came on their own to the field, it is permitted, and he need not remove them although he benefits from their manure.

[24] The baraita continues: And one may not assist gentile shepherds in pasturing their sheep in his field so that it will be fertilized, nor may one provide them with a shepherd to help herd their sheep all around the field so that it is completely fertilized. If the gentile shepherds were hired by the week, by the month, by the year, or by the septennial period, i.e., the seven years from one Sabbatical Year to the next, one may assist them and provide them with a shepherd to herd their sheep. Since they were hired for an extended period of time, it is not as though they were hired specifically for Shabbat or the Festival. Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi says: On Shabbat one may have the gentile pasture the sheep in one’s field as a favor, i.e. in order to earn one’s good graces, but not for pay; on a Festival, it is permitted even in exchange for food; and on the intermediate days of the Festival, it is permitted for pay. Rav Yosef said: The halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi.

[25] MISHNA: And similarly, with regard to one whose wine was already in the collection pit beside the wine press and needed to be removed lest it sour, and mourning for some close relative or some other unavoidable accident befell him, or his workers misled him, promising to come but failing to do so, during the intermediate days of the Festival he may draw off the wine and complete the process, and then plug each barrel of wine in its usual manner; this is the statement of Rabbi Yosei. Rabbi Yehuda says: He should construct a wooden panel to cover the collection pit so that the wine will not sour.

[26] GEMARA: The Gemara comments: And both this mishna and the previous one (11b), about the olive press, are necessary, as, if the tanna teaches us only the first mishna, one might say that only in that case does Rabbi Yosei say that one is permitted to complete the process, because in the case of oil, the potential loss is considerable. However, in the case of wine, where the loss is not as considerable, one might say that he concedes to Rabbi Yehuda that it must be done in an altered manner. And if he teaches us only the last mishna, one might say that only in that case involving wine did Rabbi Yehuda say that one must be stringent, but in the other case involving oil one might say that he concedes to Rabbi Yosei and is lenient. Therefore, it is necessary to teach both cases.

[27] Rav Yitzḥak bar Abba said: Who is the tanna who teaches that labor performed during the intermediate days of the Festival must be performed in an altered fashion even with regard to a

matter that, if unattended, will result in significant loss? That ruling is not in accordance with Rabbi Yosei’s opinion, as Rabbi Yosei permits one to perform labor that will prevent such a loss even in the usual manner. Rav Yosef said: The halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei, and it is permitted in cases of loss to perform labor in the usual manner.

[28] The students asked of Rav Naḥman bar Yitzḥak: What is the halakha with regard to sealing a barrel of beer during the intermediate days of the Festival? If it is not properly sealed, the beer will leak out through the sides of the barrel. He said to them: Sinai, i.e., Rav Yosef, said: The halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei. They asked: Say that Rabbi Yosei said that one may be lenient about wine, but about beer does he say the same thing? Beer is much cheaper than wine, and the loss would be much less significant.

[29] The Gemara explains why no distinction should be made: With regard to wine, what is the reason that Rabbi Yosei was lenient? It is because the loss involved is considerable; with beer as well, there is a loss if the barrel is not properly sealed, as Abaye said: My foster mother told me: It is better to have a barrel of six se’a that is sealed than a barrel of eight se’a that is not sealed, as in the end more beer will remain in the smaller sealed barrel than in the larger unsealed one.

[30] § Rav Ḥama bar Gurya said that Rav said: The halakhot relating to the intermediate days of a Festival resemble the halakhot relating to the Samaritans in the halakha. The Gemara asks: With regard to what aspect of the halakha are they similar? Rav Daniel bar Ketina said that Rav said: He meant to convey that they are sterile, and one may not learn further halakhot by extrapolation one from one another in both of these areas of halakha.

[31] The Gemara offers an example: For instance, Shmuel said: One may seal a jug with pitch, but one may not seal a barrel with pitch on the intermediate days of a Festival. Rav Dimi from Neharde’a said: One may seal a barrel with pitch, but one may not seal a small jug with pitch. Their reasoning is as follows: This Sage, i.e., Rav Dimi, was more concerned about possible financial loss, and so he permitted sealing the larger vessel, for which the potential for loss is great, but not the smaller one. And this Sage, i.e., Shmuel was concerned about unnecessary exertion on the Festival, and therefore he permitted sealing the smaller vessel, which requires less effort.

[32] Abaye stated a different principle: We have a tradition that the halakhot of the intermediate days of a Festival are like the halakhot of Shabbat:

[33] Some of the actions for which one is exempt by Torah law are nevertheless prohibited, and some of them are permitted ab initio.

[34] § The Gemara relates that Rav Huna had his crop harvested for him on the intermediate days of a Festival. Rabba bar Rav Huna raised an objection to his father Rav Huna from a baraita: One may grind flour on the intermediate days of a Festival for the sake of the Festival, but if it is not for the sake of the Festival, it is prohibited. With regard to a matter that, if unattended, will result in significant loss on the Festival, it is permitted to perform labor to prevent that loss on the intermediate days of the Festival. For a matter that will not result in loss if unattended during the intermediate days of the Festival, it is prohibited to perform labor.

[35] In what case is this statement said? In the case of crops that are already detached from the ground, but in the case of crops that are still attached to the ground, even if it all will be lost, labor is prohibited during the intermediate days of the Festival. And if one does not have anything to eat, then

he may reap and bind sheaves, and thresh, and winnow the grain in the wind, and separate the grain from the chaff, and grind the grain into flour, provided that he does not thresh with cows, the way that threshing is performed on an ordinary weekday. Why, then, did Rav Huna, who certainly had enough to eat, allow his workers to reap the field during the Festival week?

[36] Rav Huna said to his son: The opinion expressed in this unattributed baraita is an individual opinion, and we do not hold in accordance with it; as it is taught in a different baraita: Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel stated a principle in the name of Rabbi Yosei: In the case of an item that is already detached from the ground, even if only a portion of it will be lost by not working during the Festival, it is permitted to perform labor to prevent the loss, whereas for crops that are still attached to the ground, even if all of them will be lost, it is prohibited to perform labor for them. The opinion that all labor is prohibited for crops that have not yet been harvested is the opinion of an individual authority, Rabbi Yosei, with whom the Rabbis disagree.

[37] The Gemara asks: But if the unattributed baraita reflects the opinion of Rabbi Yosei, and it is permitted to work when one has nothing to eat, let him thresh even with cows. Didn't Rav Yitzḥak bar Abba say: Who is the tanna who taught that labor performed on the intermediate days of a Festival must be done in an altered manner even with regard to a matter that will involve a loss if unattended? It is not in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei, as Rabbi Yosei does not require altering the manner in which one performs the labor. Why, then, does the baraita say that the threshing must be done in an altered manner and not with cows?

[38] The Gemara rejects this argument: Rabbi Yosei could have said to you: Here, too, since one does not always thresh with cows, threshing without them now on the intermediate days of the Festival is also not considered threshing in an altered manner. The prohibition against threshing with cows is not because one must perform that labor in an altered manner but in order to avoid attracting public attention to the fact that one is working during the Festival week.

[39] The Sages taught in a baraita: One may grind flour on the intermediate days of a Festival for the sake of the Festival, but if it is not for the sake of the Festival, it is prohibited. And if he ground and left some flour over, it is permitted for use after the Festival. Similarly, one may cut down trees on the intermediate days of a Festival for the sake of the Festival, but if it is not for the sake of the Festival it is prohibited. And if he cut down trees for the Festival and left some wood over, it is permitted for use after the Festival.

[40] The baraita continues: One may brew beer on the intermediate days of a Festival for the sake of the Festival, but if it is not for the sake of the Festival, it is prohibited. And if he brewed beer for the sake of the Festival and left some over, it is permitted for use after the Festival provided that he does not employ an artifice, exploiting the allowance to work on a Festival by knowingly making more than was needed.

[41] The Gemara raises a contradiction from a baraita: One may brew beer on the intermediate days of a Festival for the sake of the Festival, but if it is not for the sake of the Festival, it is prohibited. This applies both to date beer and to barley beer. And even though he has old beer, he may employ an artifice and drink from the new beer, i.e., he may say he prefers new beer and brew a new batch, although he has enough old beer for the Festival. This statement contradicts the previous baraita that prohibited circumventing the prohibition against labor through artifice. The Gemara answers: This matter is a dispute between tanna'im, as it is taught in a baraita: One may not employ an artifice in

this regard, i.e., to circumvent the prohibition against labor during the intermediate days of a Festival. Rabbi Yosei bar Yehuda says: One may employ an artifice.

42 § The Gemara relates that Rav had his crop harvested on the intermediate days of a Festival. Shmuel heard about this and was dismayed. The Gemara asks: Shall we say that Shmuel holds in accordance with the individual opinion of Rabbi Yosei, who prohibits all labor for crops that are attached to the ground, even if inattention will result in significant loss? The Gemara answers: No, it was a crop of wheat, which would not have been ruined had the harvest been pushed off a week, and therefore Shmuel was offended.

43 The Gemara asks: What is the reason that Rav acted in this manner? The Gemara answers: Rav is in the category of one who does not have anything to eat, and that is why it was permitted to harvest his crops. The Gemara asks: And why, then, did Shmuel disapprove? The Gemara explains: The people who reported Rav's actions to Shmuel did not complete the story for him. Alternatively, an important person such as Rav is different, and Shmuel thought Rav should have been stringent even in his difficult circumstances.

44 It was further related that Rabbi Yehuda Nesia once went out on Shabbat with a coral seal [ḥumreta] on his ring and drank water heated by a gentile cook. Rabbi Ami heard about this and was dismayed about both things. Rav Yosef said: What is the reason that he was dismayed? If it was because of the coral seal, isn't it taught in a baraita: Bracelets, nose rings, and rings are like all other utensils that may be carried in a courtyard? Therefore, Rabbi Yehuda Nesia's action conformed to halakha.

45 And if Rabbi Ami was dismayed because Rabbi Yehuda Nesia drank water heated by a gentile cook [kapeila], didn't Shmuel bar Yitzḥak say that Rav said: With regard to anything that is eaten raw, like water, even if it was cooked by a gentile, it is not subject to the prohibition against eating food cooked by gentiles? The Gemara resolves both difficulties: An important person is different, and Rabbi Ami believed that Rabbi Yehuda Nesia should have been more stringent.

46 Rav Ḥananel said that Rav said: A person may chop down a palm tree on the intermediate days of a Festival, although he needs only its sawdust. The Gemara comments: Abaye cursed it, i.e., the behavior of one who exerts such effort on the Festival for so small a need.

47 The Gemara relates that Rav Ashi had a forest [ava] in Shelaniya. He went to cut it down on the intermediate days of the Festival. Rav Sheila from Shelaniya said to Rav Ashi: What is your opinion about what you are doing? Do you rely on that which Rav Ḥananel said that Rav said: A person may chop down a palm tree on the intermediate days of a Festival even though he needs only its sawdust? Didn't Abaye curse such behavior? Rav Ashi said to him: I did not hear that Abaye said that; that is to say, in a delicate way, I do not hold in accordance with his opinion. The iron of Rav Ashi's ax then slipped and was about to cut off his leg. He left it, ceasing his chopping, and came back again to chop down the forest only after the Festival.

48 The Gemara relates that Rav Yehuda permitted uprooting flax, cutting hops, and uprooting sesame plants on the intermediate days of a Festival. Abaye said to Rav Yosef: Granted, this is reasonable in the case of flax, which is suitable for use as a cover [ḥafifa] for various objects and therefore has a use even during the Festival, and so too hops, which are suitable for making beer, but for what are sesame plants suitable, since the sesame seeds require a long drying period before oil can be

extracted from them? Rav Yosef said to him: They are suitable for the seeds [nazyei] on them, which can be consumed immediately.

[49] It was further mentioned that Rabbi Yannai had an orchard whose time for harvesting the fruit arrived during the intermediate days of the Festival. He harvested it during the Festival, as the fruit would otherwise have spoiled. The following year, everyone delayed the harvest of their orchards until the intermediate days of the Festival. Rabbi Yannai declared the earnings from his orchard ownerless that year, since his harvesting of his fruit provided a misleading example for the public, causing many people to adopt an inappropriate leniency.

[50] MISHNA: A person may bring his fruit in from the field on the intermediate days of the Festival because he is concerned about thieves, and he may draw his flax out of the soaking pool so that it is not ruined from soaking too long in the water, provided that he does not plan from the outset to perform his work on the intermediate days of the Festival. And with regard to all of these cases, if one planned from the outset to perform his labor on the intermediate days of the Festival, the fruit of that labor must be lost and no benefit may be derived from it.

[51] GEMARA: It is taught in a baraita that one may bring in crops out of concern for thieves, provided that he brings them into his house discreetly.

[52] The Gemara relates: Rav Yosef had wooden beams, which he brought into his house during the day on one of the intermediate days of a Festival.

[53] Abaye said to him: But isn’t it taught in a baraita: One may bring in items provided that he brings them into his house discreetly? Rav Yosef said to him: Discretion with respect to these beams is moving them during the day, since at night more people are required, and also torchbearers [medokhrei denura] are needed, and the matter would be more noticeable.

[54] The mishna states: And he may draw his flax out of the soaking pool so that it is not ruined from soaking too long in the water, provided that he does not plan from the outset to do his work on the intermediate days of the Festival. And with regard to anyone, if he planned from the outset to perform his labor on the intermediate days of the Festival, the fruit of that labor must be destroyed. Rabbi Yirmeya asked Rabbi Zeira: If one planned from the outset to perform his labor on the intermediate days of a Festival, and he died after doing so, what is the halakha? Should his children be penalized after him and have to lose the products of their father’s labor?

[55] Even if you might say that

[56] in the case of one who slit the ear of a firstborn animal, the Sages penalized his son after him, that is because the prohibition is by Torah law. A firstborn animal is disqualified from sacrifice if it becomes blemished, rendering it permitted to be eaten as non-sacred meat. It is prohibited to deliberately engender a blemish in a firstborn animal, and one who does so is prohibited from eating the meat.

[57] And if you might say that in the case of one who sold his slave to a gentile and then died the Sages penalized his son after him, that is because every day the slave is in the gentile’s possession precludes him from performing mitzvot. A Canaanite slave is obligated in the same mitzvot as a Jewish woman. If he is illicitly sold to a gentile and escapes, requiring the seller to compensate the gentile, the seller may not then re-enslave the slave, who is regarded as emancipated. The Sages extended this penalty to the owner’s heirs as well.

[58] What, then, is the halakha here, where one planned from the outset to perform his work on the intermediate days of a Festival and then after performing the work he died? Should one say that the Sages penalized the man himself and he is no longer alive, or perhaps the Sages imposed a penalty on the money, such that no benefit may be derived from it, and it still exists in the hands of his heirs?

[59] Rabbi Zeira said to Rabbi Yirmeya: You already learned the answer to your question in a mishna (Shevi'it 4:2): A field whose thorns were removed during the Sabbatical Year may be sown in the eighth year, as removing thorns is not full-fledged labor that renders the field prohibited; but if it had been improved with fertilizer, or if it had been enclosed so that animals therein would fertilize it with their manure, it may not be sown in the eighth year. The Sages imposed a penalty that one not benefit from prohibited labor. And Rabbi Yosei bar Ḥanina said: We have a tradition that if one improved his field in a prohibited manner and then died, his son may sow it. Apparently, the Sages penalized only him, the one who acted wrongly, but the Sages did not penalize his son. Here, too, with regard to work performed on the intermediate days of a Festival, the Sages penalized him, but the Sages did not penalize his son.

[60] Abaye said: We have a tradition that if one rendered impure another's ritually pure items and died before paying, the Sages did not penalize his son after him and require him to pay for the damage. What is the reason for this? It is that damage that is not evident, i.e., that does not involve any physical change visible to the eye, is not considered damage by Torah law; nevertheless, the injured party suffers a loss, and the Sages penalized only him, but the Sages did not penalize his son.

[61] MISHNA: One may not purchase houses, slaves, and cattle on the intermediate days of a Festival unless it is for the sake of the Festival, or to provide for the needs of the seller who does not have anything to eat.

[62] GEMARA: Rava asked Rav Naḥman: What is the halakha with regard to wages for a worker who does not have anything to eat? Is it permitted to provide a poor worker with work on the intermediate days of the Festival? Rav Naḥman said to him: We learned this in the mishna: Or to provide for the needs of the seller, if he has nothing to eat. What is added by mentioning the condition that he has nothing to eat? Does it not add the case of wages and not only the case of one selling items he owns? Rava said to him: No, it is merely explaining what is meant by the needs of the seller.

[63] Abaye raised an objection from a mishna (18b): Promissory notes may not be written on the intermediate days of a Festival, but if the lender does not trust the borrower and is concerned that without such a note he will be unable to collect, or if he has nothing to eat, he may write a promissory note. The Gemara elaborates: What is added here by the words: If he has nothing to eat? Are they not meant to add that a promissory note may be written for the sake of the wages of the scribe who draws up the document? Conclude from it that it is permitted to hire a worker who is in need of a livelihood even for work that would otherwise be prohibited on the intermediate days of a Festival.

[64] Rav Sheshet raised an objection from a mishna (Pesaḥim 55a) that addresses the prohibition against performing labor on the eve of Passover: And the Rabbis say: The practitioners of only three crafts are permitted to perform labor until midday on Passover eve, and they are the tailors, the barbers, and the launderers, whose work is needed for the Festival. The baraita elaborates: The tailors may perform labor on Passover eve, as a layperson is permitted to sew in his usual manner during the intermediate days of the Festival. Since similar labor is permitted during the Festival, one may be

lenient on Passover eve as well. The barbers and the launderers are permitted to work, as those who arrive from overseas or one who leaves prison are permitted to cut their hair and wash their clothes on the intermediate days of the Festival because they had no opportunity to do so prior to the Festival.

[65] And if it enters your mind that paying wages to a worker who does not have anything to eat is permitted on the intermediate days of the Festival, then all other types of labor should also be permitted on the eve of Passover, as there is something similar permitted on the intermediate days of the Festival, namely, the wages paid to a worker who does not have anything to eat. Tailors are permitted to work on the eve of Passover because similar work is permitted during the intermediate days of the Festival. The payment of wages to a worker who does not have anything to eat on the Festival must be prohibited, as otherwise similar work, i.e., any work involving the payment of wages, would be permitted on the eve of Passover, which is not the case.

[66] Rav Pappa strongly objects to this: If that is so, that one can derive halakhot in this manner, then building as well should be permitted on the eve of Passover, as a wall that tilts toward the public domain and is likely to fall may be demolished and rebuilt in the usual manner on the intermediate days of a Festival due to the danger posed to passersby. Since building under such circumstances is permitted on the intermediate days of a Festival, it should be permitted in general on the eve of Passover.

[67] Ravina also strongly objects to this: If that is so, a scribe [lavlar] who draws up documents should be permitted to do so on the eve of Passover, as one may write betrothal deeds, bills of divorce, and receipts on the intermediate days of a Festival.

[68] Rather, Rav Ashi said that Rav Sheshet's original objection has no basis: Are you raising a contradiction between the halakhot of the intermediate days of a Festival and the halakhot of the fourteenth day of Nisan, i.e., the eve of Passover? They are not comparable, as the prohibition against labor on each is for a different reason: Labor is prohibited on the intermediate days of a Festival because it involves excessive exertion, and in a situation of significant loss the Sages permitted it. In contrast, the prohibition against labor on the fourteenth of Nisan is due to the need to prepare for the Festival, and especially the Paschal lamb. Whatever is needed for the Festival, e.g., the work of tailors and barbers, the Sages permitted, but whatever is not needed for the Festival, the Sages did not permit.

[69] MISHNA: One may not move his possessions from house to house during the intermediate days of a Festival, but he may move them to his courtyard if that is necessary. One may not bring home utensils from the house of a craftsman after he has completed his work, but if one is concerned about them that if he leaves them in the craftsman's house they are likely to be stolen, he may move them to another courtyard.

[70] GEMARA: The Gemara asks: But didn't you say in the first clause of the mishna that one may not move one's possessions at all, even from one house to another? How is it that the mishna then permits moving objects from one courtyard to another in the second clause? Abaye said in explanation: In the latter clause we come to the case of moving objects from the house in his courtyard to that same courtyard.

[71] The mishna states: And one may not bring home utensils from the house of a craftsman. Rav Pappa said: Rava tested us with the following question: We learned in the mishna that one may not

bring home utensils from the house of a craftsman. And this raises a contradiction to another mishna (Pesaḥim 55b): One may take utensils to and bring them from the house of a craftsman, even if they are not needed for the sake of the Festival.

[72] And we answered him: Here, the mishna that permits the practice is referring to the fourteenth of Nisan, the eve of Passover, and here, the mishna that prohibits it, is referring to the intermediate days of a Festival. And if you wish, say another explanation: Both this and that refer to the intermediate days of a Festival, but here, the mishna that prohibits the practice is referring to a case where he trusts the craftsman and is not concerned about his utensils being lost or stolen, whereas here, the mishna that permits taking utensils to and from the craftsman is referring to a case where he does not trust the craftsman.

[73] And so it is taught in a baraita: One may bring home utensils from the house of a craftsman; for example, a jug from the jug-maker's house and a cup from the glass-blower’s house, as they will be used on the Festival itself. But he may not bring home wool from the dyer’s house or utensils from the craftsman’s house, as they are not needed on the Festival. But if the craftsman has nothing to eat, he may give him his wages during the Festival week and leave the utensil with him. And if he does not trust the craftsman to properly safeguard his utensil, he may take the utensil from the craftsman and leave it in a house near him. And if he is concerned about his utensils lest they be stolen, he may move them to another courtyard. And if he does not trust the owner of the other courtyard, he may bring them into his house discreetly.

[74] The Gemara comments: You have adequately explained the contradiction between the mishnayot about whether one may bring home utensils from the house of a craftsman. The mishna that permits it can be understood as referring to a case where the craftsman is not to be trusted. But the mishna in Pesaḥim also states that one may take utensils to the house of a craftsman, and this is difficult, as the mishna above teaches: One may not bring home utensils from the house of a craftsman. And this indicates that all the more so, one may not take utensils from his house to that of the craftsman. Rather, it is clear as we answered initially that one mishna is referring to the eve of Passover and the other to the intermediate days of a Festival.

[75] MISHNA: On the intermediate days of a Festival, figs that were spread out to dry may be covered with straw to protect them from rain and dew. Rabbi Yehuda says: One may even condense the figs. Those who sell produce, clothing, and utensils may sell them in private, for the sake of the Festival. Fishermen, and groats makers [dashoshot], and bean pounders, who pulverize the beans, may ply their trades in private for the sake of the Festival. Rabbi Yosei says: They were stringent with themselves to refrain from this work even with respect to what was needed for the Festival.

[76] GEMARA: Rabbi Ḥiyya bar Abba and Rabbi Asi disagree about the following issue, and both of them assert their opinions in the name of Ḥizkiyya and Rabbi Yoḥanan. One said: Cover the figs means to lightly cover them with straw, and condense means to spread straw over them densely. And the other one said: Cover means to spread straw over them whether lightly or densely, and condense means to amass the figs into a pile, making it as if it were a pile of grain. This is also taught in a baraita: One may condense, i.e., amass the figs into a pile, making it as if it were a pile of grain. This is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda.

[77] § The mishna states: On the intermediate days of a Festival, those who sell produce, clothing, and utensils may sell them in private, for the sake of the Festival. Fishermen, groats makers, and bean

pounders may ply their trades in private for the sake of the Festival. Rabbi Yosei says that they were stringent with themselves. The Sages were asked: When it says that they were stringent with themselves, does it mean that that they did not work at all on the intermediate days of a Festival, or perhaps it means that they did their work in private, though it is permitted to do it publicly?

78 The Gemara answers based on a baraita. Come and hear: Those who sell produce, clothing, and utensils may sell them in private, for the sake of the Festival. Rabbi Yosei says: The merchants of Tiberias were stringent with themselves not to sell at all, even in private. Hunters of animals, fowlers, and fishermen may hunt their quarry discreetly for the sake of the Festival. Rabbi Yosei says: The hunters of Akko were stringent with themselves not to hunt at all. Groats makers who crack grain into groats called ḥilka, targis, and tisanei, crack the grain in private for the sake of the Festival. Rabbi Yosei says: The groats makers of Tzippori were stringent with themselves not to crack grain at all. According to Rabbi Yosei, the stringencies involve refraining from work entirely.

79 Abaye said: The term ḥilka means one kernel that is broken into two; the term targis means one kernel that is broken into three; and the term tisanei means one grain that is broken into four. When Rav Dimi came from Eretz Yisrael to Babylonia, he said: Ḥilka is referring to emmer wheat.

80 The Gemara raises an objection from a baraita: Ḥilka, targis, and tisanei are susceptible to ritual impurity everywhere. Granted, according to the one who said that these are one grain broken into two, into three, and into four, due to that reason they are susceptible to impurity everywhere, as they have already become fit to contract ritual impurity by being rinsed with water in their processing. But according to the one who says that ḥilka is emmer wheat that has not necessarily been processed, why is it susceptible to ritual impurity everywhere, since it has not necessarily become fit to contract impurity by coming into contact with water?

81 The Gemara answers: The baraita is referring to a case where, for example, the emmer wheat was husked, since if it had not been previously soaked in water, it would not have been possible to husk it. And why, according to this opinion, is it called ḥilka? It is called this because their husks [ḥelkayhu] were removed.

82 The Gemara raises an objection from a baraita: One who vows to prohibit himself from eating grain [dagan] is prohibited to partake of even dry Egyptian beans, and it is permitted for him to partake of fresh beans. And it is permitted for him to partake of rice, as well as of ḥilka, and targeis, and tisnei. Granted, according to the one who said that these are one grain broken into two, one grain broken into three, and one grain broken into four, it is fine, as when the wheat is crushed into these it leaves the category of grain. But according to the one who says that ḥilka is emmer wheat, it is still a proper grain. The Gemara concludes: Indeed, it is difficult.

83 § The Gemara relates that Rav Huna permitted the spice merchants [kerufayata] to go and sell their products in their usual manner in the marketplace on the intermediate days of a Festival. Rav Kahana raised an objection to Rav Huna’s ruling from a baraita: If a store opens into a row of pillars that runs along the street, the storekeeper may open and close it in his usual manner on the intermediate days of a Festival, since it is not in the public’s view.

84 However, if it is open to the public domain, he may open only one door and must close the other. And on the eve of the last day of the festival of Sukkot, he may take out his wares from the store and adorn the markets of the city with fruit in honor of the last day of the Festival. The Gemara infers: For the honor of the last day of the Festival, yes, it is permitted for him to open the store in order to

give people the opportunity to prepare for the holiday, but when not for the honor of the Festival, i.e., during the other intermediate days of the Festival, he is not permitted to do so. How, then, did Rav Huna permit those spice merchants to sell as usual on the intermediate days of the Festival?

85 The Gemara answers: This is not difficult: This baraita that prohibits selling in the usual manner is referring to the sale of fruit, which is usually bought in large quantities and could have been purchased before the Festival; people might therefore suspect the buyer of purchasing it for use after the Festival. In contrast, this lenient ruling of Rav Huna is referring to the sale of spices, which is permitted because people buy them only in small quantities for the sake of the Festival.

Chapter 3

1 MISHNA: And these may shave and cut their hair on the intermediate days of a Festival: One who comes from a country overseas; and one who is released from a house of captivity; and one who comes out of prison on the intermediate days of a Festival; and one who had been ostracized and therefore prohibited from cutting his hair, and the Sages released him from his decree of ostracism on the intermediate days of the Festival; and similarly, one who had vowed not to cut his hair and then requested of a Sage to dissolve his vow and was released from it on the intermediate days of the Festival; and the nazirite whose term of naziriteship ended on the intermediate days of a Festival; and the leper who needs to purify himself on the intermediate days and must shave his entire body in order to leave his state of ritual impurity and regain his ritual purity. Since these people were not able to cut their hair on the eve of the Festival, they are permitted to do so on the intermediate days of the Festival.

2 And these may launder their clothes on the intermediate days of a Festival: One who comes from a country overseas; and one who is released from a house of captivity; and one who comes out of prison on the intermediate days of a Festival;

3 and one who had been ostracized and the Sages released him from his decree of ostracism; and similarly, one who had vowed not to launder his clothes and he requested from a Sage to dissolve his vow and was released from it on the intermediate days of a Festival.

4 Hand towels; and barbers' towels, which are used to cover a person having a haircut; and body-drying towels, all of which get quickly soiled, may be laundered on the intermediate days of a Festival. Zavim, men suffering from an impure venereal emission; zavot, women who experience a flow of menstrual-type blood on three consecutive days during a time of the month when they do not expect to experience menstrual bleeding; menstruating women; women who have just given birth; and all others who leave a state of ritual impurity for a state of ritual purity on the intermediate days of the Festival, these people are all permitted to launder their clothes in order to purify themselves. But all other people are prohibited from laundering during the intermediate days of the Festival.

5 GEMARA: The Gemara asks: What is the reason that all other people are prohibited from performing these actions during the intermediate days? Why are these actions not included in the category of actions that are permitted in deference to the Festival?

6 The Gemara answers: As we learned in a mishna (Taanit 15b): Both the members of the priestly watch whose week it is to serve in the Temple and the members of the non-priestly watch who

accompanied the members of the watch to Jerusalem are prohibited from cutting their hair or laundering their clothes during that week. But on the Thursday of that week they are permitted to do so in deference to Shabbat.

[7] And Rabba bar bar Ḥana said in the name of Rabbi Elazar: What is the reason that the members of the priestly and non-priestly watch are prohibited from cutting their hair and laundering their clothes? It is in order that they not enter their watch when they are untidy. If it were permitted for them to cut their hair and launder their clothes during the week of their watch, they would leave their haircuts and laundry until the middle of that week and begin their service in a disorderly state. Here, too, ordinary people are prohibited from cutting their hair or laundering their clothes on the intermediate days of a Festival, in order that they complete all necessary preparations beforehand and not enter the Festival when they are untidy.

[8] Rabbi Zeira asks: If one lost an item on the eve of a Festival and he was busy searching for it and had no time to cut his hair or launder his clothes before the Festival commenced, can one say that since he was a victim of circumstances beyond his control, which prevented from taking care of these matters prior to the Festival, he is permitted to cut his hair and launder his clothes on the intermediate days of the Festival? Or perhaps since it is not clearly evident to others that he failed to cut his hair or launder his clothes due to unavoidable circumstances, he is not permitted to perform these actions during the Festival week.

[9] Abaye said, in answer to this question, that there is a principle of the Sages that applies here. They prohibited the baking of decorated Syrian cakes for Passover, lest people tarry in their preparation of these elaborate cakes and the cakes become leavened. When Baitos ben Zunen wished to prepare the cakes in a way that would not lead to a violation of any prohibition, the Sages nevertheless prohibited it. They explained that were they to permit him to do so, others would say: All the decorated Syrian cakes are forbidden, but the Syrian cakes of Baitos are permitted? This teaches that the Sages do not permit exceptions when the reason for leniency is not clearly evident, like in the case of one who was busy looking for a lost item.

[10] Rabbi Zeira retorted: And according to your reasoning, that which Rabbi Asi said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: Anyone who has only one shirt is permitted to launder it on the intermediate days of a Festival, there too, one should apply the principle that others will say: All the decorated Syrian cakes are forbidden but the Syrian cakes of Baitos are permitted. There, too, it is not clearly evident that the reason for leniency is that one has only one shirt.

[11] The Gemara rejects this argument: Wasn’t it already said about this that Mar, son of Rav Ashi, said: His belt is proof for him, as when he launders his only shirt he will have to wear his outer garment tied with his belt so that his body is not exposed, and everyone will understand that he has no other shirt to wear.

[12] Rav Ashi taught a different version of this passage, as follows: Rabbi Zeira asks: With regard to a craftsman who lost an item on the eve of a Festival and was busy searching for it, what is the halakha? Is it permitted for him to launder his clothes and cut his hair on the intermediate days of the Festival because he had been unable to do so before the Festival? The Gemara explains the two sides of the question: Can one say that since he is a craftsman, it is clearly evident why he did not launder his clothes and cut his hair before the Festival, as many people would have come to his place of work and seen that he was busy looking for his lost article? Or perhaps since the special circumstances are

not as clearly evident as in those cases in the mishna, it is not permitted for him to cut his hair or launder his clothes during the intermediate days of the Festival. The dilemma shall stand unresolved.

[13] § The mishna taught: One who comes from a country overseas on the intermediate days of a Festival is permitted to cut his hair. The Gemara comments: The mishna is not in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, as it is taught in a baraita that Rabbi Yehuda says: One who comes from a country overseas on the intermediate days of a Festival must not shave or cut his hair, due to the fact that he left his home without permission.

[14] The Gemara continues to explain the definition and parameters of leaving without permission. Rava said: If one left Eretz Yisrael to travel, all agree that it is prohibited for him to shave during the intermediate days of the Festival because he left on his own initiative, and this is not considered an unavoidable circumstance. If he left for basic sustenance, i.e., due to financial difficulty, all agree that it is permitted for him to shave upon his return because he is regarded as having left due to circumstances beyond his control. They disagree only with regard to the case where he left to earn greater profit, i.e., he had enough to live on in Eretz Yisrael, but he left in order to increase his income. One Sage, Rabbi Yehuda, compares him to one who left to travel, and the other Sage, the Rabbis of the mishna, compare him to one who left for basic sustenance.

[15] The Gemara raises an objection from the following baraita: Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi said: The statement of Rabbi Yehuda seems more reasonable in a case when he left without permission, and the statement of the Rabbis seems more reasonable when one left with permission. The Gemara clarifies: What is meant by without permission? If we say that it means that he left to travel, didn't you say that in this case all agree that it is prohibited for him to cut his hair upon his return? Rather, say that it means that he left for basic sustenance. But didn't you say that all agree that it is permitted for him to cut his hair in such a case? Rather, it is obvious that it means that he left in search of greater profit.

[16] Say the latter clause of the baraita as follows: The statement of the Rabbis seems more reasonable in a case when one left with permission. The Gemara clarifies: What is meant by with permission? If we say that he left for basic sustenance, didn't you say that all agree that it is permitted for him to cut his hair upon his return? Rather, say that it means that he left for greater profit. But didn't you say in the first clause that the statement of Rabbi Yehuda seems more reasonable in this case? Therefore, according to Rava's distinctions, there is an internal contradiction within the baraita.

[17] The Gemara resolves the difficulty: This is what Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi is saying: The statement of Rabbi Yehuda seems more reasonable to the Rabbis in the case where one left without permission. And what is meant by without permission? It means a case where one left to travel, as even the Rabbis disagree with Rabbi Yehuda only when one left for greater profit, but when one left to travel they agree with Rabbi Yehuda that it is prohibited for one to shave and cut his hair. And the statement of the Rabbis seems more convincing to Rabbi Yehuda in the case where one left with permission. And what is meant by with permission? It is a case where one left for basic sustenance, as even Rabbi Yehuda disagrees with the Rabbis only when one left for greater profit, but when he left for basic sustenance Rabbi Yehuda concedes to them that it is permitted for him to shave and cut his hair. Therefore, Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi's intent was not to decide between the opinions of the Rabbis and Rabbi Yehuda but to clarify their dispute.

[18] § Shmuel said: If a baby was born on a Festival and he has long hair that is bothering him, it is permitted to cut his hair on the intermediate days of the Festival, as there is no greater prison than

this, the womb of his mother, due to which his hair could not have been cut prior to the Festival. A precise reading of Shmuel’s statement indicates that if the child was born on the Festival, yes, his hair may be cut. However, if he was born before the Festival, but for some reason his hair was not cut, no, it is not permitted to cut it on the intermediate days of the Festival because there was time to do so before the Festival.

[19] Rav Pineḥas raised an objection from that which is taught in a baraita: All of those about whom the Sages said: It is permitted to shave and cut his hair on the intermediate days of the Festival, it is also permitted to shave and cut his hair during the days of his mourning. But from this it follows that one who is prohibited from shaving and cutting his hair on the intermediate days of a Festival is also prohibited from shaving and cutting his hair during the days of his mourning.

[20] And if you say that with regard to a baby there is a distinction between being born before the Festival and being born on it, and in some cases it is prohibited to cut the hair of a baby, then you find that mourning is practiced even with a minor.

[21] Isn’t it taught in a baraita: One rends the clothes of a minor whose relative has passed away, due to the desire to bring about feelings of grief among those who see him? However, there is no inherent requirement for the minor to observe any of the halakhot of mourning.

[22] Rav Ashi said: Is it taught explicitly in the first baraita cited by Rav Pineḥas that if it is prohibited for one to have a haircut during the Festival, it is likewise prohibited to have a haircut during the week of mourning? That was merely an inference. Perhaps there are those among them, i.e., those listed in the mishna, for whom it is prohibited, while there are others among them for whom it is permitted, and the halakhot of mourning do not apply to a baby.

[23] Ameimar, and some say it was Rav Sheisha, son of Rav Idi, taught that statement in this manner. Shmuel said: With regard to a baby, it is permitted to cut his hair during the Festival. It is no different whether he was born during the Festival, and it is no different whether he was born beforehand.

[24] Rav Pineḥas said: We, too, learn in the baraita a support for this statement: All of those about whom the Sages said: It is permitted to shave and cut his hair on the intermediate days of the Festival, it is also permitted to shave and cut his hair during the days of his mourning. But from this it follows that one who is prohibited from shaving and cutting his hair on the intermediate days of a Festival is also prohibited from shaving and cutting his hair during the days of his mourning.

[25] If you say that with regard to a baby it is prohibited to cut his hair, then you find that mourning is practiced even with a minor. And it was taught in a baraita: One rends the clothes of a minor whose relative has passed away due to the desire to bring about feelings of grief among those who see him. However, there is no inherent requirement for the minor to observe any of the halakhot of mourning.

[26] Rav Ashi said: Is it taught explicitly in the first baraita cited by Rav Pineḥas that if it is prohibited for one to shave during the Festival, it is likewise prohibited to shave during the week of mourning? That was merely an inference. Perhaps there are those among them for whom it is prohibited, while there are others among them for whom it is permitted. If so, there is no clear support from this baraita for Shmuel’s statement.

[27] § A mourner does not practice the halakhot of his mourning on a Festival, as it is stated: “And you shall rejoice in your Festival” (Deuteronomy 16:14).

[28] The Gemara explains: If it is a mourning period that had already begun at the outset of the Festival, the positive mitzva of rejoicing on the Festival, which is incumbent upon the community, comes and overrides the positive mitzva of the individual, i.e., the mourning. And if the mourning period began only now, i.e., the deceased died during the Festival, the positive mitzva of the individual does not come and override the positive mitzva of the community.

[29] The Gemara asks: With regard to one who was ostracized, what is the halakha? Must he observe the practices of ostracism, or are they overridden by the mitzva to rejoice on the Festival? Rav Yosef said: Come and hear an answer from that which is taught: During the Festival the court judges cases of capital law, cases of lashes, and cases of monetary law. It is known that if one does not listen to and follow the judgment, among the possibilities of enforcement is that we ostracize him until he accepts the verdict.

[30] And if it enters your mind that one does not observe the practices of ostracism during the Festival, the following a fortiori argument can be made: If, for one who has already been ostracized at the outset of the Festival, the Festival comes and overrides his observance of that status, is it reasonable that now we, the court, should ostracize he who does not listen to the judgment of the court during the Festival itself? Rather, it must be that one does observe the practices of ostracism, even during the Festival.

[31] Abaye said to him: There is no proof from here, as perhaps when the baraita states that the court judges cases, what it meant is that it deliberates in judgment on the Festival, but it does not actually reach a verdict. Therefore, the court never ostracizes someone during the Festival. Accordingly, there is no a fortiori argument proving that one observes the practices of ostracism during the Festival. Because if you do not say so, that the baraita is referring to deliberation, then in the cases of capital law that are taught, here too, would we put someone to death on the Festival?

[32] But if so, the judges would be prevented from rejoicing on the Festival, as it is taught in a baraita that Rabbi Akiva says: From where is it derived with regard to the Sanhedrin who put someone to death that they may not taste any food or drink for the entire rest of the day? The verse states: “You shall not eat with the blood” (Leviticus 19:26). It is not appropriate to eat during the same day that they caused bloodshed.

[33] Rather, the statement of the baraita, that the court judges cases of capital law, must be referring to deliberating in judgment and not actually reaching a verdict. Here too, in cases of monetary law and of lashes, it is referring to deliberating in judgment, without the possibility of ostracizing anyone during the Festival. Rav Yosef said to him: If so, if only deliberations are conducted during the Festival, you find a perversion of justice by delaying his verdict.

[34] Rather, the judges come in the morning as usual and deliberate in judgment. They then enter their homes and eat and drink all day, i.e., as much as they desire, in order to rejoice fully on the Festival. Then they come back to the courthouse close to sunset and complete his judgment, i.e., they dispense the verdict, and if necessary, they kill him. In this manner, they are not prevented from enjoying the Festival properly.

[35] Abaye said: Come and hear another support from a baraita: And it is the case with regard to one who is ostracized, that the Sages permitted him to get a haircut during the intermediate days of the Festival. This indicates that one who is ostracized need not observe the practices of ostracism during the Festival.

[36] Rava said: Is it taught in the baraita: That they permitted it, which would indicate that the Sages permitted all those who were ostracized to cut their hair on the intermediate days of the Festival? Rather, it is taught: They permitted him. This indicates that it is referring to an individual case, where one went and appeased his opposing litigant and the Sages came and released him from his decree of ostracism.

[37] § The Gemara asks a similar question: With regard to a leper, what is the halakha? Must he observe the practices of his leper status, or are they overridden by the mitzva to rejoice during the Festival? Abaye said: Come and hear a proof from a baraita: And both the nazirite and the leper who transfers from his state of ritual impurity to his new state of purity may shave on the intermediate days of the Festival. This implies that during the days of his impurity he must observe all of the ordinary practices, even during the Festival.

[38] The Gemara rejects this proof: The baraita is speaking employing the didactic style of: Needless to say. Needless to say, during the days of his impurity on the Festival, he does not observe the practices of ostracism. However, with regard to one who regains his state of purity during the intermediate days of the Festival, one might think that we should issue a decree that he not be permitted to shave, lest he delay sacrificing his offerings until the last day of the Festival, when it is prohibited to sacrifice offerings of an individual. Perhaps prohibiting him from shaving will prevent this possibility. Therefore, because one might have thought that shaving should be prohibited, the baraita teaches us that it is, in fact, permitted for him to shave during the intermediate days of the Festival.

[39] Rava said: Come and hear another source. The verse states: “And the leper in whom the plague is, his clothes shall be rent” (Leviticus 13:45). The extra emphasis of the phrase: “And the leper” comes to include the High Priest, teaching that all the halakhot of the leper apply to him. And the status of the High Priest during the entire year is like that of everyone on a Festival, as we learned in a mishna (Horayot 12b): The High Priest sacrifices animals when he has the status of an acute mourner, i.e., before the burial of a close relative who died, but he may not eat of the offering. Learn from it that a leper practices the customs of his leprosy during the Festival. The Gemara concludes: Indeed, learn from it that this is so.

[40] § The source for the halakha that it is prohibited for a mourner to receive a haircut is derived from the fact that the Merciful One states to the sons of Aaron: “Let not the hair of your heads go loose” (Leviticus 10:6). It was prohibited for them to let their hair grow long during their period of mourning over the death of their brothers, Nadav and Avihu. By inference, it is teaching that for everyone else, i.e., non-priests, it is prohibited to cut their hair during the period of mourning.

[41] The Gemara asks: What is the halakha governing those who are ostracized and lepers, with regard to a haircut? The Gemara answers: Come and hear that which was taught in a baraita: Those who are ostracized and lepers are prohibited from cutting their hair and laundering their clothes.

[42] It was further taught there: If one who is ostracized dies, the court places stones on his coffin. Rabbi Yehuda says: This does not mean that they pile up a heap of stones over him like the heap of stones that was placed over the grave of Achan (see Joshua 7:26). Rather, the court sends its agents, who place a large stone on his coffin as a symbolic gesture. This comes to teach you that anyone who is ostracized and dies while in his period of ostracism, without seeking to be released from it, the court places stones on his coffin.

43 § The Gemara continues: A mourner is obligated to wrap his head as a sign of mourning, covering his head and face. This is derived from the fact that the Merciful One says to Ezekiel, while he is in mourning: “And cover not your upper lip” (Ezekiel 24:17). God commands Ezekiel not to display outward signs of mourning, which proves by inference that everyone else is obligated to wrap their heads in this manner.

44 The Gemara asks: What is the halakha governing a person who is ostracized, with regard to wrapping of the head? Rav Yosef said: Come and hear that which was taught in a baraita about those who were fasting for rain and whose prayers were not answered: And they wrap themselves and sit as those who are ostracized and as mourners, until they are shown mercy from Heaven. This implies that those who are ostracized must wrap their heads like mourners. Abaye said to him: Perhaps one who is ostracized by Heaven is different, as that is more serious than being ostracized by an earthly court.

45 The Gemara continues and asks: What is the halakha in the case of a leper with regard to wrapping of the head? Come and hear a proof based upon the verse: “And he shall cover his upper lip” (Leviticus 13:45), from which it may be learned by inference that he is obligated to wrap his head. The Gemara concludes: Indeed, learn from here that this is the case.

46 § The Gemara moves on to another halakha: A mourner is prohibited from donning phylacteries. This is derived from the fact that the Merciful One says to Ezekiel, while he is in mourning: “Bind your headwear [pe’er] upon yourself” (Ezekiel 24:17). The word pe’er alludes to phylacteries. Ezekiel was unique in that he was commanded to put on phylacteries while in mourning, which proves by inference that everyone else is prohibited from doing so.

47 The Gemara asks: What is the halakha governing one who is ostracized, with regard to phylacteries? The dilemma shall stand unresolved. The Gemara proceeds to its next question: What is the halakha in the case of a leper with regard to phylacteries? The Gemara suggests: Come and hear a proof from the following baraita: The verse states: “And the leper” (Leviticus 13:45); as explained earlier, this comes to include the High Priest in all the halakhot of the leper. The verse states there: “His garments shall be perumim,” meaning that they shall be rent. The verse continues: “And his head shall be parua,” and this peria means only growing the hair long; this is the statement of Rabbi Eliezer.

48 Rabbi Akiva says: The meaning of these terms is derived through a verbal analogy. The verse states a form of the verb being, with regard to one’s head in the verse: “His head shall be,” teaching that a leper must perform a certain action with his head. And the verse states a form of the verb being with regard to a leper’s garment, in the verse: “His garment shall be.” Just as the term being stated with regard to his garment is referring to an object external to his body, so too, the term being used with regard to his head is referring to an object external to his body. The Gemara derives from this: What, is it not referring to phylacteries, and the verse teaches that it is prohibited for a leper to wear phylacteries?

49 Rav Pappa said: No, there is no proof from here, as the verse may be referring to a cap [kumta] or a scarf [sudara], which people wear on their heads. It is possible to explain that according to Rabbi Akiva, it is prohibited for a leper to wear such headwear because it is excessive adornment.

[50] § The Gemara continues: A mourner is prohibited from greeting others or being greeted. This is derived from the fact that the Merciful One says to Ezekiel: “Sigh in silence” (Ezekiel 24:17), implying that aside from what was absolutely essential, he was prohibited from speaking.

[51] The Gemara asks: What is the halakha governing one who is ostracized with regard to greeting others? Rav Yosef said: Come and hear a proof from a baraita dealing with those who were fasting for rain and whose prayers were not answered. These people were prohibited from greeting one another, as people who are reprimanded by the Omnipresent. This indicates that those who are ostracized must not greet each other, just as mourners may not greet each other. Abaye said to him: Perhaps one who is ostracized by Heaven is different, as that is more serious than being ostracized by an earthly court.

[52] The Gemara continues and asks: What is the halakha concerning a leper with regard to greeting others? The Gemara suggests: Come and hear a proof from the following baraita: The verse states: “And he shall cover his upper lip” (Leviticus 13:45). This means that his lips should be stuck together, that he should be like one who is ostracized and like a mourner, and he is prohibited from greeting others or being greeted. The Gemara concludes: Indeed, learn from this that this is so.

[53] The Gemara asks: If this is the case, then we should also resolve the question asked above with regard to one who is ostracized and say that such a person is prohibited from offering greetings. Rav Aḥa bar Pineḥas said in the name of Rav Yosef: Does it explicitly teach that a leper is prohibited from greeting others, like one who is ostracized? It teaches only that he should be treated like one who is ostracized and like a mourner, i.e., he should be like them with regard to other things, and that he is also prohibited from greeting others. This being the case, no proof can be derived from here with regard to whether or not one who is ostracized may offer greetings.

[54] § The Gemara moves on to a new topic: A mourner is prohibited from studying words of Torah. This prohibition is derived from the fact that the Merciful One says to Ezekiel: “Sigh in silence” (Ezekiel 24:17). Ezekiel was commanded to be silent and not discuss even Torah matters.

[55] The Gemara asks: What is the halakha concerning one who is ostracized with regard to speaking words of Torah? Rav Yosef said: Come and hear that which was taught in the following baraita: One who is ostracized may teach Torah to others, and others may teach him Torah. Similarly, he may be hired for work by others, and others may be hired by him.

[56] One who has been excommunicated, which is a more severe form of ostracism, may not teach Torah to others and others may not teach him. He may not be hired by others, and others may not be hired by him. However, he may study by himself, so that he will not interrupt his study entirely and forget everything he knows. And he may build a small store for his livelihood, so that he can earn enough money to cover his most basic needs, but not more.

[57] And Rav said: What is the small store referred to here? This is referring to selling water in the valley of Aravot, where no water was to be found. One selling water there could earn a small income. The Gemara concludes: Indeed, learn from this baraita that one who is ostracized is permitted to study Torah.

[58] The Gemara asks: What is the halakha with regard to a leper speaking words of Torah? The Gemara answers: Come and hear that which is taught in a baraita: It is written: “And you shall impart them to your children and your children’s children; the day that you stood before the Lord your God

in Horeb” (Deuteronomy 4:9–10). Just as there, the revelation at Sinai was in reverence, fear, and trembling, so too, here, in every generation, Torah must be studied in a similar fashion.

[59] From here the Sages stated: Zavim, lepers, and those who had intercourse with menstruating women despite their severe ritual impurity are permitted to read the Torah, Prophets, and Writings, and to study midrash, Talmud, halakhot, and aggada. But those who experienced a seminal emission are prohibited from doing so. The reason for this distinction is that the cases of severe impurity are caused by ailment or other circumstances beyond one’s control; as a result, they do not necessarily preclude a sense of reverence and awe as one studies Torah. However, a seminal emission usually occurs due to frivolity and a lack of reverence and awe, and it is therefore inappropriate for one who experiences a seminal emission to engage in matters of Torah. The Gemara concludes: Indeed, learn from this that a leper is permitted to study words of Torah.

[60] § The Gemara proceeds to discuss another issue: A mourner is prohibited from laundering his clothes, as it is written: “And Joab sent to Tekoa, and fetched from there a wise woman, and said to her, I pray you, feign yourself to be a mourner, and put on now mourning apparel, and do not anoint yourself with oil, but be as a woman that had a long time mourned for the dead” (II Samuel 14:2).

[61] The Gemara asks: What is the halakha concerning laundering with regard to those who are ostracized or lepers? Come and hear that which is taught in a baraita: Those who are ostracized or lepers are prohibited from cutting their hair or laundering their clothes. The Gemara concludes: Indeed, learn from here that they are prohibited from laundering their clothes.

[62] The Gemara continues: A mourner is obligated to rend his clothes. This is derived from the fact that the Merciful One says to the sons of Aaron: “Neither rend your clothes” (Leviticus 10:6), which proves by inference that everyone else, all other mourners, are obligated to rend their clothes.

[63] The Gemara asks: What is the halakha of rending clothes with regard to one who is ostracized? No answer is found, and the question shall stand unresolved.

[64] The Gemara continues: What is the halakha concerning a leper with regard to rending? Come and hear that which is taught in the following baraita: The verse states: “His garments shall be rent” (Leviticus 13:45), meaning that they shall be torn. The Gemara concludes: Indeed, learn from here that this is the case.

[65] § The Gemara moves to a different issue: A mourner is obligated to overturn his bed, so that he sleeps on the underside of it, as bar Kappara taught a baraita that states:

[66] God stated: I have placed the likeness of My image [deyokan] within humans, as they were created in My image, and owing to their sins I have overturned it, as when this person died the Divine image in him was removed. Therefore, you must also overturn your beds on account of this. The Gemara asks: What is the halakha governing one who was ostracized or a leper, with regard to overturning the bed? The Gemara has no answer, and the question shall stand unresolved.

[67] § The Gemara proceeds to the next topic: A mourner is prohibited from performing work, as it is written: “And I will turn your Festivals into mourning” (Amos 8:10). The Gemara infers: Just as a Festival is a time when it is prohibited to work, so too, a mourner is prohibited from performing work.

[68] The Gemara asks: What is the halakha concerning one who was ostracized with regard to the performance of work? Rav Yosef said: Come and hear that which is taught in the following baraita:

When the Sages said that the performance of work is prohibited on a communal fast due to lack of rain, they meant only that work is prohibited during the day of the fast, but during the night of the fast it is permitted. And you find a similar halakha with regard to a person who was ostracized and with regard to a mourner. What, is it not with regard to all of the prohibitions stated that the baraita says that they apply to one who was ostracized as well, including the prohibition to engage in work? The Gemara rejects this argument: No, this is referring to the rest of the prohibitions, but not to work.

69 The Gemara offers a different proof: Come and hear that which was taught in the following baraita: One who is ostracized may teach Torah to others, and others may teach him Torah. Similarly, he may be hired for work by others, and others may be hired by him. The Gemara concludes: Learn from here that it is permitted for one who is ostracized to engage in work. The Gemara asks: What is the halakha concerning a leper, with regard to the performance of work? An answer is not found, and the question shall stand unresolved.

70 § The Gemara discusses a different prohibition: A mourner is prohibited from bathing, as it is written: “And do not anoint yourself with oil, but be as a woman that had for a long time mourned for the dead” (II Samuel 14:2). And bathing is included in the category of anointing, as both activities have a similar goal, i.e., cleanliness.

71 The Gemara asks: What is the halakha concerning one who is ostracized with regard to bathing? Rav Yosef said: Come and hear that which was taught in the following baraita: When the Sages said that bathing is prohibited on a communal fast, they meant only that a person may not wash his entire body, but washing his face, his hands, and his feet is permitted. And you find a similar halakha with regard to a person who was ostracized and with regard to a mourner. What, is it not with regard to all the prohibitions stated in the baraita, including the prohibition against bathing, that they apply also to one who is ostracized? The Gemara rejects this argument: No, this is referring to the rest of the prohibitions, but not to bathing. The Gemara asks: What is the halakha concerning a leper with regard to bathing? An answer is not found, and the question shall stand unresolved.

72 § The Gemara moves to the next topic: A mourner is prohibited from wearing shoes. Since the Merciful One says to Ezekiel with regard to how his mourning rites should differ from the accepted custom: “And put your shoes upon your feet” (Ezekiel 24:17), which shows by inference that everyone else, i.e., all other mourners, is prohibited from wearing shoes.

73 The Gemara asks: What is the halakha concerning one who is ostracized with regard to wearing shoes? Rav Yosef said: Come and hear that which is taught in the following baraita: When the Sages said that wearing shoes is prohibited on a communal fast, they meant only that one may not wear shoes when he is walking about in the city, but if he set out to travel on the road, wearing shoes is permitted. How so? When he sets out on the road, he may put on his shoes. But as soon as he enters the city once again, he must take off his shoes and continue barefoot. And you find a similar halakha with regard to a person who was ostracized and with regard to a mourner. What, is it not with regard to all of the prohibitions stated in the baraita, including the prohibition against wearing shoes, that they apply also to one who was ostracized? The Gemara rejects this argument: No, this is referring to the rest of the prohibitions, but not to wearing shoes.

74 The Gemara asks: What is the halakha concerning a leper with regard to wearing shoes? No answer is found, and the question shall stand unresolved.

[75] § The Gemara considers another issue: A mourner is prohibited from engaging in sexual relations, as it is written: “And David comforted Bath-Sheba his wife, and went into her, and lay with her” (II Samuel 12:24), after their son had died. This proves by inference that initially, during the period of mourning, sexual relations were forbidden.

[76] The Gemara asks: What is the halakha concerning one who is ostracized with regard to sexual relations? Rav Yosef said: Come and hear that which is taught in a baraita: All those years that the Jewish people were in the wilderness they were ostracized, and yet they engaged in sexual relations, as there were children born to them during that period. It follows that it is permitted for one who is ostracized to engage in sexual relations. Abaye said to him: Perhaps one who is ostracized by Heaven is different, as that is less serious than being ostracized by an earthly court.

[77] The Gemara asks in astonishment: Is it less serious? But didn’t you, Abaye, say elsewhere that a decree of ostracism imposed by Heaven is more serious than one issued by an earthly court? For this reason, Abaye rejected several proofs of Rav Yosef from the previously cited baraita. The Gemara answers: Abaye is uncertain whether a decree of ostracism imposed by Heaven is more or less serious than one imposed by an earthly court. Therefore, when he goes in this direction he rejects the argument, and when he goes in that direction he rejects the argument. Abaye asserts that since the issue is in doubt, no proof can be derived from ostracism issued by Heaven.

[78] The Gemara continues: What is the halakha concerning a leper with regard to sexual relations? Come and hear a proof, as it is taught in a baraita: The verse concerning a leper states: “But he shall remain outside his tent seven days” (Leviticus 14:8), from which it is derived that a leper should be like one who is ostracized and like a mourner, and he is prohibited from engaging in sexual relations. How is this derived? The only meaning of the term “his tent” is his wife, as is stated after the giving of the Torah: “Go say to them, return again to your tents” (Deuteronomy 5:27). This statement rendered it permitted for the men to once again engage in sexual relations with their wives after they had previously been prohibited to do so in anticipation of the giving of the Torah, as expressed in the verse: “Come not near a woman” (Exodus 19:15). The Gemara concludes: Indeed, learn from this that it is prohibited for a leper to engage in sexual relations.

[79] The Gemara asks: If this is the case, then can we also resolve the question raised above with regard to one who is ostracized, by saying that it is prohibited for such a person to engage in sexual relations? Rav Huna, son of Rav Pineḥas, said in the name of Rav Yosef: Is it taught that a leper is prohibited from engaging in sexual relations like one who is ostracized? It states only that he should be treated like one who is ostracized and like a mourner, i.e., he should be like them with regard to other things, and in addition he is prohibited from engaging in sexual relations. Therefore, no proof can be derived from here with regard to one who is ostracized that he, too, is prohibited from engaging in sexual relations.

[80] § The Gemara continues: A mourner may not send his offerings to the Temple, as it is taught in a baraita: Rabbi Shimon says: A peace-offering [shelamim] is given this name also to teach us that one may sacrifice it only at a time when he is whole [shalem] and his mind is settled, but not at a time when he is an acute mourner, i.e., on the first day of his bereavement, when he is distressed.

[81] The Gemara asks: What is the halakha concerning one who is ostracized with regard to sending his offerings to the Temple? Rav Yosef said: Come and hear a proof from that which is taught in a baraita: All those years that the Jewish people were in the wilderness they were ostracized, and yet

they sent their offerings. Abaye said to him: Perhaps one who is ostracized by Heaven is different, as that is less serious than being ostracized by an earthly court.

[82] The Gemara asks in astonishment: Is it less serious? But certainly you, Abaye, said elsewhere that being ostracized by Heaven is more serious than being ostracized by an earthly court. The Gemara offers a resolution: Abaye is uncertain whether being ostracized by Heaven is more or less serious than being ostracized by an earthly court, and therefore he rejects Rav Yosef's arguments in both directions.

[83] The Gemara asks: What is the halakha with regard to a leper sending his offerings to the Temple? The Gemara answers: Come and hear a proof, as it is taught in a baraita with regard to a priest who became ritually impure: "And after he is purified, they shall count for him seven days" (Ezekiel 44:26). The verse should be understood as follows: "And after he is purified"; after he has separated from his deceased relative. "They shall count for him seven days"; these are the seven days of his counting before he may purify himself. "And on the day that he goes into the Sanctuary, into the inner court, to minister in the Sanctuary, he shall sacrifice his sin-offering, says the Lord God" (Ezekiel 44:27);

[84] this is the meal-offering of a tenth of an ephah of flour, which every priest would bring on the day he began serving in the Temple. But as long as he is ritually impure, whether because he had come into contact with a corpse or due to leprosy, he may not send his offerings to the Temple; this is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda.

[85] Rabbi Shimon says: The verse states: "And on the day that he goes into the Sanctuary, into the inner court, to minister in the Sanctuary he shall sacrifice his sin offering." This teaches that when he is fit to enter the Sanctuary, he is fit to sacrifice an offering. But when he is not fit to go into the Sanctuary, i.e., when he is ritually impure, he is not fit to sacrifice an offering. This implies that a leper may not send his offerings to the Temple to be sacrificed on the altar, as he himself is not fit to enter the Temple.

[86] § Having discussed some of the restrictions applying to a person who was ostracized, the Gemara explains some of the basic principles relating to ostracism: Rava said: From where do we derive that a court agent is sent to summon the defendant to appear before the court before he is ostracized? As it is written: "And Moses sent to call Dathan and Abiram, the sons of Eliab" (Numbers 16:12). And from where do we derive that we summon the defendant, that he himself must appear before the court? As it is written: "And Moses said to Korah: Be you and all your congregation before the Lord, you and they, and Aaron, tomorrow" (Numbers 16:16).

[87] From where is it derived that the defendant must be told that he is being summoned to appear before a great man? As it is written: "And Moses said to Korah: Be you and all your congregation before the Lord" (Numbers 16:16). From where is it derived that the summons must mention the names of both parties: You and so-and-so, the plaintiff? As it is written: "You, and they, and Aaron" (Numbers 16:16). From where is it derived that we set a date for the court proceedings? As it is written: "Tomorrow" (Numbers 16:16). From where is it derived that a second date must be set after the first date, if the defendant did not heed the first summons? As it is written: "They did cry there, Pharaoh, king of Egypt is but a noise; he has passed the time appointed…Surely as Tabor is among the mountains, and as Carmel by the sea, so shall he come" (Jeremiah 46:17). Although a time had been appointed and it had passed, it was not canceled entirely but pushed off to a later date.

[88] And from where do we derive that if the summoned person behaves disrespectfully toward the agent of the court, and the agent comes back and reports his conduct, that this is not considered slander? As it is written: “Will you put out the eyes of these men?” (Numbers 16:14). Dathan and Abiram spoke these words to the messenger that Moses had sent to them, and the messenger reported them back to Moses.

[89] And from where do we derive that we ostracize one who does not obey a court summons? As it is written: “Curse Meroz” (Judges 5:23), who was ostracized for not coming to battle after having been summoned. From where is it derived that the ostracized person must be told that it was the decision of a great man to ostracized him? As it is written: “Curse Meroz, said the messenger of the Lord” (Judges 5:23). And from where do we derive that, if he fails to mend his ways, we excommunicate such a person more harshly, putting him under the most severe form of excommunication? As it is written: “Curse Meroz…curse bitterly its inhabitants” (Judges 5:23), implying that one curse is followed by another, i.e., lesser ostracism is followed by harsh excommunication.

[90] From where is it derived that the curse applies to anyone who eats or drinks with, or stands within, four cubits of the ostracized person? As it is written: “Curse bitterly its inhabitants” (Judges 5:23), in reference to all those sitting together with Meroz. And from where do we derive that we detail his sin in public? As it is written: “Curse bitterly its inhabitants, because they did not come to the help of the Lord” (Judges 5:23).

[91] And Ulla said: Barak ostracized Meroz with the blowing of four hundred shofarot due to his failure to come. As for the identification of Meroz, some say that he was a great man and that he was ostracized because he did not join in the war effort. And others say that the reference is to a star and not a human being, and that it did not aid the Jewish people in their battle, as it is stated: “The stars fought from heaven; in their courses they fought against Sisera,” (Judges 5:20). This star, which did not help the Jewish people, was cursed.

[92] And from where do we derive that the court may declare the property of one who does not obey its orders as ownerless? As it is written: “And that whoever would not come within three days, according to the counsel of the princes and the Elders, all his substance shall be forfeited [yaḥoram] and himself separated from the congregation of the exiles” (Ezra 10:8). “Shall be forfeited” is referring to excommunication.

[93] And from where do we derive that we may contend with such a person, and curse him, and beat him, and pull out his hair, and make him take an oath in order to prevent him from sinning? As it is written: “And I contended with them, and cursed them, and beat some of them, and pulled out their hair, and made them take oath by God” (Nehemiah 13:25).

[94] And from where do we derive that we may shackle his hands and feet, chain him, and apply pressure? As it is written: “Whether it be for death, or for banishment [lishroshi], or for confiscation of goods, or for imprisonment” (Ezra 7:26). The Gemara asks: What is the meaning of the word “lishroshi,” translated here as banishment? Adda Mari said that Neḥemya bar Baruch said that Rav Ḥiyya bar Avin said that Rav Yehuda said: This is pressure. Since this expression is also unclear, the Gemara asks: What is pressure? Rav Yehuda, son of Rav Shmuel bar Sheilat, said in the name of Rav that this term refers to the following series of actions: They ostracize him immediately, and then once again after thirty days, and if he still does not repent, they excommunicate him after sixty days.

[95] Rav Huna bar Ḥinnana said to him: Rav Ḥisda said as follows: Before excommunicating a person, the court warns him three times, on Monday, Thursday, and the following Monday. The Gemara notes: This applies in a case where one ignores a monetary judgment that was issued against him. He is warned three times that he must repay his debt. But in a case where one behaves disrespectfully toward a Torah scholar, he is immediately ostracized.

[96] § The Gemara relates that a certain butcher behaved disrespectfully toward Rav Tuvi bar Mattana. Abaye and Rava were appointed to the case and ostracized him. In the end the butcher went and appeased his disputant, Rav Tuvi. Abaye said: What should we do in this case? Shall he be released from his decree of ostracism? His decree of ostracism has not yet been in effect for the usual thirty days. On the other hand, shall he not be released from ostracism? But the Sages wish to enter his shop and purchase meat, and they are presently unable to do so. What, then, is the most appropriate course of action?

[97] He said to Rav Idi bar Avin: Have you heard anything with regard to such a case? Rav Idi bar Avin said to Abaye: Rav Taḥlisa bar Avimi said that Shmuel said as follows: A shofar blast at the time of the ostracism makes it binding, and a shofar blast releases it. In other words, the shofar should be sounded now, as it had been sounded when the decree of ostracism was pronounced, and it should be canceled, although thirty days have not passed. Abaye said to him: This applies in a case where one ignores a monetary judgment that was issued against him; but in a case where one behaves disrespectfully, there must be no release until the decree of ostracism has been in effect for thirty days.

[98] The Gemara comments: Apparently, Abaye maintains that if three people ostracized one, three others may not come and release him. This is derived from the fact that Abaye was concerned about releasing the butcher from ostracism and did not delegate the task to someone else.

[99] As a dilemma was raised before the Sages: If three people ostracized someone, what is the halakha with regard to three others coming and releasing him from his decree of ostracism? The Gemara suggests: Come and hear a proof from that which is taught in a baraita: One who was ostracized by the teacher of Torah for having acted disrespectfully toward him is considered ostracized with regard to the student, and the latter must keep his distance from him. However, one who was ostracized by the student is not considered ostracized with regard to the teacher.

[100] One who was ostracized by his own city is considered ostracized with regard to another city. However, one who was ostracized by another city is not considered ostracized with regard to his own city. One who was ostracized by the Nasi of the Sanhedrin is considered ostracized with regard to all the Jewish people; but one who was ostracized by all the Jewish people is not considered ostracized with regard to the Nasi of the Sanhedrin. Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel says: If one of the students sitting as a judge on the court had ostracized someone, and he died before releasing him from the decree of ostracism, his portion of the decree of ostracism is not nullified.

[101] The Gemara says: Learn three halakhot from this baraita. Learn from this that in the case of a student who ostracizes someone due to an insult to his dignity and not because the ostracized person was guilty of some transgression, his decree of ostracism is valid. Were the case one where one was ostracized due to sin, everyone is required to respect the decree of ostracism, even the student’s teacher. And learn from this that each and every one who participated in the decree of ostracism nullifies his own portion of the decree of ostracism, as the baraita speaks of: His portion. And learn

from this that if three people ostracized another person, three other people may not come and nullify the decree of ostracism. Were this not the case, it wouldn't matter if a certain person's portion was not nullified. His portion could be nullified by someone else.

[102] Ameimar said: The halakha is that if three people ostracize another person, three others may come and nullify the decree of ostracism. Rav Ashi said to Ameimar: But isn't it taught in a baraita: Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel says: If one of the students had ostracized another person, and he died before releasing him from the decree of ostracism, his portion is not nullified? What, is it not that it is not nullified at all, i.e., it cannot be nullified by another person? The Gemara rejects this argument: No, this means that the decree of ostracism remains in force until three other people come and nullify it.

[103] § The Sages taught the following baraita: Ostracism does not apply for less than a period of thirty days, and admonition, which is less severe than ostracism, does not apply for less than a period of seven days. And although there is no proof with regard to the matter, i.e., the standard duration of admonition, there is an allusion to the matter, as it is stated: "If her father had but spit in her face, should she not be ashamed for seven days?" (Numbers 12:14). This implies that admonition lasts for seven days.

[104] Rav Ḥisda said: Our decree of ostracism in Babylonia has the power of their admonition in Eretz Yisrael. Since the authorities in Eretz Yisrael are ordained with the title Rabbi, their admonition carries more weight than a decree of ostracism issued in Babylonia. The Gemara asks: Is their admonition in Eretz Yisrael only seven days and no more? But isn't it related that Rabbi Shimon, son of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, and bar Kappara were sitting and studying, and they posed a difficulty with a certain halakha. Rabbi Shimon said to bar Kappara: This issue requires my father, Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, to explain it. Bar Kappara said to Rabbi Shimon, somewhat mockingly: And what can your father, Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, say about this issue? What can he add and teach us about it?

[105] Rabbi Shimon went and told his father, Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, what bar Kappara had said, and Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi became angry with him. When bar Kappara came at some later point to visit, Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi said to him: Bar Kappara, I do not know you at all. Bar Kappara understood that Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi had taken his statement to heart, i.e., was insulted. He subsequently behaved as if he had been admonished, as a self-imposed punishment, for thirty days.

[106] Once again, on another occasion, Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi decreed that students not be taught in the marketplace but only in a study hall. What verse did he expound to serve as the basis for this decree? The verse states: "Your rounded thighs are like jewels, the work of the hands of an artist" (Song of Songs 7:2). Just as a thigh is ordinarily hidden and kept covered with clothes,

[107] so too, the words of Torah, which are "the work of the hands of an artist," i.e., God, must remain hidden in the study hall.

[108] Despite Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi's decree, Rabbi Ḥiyya went out and taught his two nephews, Rav and Rabba bar bar Ḥana, in the marketplace. Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi heard what he had done and became angry with him. When Rabbi Ḥiyya came at some later date to visit him, Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi mockingly said to him: Iyya, who is calling you outside? By asking this question Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi was intimating that Rabbi Ḥiyya should leave his house. Rabbi Ḥiyya understood that Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi had taken the matter to heart and was insulted, and so he conducted himself as if he had been admonished, as a self-imposed punishment, for thirty days.

[109] On the thirtieth day, Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi sent him a message, saying: Come and visit me. However, he later reversed his opinion and sent him another message, telling him not to come.

[110] The Gemara asks: At the outset what did he hold, and ultimately what did he hold? Initially, Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi held that the legal status of part of the day is like that of an entire day, and since the thirtieth day already begun, Rabbi Ḥiyya's time of admonition had ended. But ultimately he held that with regard to this issue we do not say that the legal status of part of the day is like that of an entire day.

[111] In the end Rabbi Ḥiyya came on that same day. Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi asked him: Why have you come? Rabbi Ḥiyya responded: Because you, Master, sent me a message that I should come. He said to him: But I sent you a second message that you should not come. He responded: This messenger that you sent, i.e., the first one, I saw him and I did as he said, but that messenger, i.e., the second one, I did not see. Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi read the verse about Rabbi Ḥiyya: "When a man's ways please the Lord, He makes even his enemies to be at peace with him" (Proverbs 16:7), as it was clear to him that Rabbi Ḥiyya had merited divine assistance.

[112] § Concerning the issue with which the entire incident had begun, Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi asked Rabbi Ḥiyya: What is the reason that you, the Master, acted as you did, ignoring my instructions not to teach Torah in the marketplace? Rabbi Ḥiyya said to him: As it is written: "Wisdom cries aloud in the streets" (Proverbs 1:20), which implies that Torah should be publicized in the streets. Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi said to him: If you read this verse once, you certainly did not read it a second time in greater depth; and if you read it a second time, you certainly did not read it a third time; and if you read it a third time, then it was not adequately explained to you, as it is clear that you do not understand it properly.

[113] The words: "Wisdom cries aloud in the streets," should be understood in accordance with the opinion of Rava. As Rava said: With regard to everyone who occupies himself with Torah study inside the privacy of his home, his Torah knowledge will proclaim his greatness outside, as it will be revealed to the masses and they will see his greatness.

[114] The Gemara asks: But isn't it written: "From the beginning I have not spoken in secret" (Isaiah 48:16), implying that the Torah should be taught and proclaimed in public? The Gemara answers: That verse is referring to the days of the kalla, the gathering for Torah study held during Elul and Adar, when many people come to listen to Torah discourses. During this time, it is not only permitted but even recommended to teach Torah to the masses. In this way, the verse can be explained in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi.

[115] The Gemara asks: And what did Rabbi Ḥiyya do with this verse: "Your rounded thighs are like jewels"? How did he understand it? This verse implies that the Torah must be kept hidden in the study hall and not publicized in the marketplace. The Gemara explains: He interprets it not as a reference to Torah, but as referring to acts of charity and loving-kindness, which should certainly be performed in private.

[116] This incident demonstrates that, apparently, admonition of those who live in Eretz Yisrael lasts for thirty days and not for seven days. The Gemara answers that this is not a conclusive proof, since Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi was the Nasi. The admonition of the Nasi of the Sanhedrin is different i.e., more severe, than the admonition of anyone else.

117 The Gemara asks: And how long is our admonition in Babylonia? The Gemara answers: It is only one day, as in the case involving Shmuel and the Exilarch Mar Ukva. When they would sit and study halakha, Mar Ukva would sit before Shmuel at a distance of four cubits as a sign of respect. Mar Ukva would conduct himself as though Shmuel were his teacher because Shmuel was much greater than him in Torah matters. And when they would sit together in judgment, Shmuel would sit before Mar Ukva at a distance of four cubits because Mar Ukva was the Exilarch and the chief judge. But they would lower a place for Mar Ukva in the matting upon which he sat, and he would sit on it so that he could hear Shmuel's words of Torah even when they were engaged in judgment.

118 Every day, Mar Ukva would accompany Shmuel to his lodgings, in the manner that a student would show honor toward his teacher. One day, Mar Ukva was so heavily preoccupied with a case that had been brought before him for judgment that he did not realize that Shmuel was walking behind him to show him respect due to his position as the Exilarch. When Mar Ukva reached his home, Shmuel said to him: Is it not enough for you that I accompanied you until here? Release me, Master, from my obligation, so that I may return home. Mar Ukva understood that Shmuel had taken the matter to heart and was insulted. Therefore, he conducted himself as if he had been admonished, for one day as a self-imposed punishment.

119 It was related that a certain woman was sitting alongside a path with her leg extended while she was sifting barley. A Torah scholar passed by her on this path, but she did not yield to him and move her leg to make room for him. He said: How rude is that woman! The woman came before Rav Naḥman to ask if this statement should be deemed as excommunication. He said to her: Did you hear the word excommunication explicitly issue from his mouth? She said to him: No. He said to her: If this is the case, then go and observe an admonition for one day, as it appears that the Torah scholar sought only to admonish you.

120 § Zutra bar Toviyya was once reading the portion of the Bible before Rav Yehuda. When he reached the verse: "Now these are the last words of David" (II Samuel 23:1), Zutra bar Toviyya said to Rav Yehuda: If it is written that these are the last of David's words, by inference there are first words as well. If this is the case, what are these first words of David? Prior to this, it mentions only David's song, but not his words.

121 Rav Yehuda remained silent and said nothing to him. Zutra bar Toviyya thought that Rav Yehuda did not hear what he had said, so he then said to him a second time: If it is written that these are the last of David's words, by inference there are first words as well. If this is the case, what are these first words of David? He said to him: What do you think? Do you think that anyone who does not know the meaning of this verse is not a great man? Why are you stressing the fact that I do not know the answer to your question? Zutra bar Toviyya understood that Rav Yehuda had taken the matter to heart and was insulted. Therefore, he conducted himself as if had been admonished for one day as a self-imposed punishment.

122 The Gemara asks: But now that we have come to discuss this issue, since the verse mentions David's last words, by inference there are also first words. What then are these first words of David? The Gemara answers: The first words are: "And David spoke to the Lord the words of this song in the day that the Lord delivered him out of the hand of his enemies, and out of the hand of Saul" (II Samuel 22:1), as that song is also referred to as words.

123 The Gemara elaborates: The Holy One, Blessed be He, said to David: David, do you recite a song over the fall of Saul? Had you been Saul and he were David, then I would have destroyed many Davids before him. Although I decreed that Saul's kingdom would not continue, as an individual he was far greater and more important than you.

124 The response to this admonishment is found in the verse, as it is written: "Shiggaion of David, which he sang to the Lord, concerning the words of Cush the Benjaminite" (Psalms 7:1). Is Cush his name? Saul is his name. Rather, this is a designation that indicates: Just as a Cushite, a native of the ancient kingdom of Cush in eastern Africa, is distinguished by his dark skin, so too, Saul was distinguished by his actions, as he was absolutely righteous and performed many good deeds. Therefore, David uses the word shiggaion as an allusion to the error [shegia] that he had made when he sang a song of praise over Saul's downfall.

125 The Gemara notes: Similarly, you can explain the verse: "And Miriam and Aaron spoke against Moses due to the Cushite woman whom he had married, for he had taken a Cushite woman" (Numbers 12:1). But is her name Cushite? Zipporah is her name. Rather, just as a Cushite is distinguished by his dark skin, so too, Zipporah was distinguished by her actions. The Gemara continues: Similarly, you can explain the verse: "Now when Ebed-Melech the Cushite heard" (Jeremiah 38:7). Is his name Cushite? Zedekiah is his name. Rather, just as a Cushite is distinguished by his dark skin, so too, Zedekiah was distinguished by his righteous actions.

126 Similarly, you can explain the verse: "Are you not as much Mine as the children of the Cushites, O children of Israel?" (Amos 9:7). Is their name Cushite? Israel is their name. Rather, just as a Cushite is distinguished by his dark skin, so too, the Jewish people are distinguished by their actions, and they are different from all the other nations.

127 § Having mentioned the last words of David, the Gemara continues to explain other expressions in that passage. Rabbi Shmuel bar Naḥmani said in the name of Rabbi Yonatan: What is the meaning of that which is written: "The saying of David, son of Yishai, and the saying of the man who was raised up on high [al]" (II Samuel 23:1)? It means as follows: The saying of David, son of Yishai, who raised the yoke of [ulla] repentance, as through his actions he taught the power of repentance. The word al, on high, and the word ulla are comprised of the same consonants in Hebrew.

128 The passage continues: "The God of Israel said, the Rock of Israel spoke to me, He that rules over men must be righteous, ruling in the fear of God" (II Samuel 23:3). The Gemara asks: What is this verse saying? What does it mean? Rabbi Abbahu said: This is what the verse is saying: The God of Israel said, the Rock of Israel spoke to me: Although I rule over man, who rules over Me? It is a righteous person. How is it possible to say that a righteous person rules over God, as it were? As I, God, issue a decree and the righteous person nullifies it.

129 Similarly, the verse states there: "These are the names of David's warriors; Josheb-Basshebeth a Tahchemonite, chief of the captains; the same was Adino the Eznite; he raised his spear against eight hundred, whom he slew at one time" (II Samuel 23:8). The Gemara asks: What is this verse saying? Rabbi Abbahu said: This is what the verse is saying: These are the names of the mighty actions of David. These expressions should not be read as names of people but instead as descriptions of David's good deeds.

130 Josheb-Basshebeth [yoshev bashevet] indicates that when David would sit [yoshev] in the study hall, he would not sit upon pillows and cushions, as an important person ordinarily would. Rather, he

would sit on the ground like one of the students. For as long as David's teacher, Ira the Jairite, was alive, Ira would teach the Sages while sitting on pillows and cushions. When Ira passed away, David would teach the Sages, and he did this while sitting on the ground. They said to him: Master, you should sit upon pillows and blankets. He did not accept their suggestions, since in his humility he did not wish to appear as the teacher of the Jewish people.

[131] In this verse, David is described as "a Tahchemonite [taḥkemoni]." Rav said: The Holy One, Blessed be He, said to him: Since you have humbled yourself, be you now like Me [tehe kamoni]. How so? As I issue a decree, and you, owing to your righteousness, may nullify it.

[132] David is also described here as "chief of the captains [rosh hashalishim]" because God said to him: You will be the head [rosh] of the three [sheloshet] Patriarchs. "The same was Adino the Eznite"; this alludes to the fact that when David would sit and occupy himself with Torah, he would make himself soft [me'aden] as a worm, and when he would go out to war, he would make himself hard and strong as a tree [etz].

[133] The expression: "Against eight hundred people, which he slew at one time," means that he would throw an arrow in the air and with it kill eight hundred people at one time. And David would sigh over the two hundred who were missing from fulfillment of the Torah's promise, as it is written: "How should one man chase a thousand" (Deuteronomy 32:30).

[134] A Divine Voice issued forth and said by way of explanation as to why the promise was not entirely fulfilled: "Because David did that which was right in the eyes of the Lord, and turned not aside from anything that He commanded him all the days of his life, save only the matter of Uriah the Hittite" (I Kings 15:5). Had David not committed this sin, then all of the promises mentioned in the Torah would have been fulfilled in their entirety through him.

[135] The Gemara returns to the halakhot of ostracism and mentions that Rabbi Tanḥum, son of Rabbi Ḥiyya, of the village of Akko, said that Rabbi Ya'akov bar Aḥa said that Rabbi Simlai said, and some say that this tradition was transmitted in the following manner: Rabbi Tanḥum said that Rav Huna said, and others say that Rav Huna himself made this statement without the chain of transmission:

[136] If a student ostracized someone else due to an insult to his dignity, and not because the ostracized person was guilty of some transgression, his decree of ostracism is valid, as it is taught in a baraita: One who is ostracized by the teacher is considered ostracized with regard to the student. However, one who is ostracized by the student is not considered ostracized with regard to the teacher. The Gemara attempts to draw an inference from a careful reading of this baraita: He is not considered ostracized with regard to the teacher, which implies that he is considered ostracized with regard to everyone else.

[137] The Gemara clarifies the case: For what reason was he ostracized? If it was for a matter relating to Heaven, i.e., because he sinned, then why, if he was ostracized by the student, should he not be considered ostracized with regard to the teacher? Doesn't the verse state: "There is no wisdom or understanding or counsel against the Lord" (Proverbs 21:30)? This means that when a sin is committed and God's name is desecrated, all other considerations are ignored, even the eminence and knowledge of the teacher, and therefore he too must treat the offender as ostracized. Rather, is it not that the Gemara is referring to a case where the student ostracized the other person due to an insult to his own dignity? Therefore, it is apparent that his decree of ostracism is valid and binding upon all, with the exception of his teacher.

[138] Rav Yosef said: A Torah scholar may execute judgment for himself with regard to a matter about which he is certain, and he is not required to first go to court and have the case decided for him. The same applies when another person behaves in a disrespectful manner toward him; he is permitted to go ahead on his own and ostracize him.

[139] There was a certain Torah scholar who gained a bad reputation due to rumors about his conduct. Rav Yehuda said: What should be done? To excommunicate him is not an option. The Sages need him, as he is a great Torah authority. Not to excommunicate him is also not an option, as then the name of Heaven would be desecrated.

[140] Rav Yehuda said to Rabba bar bar Ḥana: Have you heard anything with regard to this issue? He said to him: Rabbi Yoḥanan said as follows: What is the meaning of that which is written: “For the priest’s lips should keep knowledge, and they should seek Torah at his mouth; for he is a messenger [malakh] of the Lord of hosts” (Malachi 2:7)? This verse teaches: If the teacher is similar to an angel [malakh] of the Lord, then seek Torah from his mouth, but if he is not pure and upright, then do not seek Torah from his mouth; even if he is knowledgeable about Torah, do not learn from him.

[141] Based on this statement, Rav Yehuda ostracized that Torah scholar. In the end, after some time had passed, Rav Yehuda took ill and was on the verge of death. The Sages came to inquire about his well-being, and the ostracized scholar came along with them as well. When Rav Yehuda saw him, that scholar, he laughed.

[142] The ostracized scholar said to him: Was it not enough that you excommunicated that man, i.e., me, but now you even laugh at me? Rav Yehuda said to him: I was not laughing at you; rather, I am happy as I go to that other world that I did not flatter even a great man like you, but instead I treated you fairly in accordance with the halakha.

[143] Rav Yehuda died. The ostracized scholar came to the study hall and said to the Sages: Release me from the decree of ostracism. The Sages said to him: There is no man here as eminent as Rav Yehuda who can release you from the ostracism. Rather, go to Rabbi Yehuda Nesia in Eretz Yisrael, as only he can release you. That scholar came before Rabbi Yehuda Nesia. Rabbi Yehuda Nesia said to Rabbi Ami: Go and examine his case. If it is necessary to release him from his decree of ostracism, release him on my behalf.

[144] Rabbi Ami examined his case and thought at first to release him from his ostracism. But Rabbi Shmuel bar Naḥmani rose up on his feet and said: If the maidservant in the house of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi once ostracized another person, and the Sages did not relate frivolously to her decree of ostracism and did not revoke it until three years had passed, all the more so, with regard to a decree of ostracism placed by Yehuda our colleague, we must take it seriously and not release this scholar.

[145] Rabbi Zeira said: What caused this Elder, Rabbi Shmuel bar Naḥmani, to come before us in the study hall today though for many years he did not come, and now he comes precisely during this discussion. Learn from this that it is not necessary to release him from his decree of ostracism, as this combination of events is certainly not a coincidence. Rather, it should be viewed as an instructive sign from Heaven. Consequently, Rabbi Ami did not release him from the ostracism, and the ostracized scholar left in tears.

[146] A wasp came and stung the ostracized scholar on his penis and he died. Because he was a great Torah scholar, they took him into the caves in which the pious are interred in order to bury him there,

but the caves did not accept him. A snake stood at the entrance of the caves and did not let them pass. They then took him into the caves of the judges, and they accepted him.

147 The Gemara asks: What is the reason that he was accepted there? The Gemara answers: Even though he sinned, he still acted in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Ilai, as it is taught in a baraita: Rabbi Ilai says: If a person sees that his evil inclination is gaining control over him and he cannot overcome it, then he should go to a place where he is not known. He should wear black, and he should wrap his head in black, as if he were a mourner. Perhaps these changes will influence him, so that he not sin. Even if these actions do not help, he should at least do as his heart desires in private and not desecrate the name of Heaven in public. Although this person had sinned, he did so in private and in a manner that did not publicly desecrate God's name, and therefore it was fitting that he be given an honorable burial.

148 The Gemara asks: What is the story mentioned by Rabbi Shmuel bar Naḥmani involving the maidservant in the house of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi? It was related that the maidservant in Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi's house saw a certain man who was striking his adult son. She said: Let that man be excommunicated, due to the fact that he has transgressed the injunction: "You shall not place a stumbling block before the blind" (Leviticus 19:14), as it is taught in a baraita that the verse states: "You shall not place a stumbling block before the blind," and the verse speaks here of one who strikes his adult son, as the son is likely to become angry and strike his father back, thereby transgressing the severe prohibition against hitting one's parent.

149 Similarly, it was related that Reish Lakish was guarding an orchard for payment when a certain man came and ate some figs that were growing there. Reish Lakish raised his voice and yelled at him, but this man paid no attention to him and kept eating. Reish Lakish said: Let that man be in a state of excommunication. The man eating the figs said to him: On the contrary, let that man, i.e., Reish Lakish, be in a state of excommunication, for even if I have become liable to you for payment, as I have eaten of the figs without permission, have I become liable to you for excommunication? With that statement, the man left.

150 Reish Lakish went to the study hall to inquire about the halakha with regard to this man. The other Sages said to him: His decree of ostracism is valid, but your decree of ostracism is not. In other words, that man was correct and Reish Lakish should not have ostracized him in response to his actions.

151 Reish Lakish then asked: If so, what is the remedy for this decree of ostracism? The Sages answered him: Go to him so that he may release you from it. Reish Lakish replied: I do not know him. They said to him: Go then to the Nasi, so that he may release you from the ban, as it is taught in a baraita: If one was ostracized, but he does not know who ostracized him, he should go to the Nasi, and the Nasi may release him from his decree of ostracism.

152 The Gemara continues: Rav Huna said that in Usha it was enacted: If the president of the court sinned, he is not ostracized. Although this would be the appropriate punishment, he is not ostracized, so as not to cause a desecration of God's name. Rather, they say to him the words of the verse: "Keep your honor and stay at home" (II Kings 14:10). That is to say, to preserve your dignity, it would be best if you were to stay at home, resign your position, and refrain from further public appearances. If he sins again, he is ostracized, due to the desecration of God's name that would ensue were people to think that he was spared his rightful punishment due to his high position.

153 The Gemara comments: This opinion disagrees with that of Reish Lakish, for Reish Lakish said: If a Torah scholar sins, he is not ostracized at all in public, as it is stated: “Therefore, shall you fall in the day, and the prophet also shall fall with you in the night” (Hosea 4:5). This is explained to mean: If a prophet or any other important person sins, his offense should be concealed like the night and not punished in public.

154 With regard to this issue, it was related that when a Torah scholar would become liable to be punished with excommunication before Mar Zutra the Pious, Mar Zutra would first excommunicate himself as a mark of respect for the Torah scholar, and afterward he would ostracize the Torah scholar. This self-imposed excommunication was meant only as a show of honor to the other Torah scholar, and therefore when Mar Zutra would enter his house of lodging, he would release his own excommunication, and afterward he would release the other’s excommunication.

155 Rav Giddel said that Rav said: A Torah scholar may ostracize himself, and he may similarly release himself from self-imposed ostracism. Rav Pappa said: I have good coming to me, for I am praiseworthy, as I have never ostracized a Torah scholar. The Gemara asks about this: If so, when a Torah scholar was liable to be ostracized, what would he do? The Gemara answers: He did as they do in the West, Eretz Yisrael, where they appoint a court to give a Torah scholar lashes, but they do not appoint a court to ostracize him. That is to say, lashes were preferred over ostracism.

156 The Gemara proceeds with a discussion that explains the severity of the punishment of excommunication: What is the meaning of the word excommunication [shamta]? Rav said: This word is a contraction of the expression there is death [sham mita], alluding to the deathly aspect of excommunication. And Shmuel said: Shamta means that he will be a desolation [shemama yiheyeh], and it is effective upon him like fat smeared on an oven. Just as some of the fat will always remain absorbed in the walls of the oven, so too some aspect of the curse contained in the excommunication will continue to adhere to him even after the excommunication has been nullified.

157 The Gemara comments: And this opinion disagrees with the opinion of Reish Lakish, for Reish Lakish said: Just as ostracism enters the two hundred and forty-eight organs of one’s body when it is first pronounced, so too when it leaves, it leaves from his two hundred and forty-eight organs.

158 The following allusion is offered in support of the opinion of Reish Lakish: When it enters, it enters all the organs, as it is written: “And the city shall be a curse [ḥerem]” (Joshua 6:17), and the numerical value [gimatriyya] of the word ḥerem, a concept similar to ostracism, is two hundred and forty-eight. Therefore, the verse alludes to the fact that a decree of ostracism penetrates one’s two hundred and forty-eight organs. When it leaves, it leaves all the organs, as it is written: “In wrath remember mercy [raḥem]” (Habakkuk 3:2), and the numerical value of the word raḥem is also two hundred and forty-eight, thereby teaching that when the decree of ostracism is revoked, it disappears entirely.

159 The Gemara continues discussing the power of a ban. Rav Yosef said: Cast an excommunication on the tail of a dog and it, the excommunication, will do its work and harm the dog. It was related that there was a certain dog that would eat the shoes of the Sages, and they did not know who it was causing this damage. They thought that it was a person, and so they excommunicated whoever was doing it. Soon thereafter, the dog’s tail caught fire and got burnt. This shows that excommunication can have a harmful effect even on a dog.

[160] It was further related that there was a violent person who caused suffering to a certain Torah scholar. This Torah scholar came before Rav Yosef to ask what he should do. Rav Yosef said to him: Go and ostracize him. This Torah scholar said to him: I am afraid of him, that he will harass me even more.

[161] Rav Yosef said to him: Take out, i.e., publish a written ostracism against him. The Torah scholar said to him: All the more so I am fearful of him, for if I publicize the matter he will certainly come after me. Rav Yosef said to him to do as follows: Take the written ostracism and place it in a jug,

[162] and set it down in a cemetery, where nobody is found, and sound a thousand, i.e., many, shofar blasts over the course of forty days. That man went and did this. The jug burst and the violent man died. The Gemara asks: What is the reason that shofarot are sounded when a decree of ostracism is pronounced? The shofarot allude to the fact that they extract punishment [shenifra'in] from the excommunicated person.

[163] The Gemara asks further: What is the reason that broken blasts are sounded on the shofar when the excommunication is pronounced? Rav Yitzḥak, son of Rav Yehuda, said: It breaks tall buildings, i.e., a decree of ostracism can harm and break even the high and mighty, as it is taught in a baraita: Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel said: Wherever it says that the Sages set their eyes in anger upon a particular person, it causes either death or poverty.

[164] § It is taught in the mishna: And the nazirite whose term of naziriteship ended on the intermediate days of a Festival, and the leper who needs to purify himself on the intermediate days and must shave his entire body in order to leave his state of ritual impurity and regain his ritual purity, these people are permitted to cut their hair on the intermediate days of the Festival because they were not able to do so on the eve of the Festival. Rabbi Yirmeya raised a question before Rabbi Zeira: Is this allowance limited to the case where they did not have the time to cut their hair before the Festival, as it was prohibited for them to do so beforehand? Or perhaps they may cut their hair even in a case where they had the time to do so beforehand.

[165] He said to him: We already learned this in a baraita: With regard to all those about whom the Sages said that they are permitted to cut their hair on the intermediate days of a Festival, they may do so only if they did not have time to cut their hair before the Festival. But if they had time before the Festival began, then they are prohibited from doing so.

[166] However, a nazirite and a leper, even if they had the time to do so before the Festival, they are permitted to cut their hair. Why are they granted this special allowance? So that they will not delay bringing their offerings. Both a nazirite and a leper must cut their hair before sacrificing their offerings in completion of their purification process. Therefore, if they are not permitted to cut their hair, they will not be able to sacrifice their offerings at the proper time.

[167] In was taught in a baraita: A priest and a mourner are permitted to cut their hair during the intermediate days of a Festival. The Gemara asks: What are the circumstances when the mourner is permitted to do so? If we say that the eighth day of his mourning occurred on the eve of the Festival, then he should have cut his hair on the eve of the Festival, as the more stringent restrictions of his mourning no longer applied. Rather, it must be that we are dealing with a case where the eighth day of his mourning occurred on a Shabbat that was the eve of the Festival, and so he could not have cut his hair on the Festival eve.

[168] But if this is the case, he should have cut his hair on Friday, for Rav Ḥisda said that Ravina bar Sheila said: The halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Abba Shaul. If the deceased was buried seven days before the Festival, then not only has the mourner completed the seven-day mourning period, but he is even regarded as having begun the thirty-day mourning period, and so the Festival cancels this thirty-day period of mourning. And the Rabbis concede to the opinion of Abba Shaul when the eighth day of his mourning occurs on a Shabbat that is the eve of the Festival, and they maintain that he is permitted to cut his hair on Friday. Since he is unavoidably prevented from cutting his hair on the eighth day, the Rabbis allowed him to cut it already on the seventh day.

[169] The Gemara answers: No, the ruling of the baraita is necessary in the case where the seventh day of his mourning occurs on a Shabbat that is the eve of the Festival. In that case, he certainly cannot cut his hair on Friday because it is only the sixth day of his mourning, and so he is permitted to cut his hair on the intermediate days of the Festival.

[170] The Gemara comments: The tanna of the baraita, who permits a mourner to cut his hair during the intermediate days of the Festival, holds in accordance with the opinion of Abba Shaul, who said: The legal status of part of the day is like that of an entire day, and therefore the seventh day counts as both the final day of the seven-day mourning period and the first day of the thirty-day mourning period. From the perspective of the halakhot of mourning, one would be permitted to cut his hair; however since this day is Shabbat, he is unavoidably prevented from doing so, and therefore he is permitted to cut his hair during the intermediate days of the Festival.

[171] The tanna of our mishna, on the other hand, who does not mention that a mourner is permitted to cut his hair on the intermediate days of a Festival, holds in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis, who say: We do not say that the legal status of part of the day is like that of an entire day for a mourner. Therefore, he has not yet completed his seven-day period of mourning, and consequently he will not be permitted to cut his hair even after the Festival, until the completion of the thirty-day mourning period.

[172] The Gemara continues and asks: The case of this priest, who is permitted to cut his hair during the intermediate days of a Festival, what are the circumstances? If we say that he completed his watch on the eve of the Festival, then he should have cut his hair on the eve of the Festival.

[173] The Gemara answers: No, the ruling of the baraita is necessary in the case where one completed his watch during the Festival week itself. The tanna of our mishna holds that since we learned in a mishna (Sukka 55b): At the year, i.e., the three pilgrimage Festivals, all of the priestly watches share equally in the Festival offerings and in the division of the shewbread among the priests on Shabbat that occurs on the Festival, therefore, he is considered like one whose watch was not completed during the Festival, and he may not cut his hair until after the Festival. And the tanna of the baraita holds that although he belongs also to those other watches serving during the Festival, nevertheless, his own watch was completed before the Festival, and so he is permitted to cut his hair.

[174] § The Sages taught the following baraita: All those about whom it was said that they are permitted to cut their hair on the intermediate days of a Festival because they were unable to do so beforehand, they may similarly cut their hair during the period of their mourning if they had been unable to do so beforehand.

[175] The Gemara asks: But isn’t it taught in another baraita: They are nevertheless prohibited from cutting their hair during the period of their mourning? Rav Ḥisda said that Rav Sheila said: When it

is taught in the baraita that they are permitted to cut their hair, it is referring to one for whom two periods of mourning applied in succession. In other words, this person was required to practice one period of mourning immediately following another period of mourning, and he is unable to endure the prescribed restrictions for such an extended period.

176 The Gemara asks: If this is referring to a case where his mourning applied in succession, then why specifically does the baraita discuss all those about whom it was said that they may cut their hair? The allowance should apply even to everyone, not only to those who had been unavoidably prevented from cutting their hair in the preceding period, as it is taught in a baraita: If one's mourning periods applied in succession, one after the other, and his hair grew long and became heavy, he may lighten it by cutting his hair with a razor, and he may wash his garment in water, so that he does not suffer for such a long time without cutting his hair or washing his clothes.

177 The Gemara answers: But wasn't it said with regard to that baraita: Rav Ḥisda said: When it states that one may cut his hair, it means that he may do so with a razor, but not with scissors? Similarly, when it states that one may wash his clothes, it means that he may launder them with water, but not with neter or soap. Therefore, the baraita teaches that if one had been unavoidably prevented from performing these actions beforehand and then had to observe a double mourning period, he may cut his hair in an ordinary manner, without performing these actions in an altered way. Rav Ḥisda said: That is to say that, generally speaking, a mourner is prohibited from laundering his clothes.

178 The Sages taught the following baraita: Just as the Sages said that it is prohibited to cut one's hair during the intermediate days of a Festival, so too it is prohibited to cut one's nails during the intermediate days of a Festival; this is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda, whereas Rabbi Yosei permits cutting nails.

179 And just as the Sages said that a mourner is prohibited from cutting his hair during the period of his mourning, so too he is prohibited from cutting his nails during the period of his mourning; this is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda, whereas Rabbi Yosei permits a mourner to cut his nails.

180 Ulla said: The halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda with regard to mourning, but the halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei with regard to the intermediate days of the Festival. Shmuel said:

181 The halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei with regard to the intermediate days of the Festival and with regard to mourning, as Shmuel said this general principle: The halakha is in accordance with the statement of the more lenient authority in matters relating to mourning.

182 It was related that something unpleasant happened to Pineḥas, brother of Mar Shmuel, that is to say, one of his close relatives died. Shmuel entered to ask him the reason, i.e., to console him. He saw that Pineḥas's nails were long, and said to him: Why do you not cut them? Pineḥas replied: If it were your relative who died, and you were in mourning, would you treat the matter so lightly and cut your nails?

183 Pineḥas's words were: "Like an error that proceeds from a ruler" (Ecclesiastes 10:5). As soon as he uttered them they come true, even though he did not intend them. Shortly after Pineḥas made his comment, something unpleasant happened to Shmuel, and one of his close relatives died. Pineḥas, his brother, entered to ask him the reason, i.e., to offer words of comfort. Shmuel took his nails and

cast them in Pineḥas’s face. Shmuel then said to him: Do you not know the principle that a covenant is made with the lips? In other words, do you not know that what one says influences future events?

184 This is as Rabbi Yoḥanan said: From where is it derived that a covenant is made with the lips, and that one’s speech has the power to change events? For it is stated: “And Abraham said to his young men: Stay here with the donkey, and I and the lad will go onward; and we will worship, and we will come back to you” (Genesis 22:5). Abraham said this even though he thought that he was going to sacrifice his son as an offering and that Isaac would not be returning, yet this had an influence and they both came back.

185 With regard to this halakha pertaining to a mourner cutting his nails: They initially concluded from this: With regard to the nails on his hand, yes, a mourner may cut them; but as for the nails on his foot, no, he may not cut them, because long toenails are less repulsive. Rav Anan bar Taḥlisa said: It was explained to me by Shmuel himself: It is not different if it is the nails on the hand and it is not different if it is the nails on the foot, as in both cases cutting the nails is permitted.

186 Rav Ḥiyya bar Ashi said that Rav said: But with scissors [genustera] specifically for nail cutting it is prohibited, i.e., the mourner should cut his nails in an alternate manner. Rav Shemen bar Abba said: I once stood before Rabbi Yoḥanan in the study hall during the intermediate days of a Festival, and he cut his nails with his teeth and threw them down.

187 The Gemara comments: Learn from this incident of Rabbi Yoḥanan three halakhot: Learn from this that it is permitted to cut one’s nails on the intermediate days of a Festival. And learn from this that nails have no prohibition due to the fact that they are repulsive, i.e., there is no prohibition against biting them on that basis. Inasmuch as one is prohibited from placing something repulsive in his mouth, this incident teaches that nails do not fall into this category. And also learn from this that it is permitted to throw nails away.

188 The Gemara asks: Is that so? But isn’t it taught in a baraita: Three things were said about nails: One who buries them in the ground is deemed righteous. One who burns them is even better, as he is considered pious. One who merely throws them away is regarded as wicked. The Gemara explains: What is the reason that it is prohibited to throw away nail clippings? This is prohibited lest a pregnant women pass over them and miscarry, for the Sages had a tradition that it is dangerous for a pregnant woman to walk over fingernails.

189 The Gemara answers: A woman is not usually found in the study hall, and therefore Rabbi Yoḥanan was not concerned about throwing his nail clippings there. If you say that sometimes the nails are gathered together when the floor is swept and then thrown outside where a pregnant woman may walk over them, this is not a problem. Once their place has changed the nails themselves change and are no longer harmful.

190 Rav Yehuda said that Rav said: A pair of Sages from Ḥamatan came before Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi. And Mar Zutra taught it without the names of Rav Yehuda and Rav, simply as: A pair of Sages from Ḥamatan came before Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi. And they asked him whether or not a mourner is permitted to cut his nails, and he permitted it to them. And had they asked him whether or not a mourner may trim his mustache, he would also have permitted it to them. And Shmuel said: They also asked him about trimming a mustache, and he permitted it to them.

191 Avitul the scribe said in the name of Rav Pappa: A mustache may be trimmed from one corner to the other corner of the mouth. Rabbi Ami said: One may trim only the portion of the mustache that interferes with normal eating, but one may not trim the mustache for beautification. Rav Naḥman bar Yitzḥak said: For me, my entire mustache is considered like a mustache that interferes with normal eating, as I am particularly sensitive, and so I may trim my entire mustache.

192 § Having mentioned Avitul the scribe, the Gemara records other statements of his: And Avitul the scribe said in the name of Rav Pappa: The Pharaoh who lived in the days of Moses was a cubit tall, his beard was a cubit long, and his penis [parmashtako] was a cubit and a span, i.e., a cubit and the distance between the thumb and the little finger, in length, in order to fulfill what is stated: “And He sets up over it the lowest of men” (Daniel 4:14), which teaches that Pharaoh was extremely short and lowly.

193 Avitul the scribe also said in the name of Rav Pappa: The Pharaoh who lived in the days of Moses was a sorcerer [amgushi], as it is stated: “Behold, he goes out to the water” (Exodus 7:15). Pharaoh would regularly go out to the water in order to engage in witchcraft.

194 § The mishna taught: And these people may launder their clothes on the intermediate days of a Festival: One who comes from a country overseas. Rav Asi said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: Anyone who has only one shirt is permitted to launder it on the intermediate days of a Festival.

195 Rabbi Yirmeya raised an objection from what was taught in the mishna: And these people may launder their clothes on the intermediate days of a Festival: One who comes from a country overseas, and one who is released from a house of captivity, and one who comes out of prison, and one who had been ostracized and the Rabbis released him from his decree of ostracism, etc. It may be inferred: Those who are mentioned in the mishna, yes, they may launder their clothes during the intermediate days of the Festival, but one who has only one shirt may not launder it.

196 Rabbi Ya’akov said to Rabbi Yirmeya: I will explain it to you. The mishna is referring to those cases where one is permitted to launder his clothes even if he has two changes of garments and they are dirty. Rabbi Yoḥanan speaks about one who has only one garment, and he rules that he may launder it in all circumstances.

197 Rav Yitzḥak bar Ya’akov bar Giyorei sent a message in the name of Rabbi Yoḥanan: With regard to linen garments, it is permitted to launder them during the intermediate days of the Festival because they are easily soiled. Rava raised an objection from what is taught in the mishna: Hand towels, the towels

198 of barbers that are used to cover a person having a haircut, and body-drying towels may all be laundered on the intermediate days of a Festival. This statement implies that these garments, yes, they may be laundered, but other types of linen garments, no, they may not be laundered.

199 Abaye said to him: This is not a contradiction: The mishna is referring to garments made even of other types of materials; linen garments, however, may be laundered even when they serve other purposes. Bar Hedya said: I myself saw the Sea of Tiberias, the Sea of Galilee, to which basins full of linen garments were brought out to be laundered during the intermediate days of a Festival.

200 Abaye strongly objects to this: This report cannot be adduced as proof for the halakha, for who says to us that they did this in accordance with the will of the Sages? Perhaps they did it without the will of the Sages.

[201] MISHNA: And these are the documents that may be written on the intermediate days of a Festival: Documents of betrothal of wives, through which bridegrooms betroth their brides; bills of divorce; receipts for the repayment of debts; wills [deyateiki]; deeds of gift; perozbolin, documents through which lenders authorize the courts to collect their loans on their behalf, thereby preventing the Sabbatical year from canceling their debts; letters of valuation, which were drawn up by the court when they valuated property and transferred it to the lender; and letters of sustenance, which were drawn up when one accepted upon himself to maintain another, e.g., his step-daughter.

[202] The list continues: Documents of the ritual through which the brother-in-law frees the yevama of her levirate bonds [ḥalitza], thereby freeing her from the obligation to marry one of her deceased husband's brothers; documents in which the court records the refusal of a girl upon reaching majority to remain married to the man to whom her mother or brothers married her as a minor after the death of her father; documents of arbitration, in which the court summarizes a conflict that had been resolved through arbitration; court rulings; and the official correspondence of the ruling authorities.

[203] GEMARA: Shmuel said: It is permitted to betroth a woman on the intermediate days of a Festival, lest another come and betroth her first. The Gemara asks: Let us say that the mishna supports Shmuel, who said: And these are the documents that may be drawn up on the intermediate days of a Festival: Documents of betrothal.

[204] What, is the mishna not referring to actual documents of betrothal, through which one would actually betroth a woman? The Gemara rejects this: No, the mishna is referring to documents of stipulation recording the amounts that the parents agree to pay as the dowry of their respective son or daughter, in accordance with what Rav Giddel said that Rav said.

[205] For Rav Giddel said that Rav said: When two families negotiate the terms of marriage for their respective children, and one side says to the other: How much do you give to your son as a dowry? And the second side says: I give such and such amount; how much do you give to your daughter? And the first side responds: Such and such amount, then, once the bride and groom arose and pronounced the betrothal formula, then all of these obligations are acquired and therefore binding. These are among the things that are acquired through words alone. In other words, there is no need to perform an additional act of acquisition in order to confirm the agreement, and the mishna is referring to a document recording such an agreement. Although such a document may be drawn up even on the intermediate days of a Festival, this does not mean that one may actually betroth a woman during this period.

[206] The Gemara asks: Let us say that the following mishna supports Shmuel: One may not marry a woman on the intermediate days of a Festival, neither a virgin nor a widow; nor may one then perform levirate marriage with his sister-in-law, if his brother died childless, because that would be a joyous occasion for him. This statement implies that it is only marrying that is prohibited, but betrothing is permitted.

[207] The Gemara rejects this argument: This is not the correct way to understand the mishna, as it is speaking in the style of: Needless to say. It is needless to say that betrothal is not permitted, because the groom does not perform a mitzva through betrothal. Rather, the same is true even of marriage, through which one performs a mitzva, as marriage is preparation for fulfilling the mitzva of procreation. It is still not permitted.

208 The Gemara offers another support for Shmuel: Come and hear that which a Sage of the school of Shmuel taught in the following baraita: One may betroth a woman on the intermediate days of a Festival, but he may not marry her, nor may he make a betrothal feast, nor may he perform levirate marriage, because that would be a joyous occasion for him, and one may not mix the joy of a wedding with the joy of the Festival. The Gemara concludes: Learn from this a support for Shmuel's opinion.

209 The Gemara raises a question about the ruling itself: And did Shmuel actually say that we are concerned that perhaps another man will come and betroth the woman first? But didn't Rav Yehuda say that Shmuel said: Every day a Divine Voice issues forth and says: The daughter of so-and-so is destined to be the wife of so-and-so; the field of so-and-so will belong to so-and-so? If this is the case, why should one be concerned lest another betroth her first? It is predestined that he will marry his designated mate.

210 Rather, Shmuel's statement should be understood as follows: Perhaps another man will come and betroth her first by means of praying for divine mercy. In other words, Shmuel is concerned that the rival may beseech God to cancel the decree of the Divine Voice, and therefore the first man needs to hurry and betroth the woman before the other one has a chance to pray that he should take her from him.

211 This is like this incident, in which Rava heard a certain man asking for mercy, i.e., praying, who said: Grant me so-and-so as a wife. Rava said to him: Do not pray and ask for mercy in this way. If she is fit for you, and it has been decreed that she will be your wife, she will not go away from you. And if she is not destined to be your wife, you will come to deny the Lord when you see that your prayer is not answered. After the man married this woman, Rava heard him say in prayer: Please either let him die before her or let her die before him. He was speaking about himself and his wife because he had grown to hate her so much. Rava said to him: Did I not say to you not to pray for this matter?

212 Rav said in the name of Rabbi Reuven ben Itzterobili as follows: From the Torah, and from the Prophets, and from the Writings; it implies that the decree that a specific woman is destined to be married to a specific man is from God. From where is this derived? It is from the Torah, as it is written: "Then Laban and Bethuel answered and said: The thing comes from the Lord, we cannot speak to you either bad or good" (Genesis 24:50). From the Prophets, as it is written: "But his father and his mother knew not that it was of the Lord" (Judges 14:4). From the Writings, as it is written: "House and riches are the inheritance of fathers; but a prudent woman is from the Lord" (Proverbs 19:14).

213 § Apropos a teaching of Rabbi Reuven ben Itzterobili, the Gemara states that Rav said in the name of Rabbi Reuven ben Itzterobili, and some say that it was taught in a baraita that Rabbi Reuven ben Itzterobili said: A man is suspected of having done something wrong only if he has indeed done so. And if he did not do it wholly, then probably he did it partly. And if he did not do it even partly, then probably he thought in his heart to do it. And if he did not even think to himself to do it, then certainly he saw others doing it and was happy. Suspicions do not arbitrarily arise about a person; therefore there is certainly some basis for them.

214 Rabbi Ya'akov raised an objection: Does the verse not say: "And the children of Israel fabricated matters that were not right against the Lord their God" (II Kings 17:9), which indicates that it is

possible to make up stories about someone else even though they are entirely baseless. The Gemara answers: There they did it in order to anger God, but they did not actually think that what they were saying was true.

215 Come and hear a challenge from a different source: The verse states: “And they were jealous of Moses in the camp, of Aaron the Lord’s holy one” (Psalms 106:16). Rav Shmuel bar Yitzḥak said: This verse teaches that every man warned his wife against seclusion with Moses because he was jealous. This implies that every man thought that his wife had secluded herself with Moses and sinned, although this was certainly not the case. This demonstrates that it is possible to suspect an absolutely innocent person. The Gemara answers: There they did it out of hatred for Moses. They did not actually suspect him of wrongdoing. Instead, their goal was to degrade him by leveling these false accusations against him.

216 The Gemara raises another challenge, based on yet another source: Come and hear that which Rabbi Yosei said: May my portion in the future world be with one who is suspected of a certain wrongdoing but is innocent, as the pain that such a person experiences atones for his sins. This statement also appears to imply that it is possible to suspect an absolutely innocent person. And Rav Pappa said: They suspected me of a certain wrongdoing but I was not guilty.

217 The Gemara answers: It is not difficult. This is referring to a rumor that stops, and therefore it is possible that it is groundless, whereas that is referring to a rumor that does not stop, and in that case there must be a factual basis for the suspicion. The Gemara asks: To be considered a rumor that does not stop, for how long must it persist? Abaye said: My nurse told me: Local gossip lasts for a day and a half, and then it is deemed to be a rumor that does not stop.

218 The Gemara comments: This applies only if the rumor did not stop in between, during the day and a half, but if it stopped in between then we have no problem with it, and it is not a persistent rumor. And if the rumor stopped in between, we said that it is considered baseless only if it stopped of its own accord and not out of fear, i.e., because the suspect is violent and therefore people are afraid to speak badly about him. But if the rumor stopped out of fear, then this dispensation does not apply, and it is still assumed that there must be some basis to the rumor.

219 And we said that a rumor that stopped is assumed to be baseless only if it did not arise again. But if it arose again, then this does not apply. And we said that a rumor that does not stop must be taken seriously only if the slandered person has no enemies. But if he has known enemies, then it can be assumed that it was the enemies who disseminated the rumor.

220 MISHNA: One may not write bills of debt on the intermediate days of a Festival. But if the lender does not trust the borrower, and he is concerned that the borrower will later deny the loan, or if the scribe has nothing to eat, then he may write a bill of debt during the Festival week.

221 One may not write Torah scrolls, phylacteries, or mezuzot on the intermediate days of a Festival, nor may one correct a single letter, even in the Torah scroll of Ezra, which was kept in the Temple and upon which all the Jewish communities relied. Rabbi Yehuda says: One may write phylacteries and mezuzot for himself on the intermediate days of a Festival if he needs them.

222 And one may spin sky-blue wool for his ritual fringes on his thigh, but not in the ordinary manner with a spindle, as this procedure must be performed in an altered manner on the intermediate days of a Festival.

223 GEMARA: The Sages taught the following baraita: A person may write phylacteries and mezuzot for himself and spin sky-blue wool for his fringes on his thigh. And for others he may do these things as a favor, but not for payment. This is the statement of Rabbi Meir. Rabbi Yehuda says: If he initially made them for himself, he may employ artifice, sell his own and then go back and write new ones for himself. Rabbi Yosei says: He may write and sell them in his usual manner, in the amount that is enough to provide for his livelihood.

224 Rav ruled for Rav Ḥananel, and some say it was Rabba bar bar Ḥana who ruled for Rav Ḥananel: The halakha is that one may write and sell them in his usual manner, in the amount that is enough to provide for his livelihood.

225 § The mishna taught: And one may spin sky-blue wool for his ritual fringes on his thigh. The Sages taught a baraita: A person may spin sky-blue wool for his ritual fringes on his thigh, but not with a stone, which can be used to form a small spindle and ease the spinning process; this is the statement of Rabbi Eliezer. But the Rabbis say: One may spin the sky-blue wool even with a stone. Rabbi Yehuda said in the name of Rabbi Eliezer: It is permitted with a stone, but not with a spindle. And the Rabbis say: One may spin this wool with either a stone or a spindle.

226 Rav Yehuda said that Shmuel said, and similarly Rabbi Ḥiyya bar Abba said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: The halakha is that one may spin the sky-blue wool for fringes on the intermediate days of a Festival, both with a stone and with a spindle, owing to the importance of the mitzva of ritual fringes. And similarly the halakha is: One may write phylacteries and mezuzot on the intermediate days of a Festival in his usual manner and sell enough to provide for his livelihood.

227 MISHNA: One who buries his deceased relative three days before a pilgrimage Festival has the decree of the seven-day period of mourning, i.e., the halakhot and prohibitions associated with that period, nullified for him by the Festival. He is not required to complete this seven-day mourning period after the Festival. If one buries his deceased relative eight days before a pilgrimage Festival, then the decree of thirty days is nullified for him. The restrictions that ordinarily apply during this thirty-day mourning period no longer apply after the Festival.

228 This is because the Sages said a principle with regard to this issue: Shabbat counts as one of the days of mourning, although one may not mourn on it and it does not interrupt the mourning period, which continues after Shabbat. The pilgrimage Festivals, on the other hand, interrupt the mourning period, so that if one began mourning before such a Festival, then the mourning period is canceled by the Festival. They do not, however, count. If one did not begin mourning before the Festival, or if his relative died during the Festival, then he is required to complete his mourning period afterward, as the days of the Festival do not count toward the requisite days of mourning.

229 Rabbi Eliezer says: From the time that the Temple was destroyed, Shavuot is like Shabbat, because nowadays the days following Shavuot are not treated like Festival days. When the Temple stood, many of the Festival’s offerings that could not be sacrificed on Shavuot itself would be sacrificed during the six days following the Festival. Nowadays, however, when offerings are no longer sacrificed, Shavuot lasts for only one day in Eretz Yisrael, and therefore it is treated like Shabbat with regard to mourning: It counts as one of the days of mourning, but does not interrupt the period of mourning.

230 Rabban Gamliel says: Even Rosh HaShana and Yom Kippur are considered like the pilgrimage Festivals, in that they interrupt the mourning period but are not counted toward the days of

mourning. And the Rabbis say: The halakha is neither in accordance with the statement of Rabbi Eliezer nor in accordance with the statement of Rabban Gamliel. Rather, with regard to mourning, Shavuot is treated like the other pilgrimage Festivals, whereas Rosh HaShana and Yom Kippur are treated like Shabbat.

231 GEMARA: With regard to the mishna's statement that the seven- and thirty-day periods of mourning are nullified, Rav said: The decree, meaning the main prohibitions of the period, was nullified, but the days of mourning themselves were not entirely nullified. Instead, these periods of mourning remain to some degree. And so said Rav Huna: The decree was nullified, but the days of mourning themselves were not nullified. And Rav Sheshet said: Even the days of mourning were also nullified.

232 The Gemara asks: What is the reason that the days themselves were not nullified? The Gemara explains: It is so that if one observed eight days of mourning before the Festival, so that the prohibition against hair cutting was nullified before the Festival, but for whatever reason he did not cut his hair on the eve of the Festival, he is prohibited from cutting his hair after the Festival until the end of the thirty-day period of mourning. In other words, the mourning period was not entirely nullified, and since he did not take advantage of the allowance to cut his hair before the Festival, he must observe the prohibitions applying during the thirty-day period of mourning after the Festival as well.

233 But isn't it taught in a baraita: In the case of one who buries his dead relative three days before a pilgrimage Festival, the decree of the seven-day period of mourning is nullified for him. If one buries his dead relative eight days before a Festival, the decree of thirty days is nullified for him, and therefore he may cut his hair on the eve of the Festival. If, however, he did not cut his hair on the eve of the Festival, he is prohibited from cutting his hair after the Festival until the end of the thirty-day period of mourning.

234 Abba Shaul says: Even if he failed to cut his hair on the eve of the Festival, he is permitted to cut his hair after the Festival, for just as his observance of the mitzva of three days of mourning prior to the Festival cancels the decree of the seven-day period of mourning, and so if the deceased was buried three days before the Festival, the mourner is no longer required to continue this period of mourning after the Festival, so too, his observance of the mitzva of seven days of mourning before the Festival cancels the decree of the thirty-day period of mourning.

235 The Gemara asks: Why does Abba Shaul speak of the observance of seven days of mourning? But didn't we learn in the mishna that it requires eight days? The Gemara explains: Abba Shaul maintains that the legal status of part of the day is like that of an entire day, and therefore the seventh day counts as both the final day of the seven-day period of mourning and the first day of the thirty-day period of mourning. Rav Ḥisda said that Ravina bar Sheila said: The halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Abba Shaul.

236 And furthermore, even the Rabbis concede to Abba Shaul that when one's eighth day of mourning occurs on a Shabbat, which is also the eve of a Festival, he is permitted to cut his hair on Friday, which is the seventh day. Since he is unavoidably prevented from cutting his hair on the eighth day, as it is prohibited for him to cut his hair on Shabbat, he may do so already on Friday, although it is only his seventh day of mourning.

237 The Gemara asks: In accordance with whose opinion is that which Rav Amram said that Rav said: With regard to a mourner, once the comforters have stood up to leave his house on the seventh day of his mourning, he is immediately permitted to bathe? In accordance with whose opinion? In accordance with the opinion of Abba Shaul. He maintains that a part of the seventh day is treated as an entire day with regard to this issue.

238 Abaye said: The halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Abba Shaul with regard to the seventh day of mourning, and the Rabbis concede to Abba Shaul with regard to the thirtieth day, for with regard to the thirtieth day we certainly say that the legal status of part of the day is like that of an entire day, and so a mourner may already cut his hair on the morning of the thirtieth day.

239 Rava said: The halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Abba Shaul with regard to the thirtieth day of mourning, but the halakha is not in accordance with Abba Shaul with regard to the seventh day. And the Sages of Neharde'a say: The halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Abba Shaul with regard to both the seventh day and the thirtieth day, for Shmuel said: The halakha follows the statement of the more lenient authority in matters relating to mourning.

240 § The Gemara asks now about the thirty-day mourning period: From where do we derive the thirty-day period of mourning? The Gemara answers: It is learned by way of a verbal analogy between one instance of the word pera and a different instance of the word pera stated with regard to a nazirite. Here, in the instructions given to Aaron not to mourn the deaths of his sons, it is written: "Let the hair of your heads not grow loose [tifra'u]" (Leviticus 10:6), which indicates that ordinary mourners are required to grow their hair long. And there, with regard to a nazirite, it is written: "He shall let the hair of his head grow long [pera]" (Numbers 6:5). Just as there, in the case of the nazirite, he must grow his hair for thirty days, so too, here a mourner must grow his hair for thirty days.

241 The Gemara asks: And there, with regard to a nazirite, from where do we derive that he must grow his hair for thirty days? Nowhere is this explicitly stated with regard to a nazirite. The Gemara answers: Rav Mattana said: An unspecified naziriteship, when one takes a vow of naziriteship without specifying for how long, extends for thirty days. What is the reason for this? The verse states: "He shall be sacred, and he shall let the hair of his head grow" (Numbers 6:5), and "He shall be [yihye]," which is written yod, heh, yod, heh, has a numerical value [gimatriyya] of thirty, as yod has a numerical value of ten and heh has a numerical value of five. This implies that an unspecified naziriteship extends for thirty days, and by way of the verbal analogy, this is applied to mourning as well.

242 Rav Huna, son of Rav Yehoshua, said: Everyone, including Abba Shaul, who says that part of a day is treated like a full day, agrees that when his third day of mourning occurs on the eve of the Festival, the mourner is prohibited from bathing his body until the evening. In this case, the principle that the legal status of part of the day is like that of an entire day does not apply. Rather, one must observe three full days of mourning. He must therefore wait until the evening and wash himself with cold water, or wait until the intermediate days of the Festival and bathe in hot water.

243 Rav Neḥemya, son of Rav Yehoshua, said: I once found Rav Pappi and Rav Pappa sitting together and saying: The halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rav Huna, son of Rav Yehoshua. There are those who say a different version of this tradition: Rav Neḥemya, son of Rav Yosef, said: I once found Rav Pappi, Rav Pappa, and Rav Huna, son of Yehoshua, sitting together

and saying: Everyone concedes that when the third day of mourning occurs on the eve of a Festival, the mourner is prohibited from bathing his body until the evening.

[244] Abaye inquired of Rava: If one buried his dead relative on the Festival itself, does the Festival count toward his thirty-day period of mourning, or does the Festival not count toward his thirty-day period of mourning? Abaye elaborated on his question: I do not ask whether or not the Festival counts toward his seven-day period of mourning because the obligation to observe seven days of mourning does not apply at all during the Festival, and therefore he must certainly observe the seven-day mourning period, beginning from after the Festival. What I am asking is with regard to the thirty-day period of mourning, because certain aspects of the mitzva of the thirty-day mourning period do in fact apply during the Festival, e.g., the prohibitions to launder clothes and cut hair. What, then, is the halakha: Do the days of the Festival count toward the thirty days or not?

[245] Rava said to him: The Festival does not count toward the thirty days. Abaye raised an objection to Rava's opinion from the following baraita: If one buries his dead relative two days before a Festival, he must count five days of mourning after the Festival, and during this period his work is performed for him by others. And his menservants and maidservants do this work in private inside his house, and the public need not occupy themselves with him by coming to console him,

[246] for they already occupied themselves with him when they came to console him during the Festival. The general principle with regard to the matter is as follows: Any activity that is prohibited to the mourner because it is an expression of mourning is interrupted by the Festival and remains prohibited afterward. And anything that involves the public's occupation with the mourner, e.g., coming to the mourner to offer him comfort and condolence, is not interrupted by the Festival, for people console the mourner during the Festival as well.

[247] If he buries his relative three days before the end of the Festival, the mourner must count seven days of mourning after the Festival because his mourning never began. On the first four days of his mourning, the public must occupy themselves with him and come to console him. On the three last days, however, the public need not occupy themselves with him, as they already occupied themselves with him during the Festival. That is to say, they certainly came to console him during the Festival, although the period of mourning did not actually begin until afterward. And the Festival counts for him toward the thirty-day mourning period.

[248] With regard to the statement of the baraita that the Festival counts toward the thirty-day period of mourning: What, is it not referring to the latter clause of that baraita, which speaks about a case where the burial was performed during the Festival itself? If this is the case, then a refutation of Rava's opinion is stated explicitly, that the Festival counts toward the thirty-day mourning period, even if the deceased was buried on the Festival itself. Rava rejects this argument: No, it is referring to the first clause, which discusses a case where the burial was performed before the Festival, and since rites of mourning were observed already before the Festival, the Festival is counted toward the thirty-day period of mourning. Therefore, it is not a refutation of Rava's halakha.

[249] Abaye raised an objection to Rava's opinion from another baraita, in which it was taught: A pilgrimage Festival counts toward the thirty-day period of mourning. How so? If one buried his dead relative at the beginning of a pilgrimage Festival, he must count seven days of mourning after the Festival, and during this period his work is performed by others. And his menservants and maidservants perform this work in private inside his house, and the public need not occupy

themselves with him and come to console him, for they already occupied themselves with him during the Festival. And the Festival counts for him. Here it is explicitly stated that the Festival counts toward the thirty-day period of mourning, even when the deceased was buried during the Festival itself. The Gemara concludes: This is indeed a conclusive refutation of Rava's opinion.

250 When Ravin came from Eretz Yisrael to Babylonia, he said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: Even if one buried his dead relative during the Festival, the Festival counts toward his thirty-day period of mourning. And, similarly, Rabbi Elazar ruled for Rabbi Pedat, his son: Even if one buried his dead relative during the Festival it counts towards his thirty days.

251 § The Sages taught the following baraita: If one fulfilled the obligation of overturning the bed for three days before the pilgrimage Festival, he is no longer required to overturn it after the Festival; this is the statement of Rabbi Eliezer. But the Rabbis say: Even if one overturned his bed for only one day, or even for only one hour, he is not required to overturn it after the Festival.

252 Rabbi Elazar, son of Rabbi Shimon, said: This is the statement of Beit Shammai, and that is the statement of Beit Hillel. In other words, Rabbi Eliezer and the Rabbis disagreed about a matter that was the subject of an earlier dispute between Beit Shammai and Beit Hillel, for Beit Shammai say: Three days, and Beit Hillel say: Even one day.

253 Rav Huna said that Rabbi Ḥiyya bar Abba said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said, and some say a different version of this line of transmission: Rabbi Yoḥanan said to Rabbi Ḥiyya bar Abba and to Rav Huna: Even one day, even one hour. The Gemara cites Rava, who said: The halakha is in accordance with the opinion of the tanna of our mishna, who said three days. Based on this, we rule that the mourning rites are not canceled after the Festival unless they were observed for at least three days before the Festival.

254 Ravina happened to come to the city of Sura on the banks of the Euphrates River. Rav Ḥaviva said to Ravina: What is the halakha with regard to this issue? He said to him: Even one day, and even one hour.

255 § It was related that Rabbi Ḥiyya bar Abba, Rabbi Ami, and Rabbi Yitzḥak Nappaḥa were once sitting in the pavilion of Rabbi Yitzḥak ben Elazar and were conversing. A matter emerged from among them: From where is it derived that the rites of mourning are observed for seven days? As it is written: "And I will turn your Festivals into mourning" (Amos 8:10). Just as a Festival lasts for seven days, so too mourning lasts for seven days.

256 The Gemara asks: And say that perhaps mourning is like Shavuot, which is only one day. The Gemara rejects this argument: That derivation, from the one day of Shavuot, is required for what was stated by Reish Lakish, as Reish Lakish said in the name of Rabbi Yehuda Nesia: From where is it derived that mourning in the case of distant tidings, i.e., when one hears that one of his relatives died a long time ago, applies for only one day? As it is written: "And I will turn your Festivals into mourning," and we find with regard to Shavuot that one day is also called a Festival.

257 The Sages taught the following baraita: In the case of recent tidings of a relative's death, mourning applies for seven- and thirty-day periods. In the case of distant tidings, it applies only for one day. What are considered recent tidings and what are considered distant tidings? Recent tidings are news that arrives within thirty days of the person's death. Distant tidings are news that arrives

after thirty days; this is the statement of Rabbi Akiva. And the Rabbis say: Both in the case of recent tidings and in the case of distant tidings, mourning applies for seven- and thirty-day periods.

[258] Rabba bar bar Ḥana said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: Wherever you find an individual being lenient and the majority being stringent, the halakha is in accordance with the majority, except for this case, for even though Rabbi Akiva is lenient and the Rabbis are stringent, the halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Akiva. This is in keeping with the principle stated by Shmuel: The halakha follows the statement of the more lenient authority in matters relating to mourning.

[259] It was related that Rav Ḥanina received distant tidings of his father's death from Bei Ḥozai. He came before Rav Ḥisda to ask what he should do. Rav Ḥisda said to him: In the case of distant tidings, mourning applies for only one day. It was similarly related that Rav Natan bar Ami received a report about his mother's death from Bei Ḥozai. He came before Rava, and Rava said to him: They said that in the case of distant tidings, mourning applies for only one day.

[260] Rav Natan raised an objection to Rava's opinion based on what was taught in a baraita: In what case is this statement that mourning applies for only one day said? In the case of the other five close relatives, over whose death it is a mitzva to mourn, i.e., son, daughter, brother, sister, and spouse. But for one's father or mother, one is required to mourn for seven and thirty days, even when the report of the parent's death is received some time after the event.

[261] Rava said to him: This is an individual opinion, and we do not hold in accordance with his opinion, as it is taught in a baraita: There was an incident and the father of Rabbi Tzadok died in the city of Ginzak, and they informed him of his father's passing only after three years. He came and asked Elisha ben Avuya and the Elders with him what he should do. And Elisha ben Avuya said to him: Observe the rites of mourning for seven and thirty days. And when the son of Rabbi Aḥiyya died in the Diaspora, and Rabbi Aḥiyya was informed about his passing a long time afterward, he sat in mourning for seven and thirty days. Therefore, it is clear that this opinion was held only by a few individual Sages, but it was not generally accepted.

[262] The Gemara asks: Is that so, that this is Rabbi Aḥiyya's opinion? But Rav was the son of Rabbi Ḥiyya's brother and also the son of Rabbi Ḥiyya's sister, for Rav's father, Aivu, was Rabbi Ḥiyya's paternal half brother, and Rav's mother was Rabbi Ḥiyya's maternal half sister. When Rav went there, Eretz Yisrael, his uncle Rabbi Ḥiyya said to him: Is your father, Aivu, still alive?

[263] Not wishing to deliver unfortunate news, Rav said to him: Is my mother still alive? In other words, why do you not ask me about my mother, who is your sister, whether she is still among the living? Rabbi Ḥiyya said to him: Is your mother still alive? Rav said to him: Is my father still alive? Rabbi Ḥiyya understood from Rav's failure to provide him with straight answers that both his brother and his sister had passed away. Rabbi Ḥiyya immediately said to his servant: Remove my shoes as a sign of mourning, and afterward carry my clothes behind me, as I am going to the bathhouse.

[264] The Gemara comments: Learn three halakhot from this incident with Rabbi Ḥiyya. Learn from this that a mourner is prohibited from wearing shoes, and therefore Rabbi Ḥiyya removed his shoes upon hearing of the deaths of his brother and sister. And learn from this that in the case of distant tidings of a relative's death, the mourning rites apply for only one day and no more. And learn from this that the legal status of part of the day is like that of an entire day, as immediately following the removal of his shoes, Rabbi Ḥiyya went to the bathhouse.

265 In any case, Rabbi Ḥiyya observed only one day of mourning after receiving a belated report of his siblings' passing, in contrast to Rabbi Aḥiyya, who observed seven and thirty days. The Gemara's question assumes that Rabbi Ḥiyya and Rabbi Aḥiyya are the same person. The Gemara answers: This is not difficult, for Rabbi Ḥiyya is a discrete person and Rabbi Aḥiyya is a discrete person; despite the similarity between their names, these are two different people.

266 § Rabbi Yosei bar Avin said: If one received recent tidings of a relative's death during a Festival, when it is prohibited to mourn, and after the Festival they became distant tidings, as after the Festival thirty days had already elapsed since the relative's passing, the Festival counts for him toward the number of days that make it a belated report. And, consequently, after the Festival he observes only one day of mourning. Similarly, Rabbi Adda of Caesarea taught a baraita before Rabbi Yoḥanan: If one received recent tidings of a relative's passing on Shabbat, and at the conclusion of Shabbat it became distant tidings, he observes only one day of mourning.

267 § The Gemara asks: Upon receiving a belated report of a close relative's passing, does one rend his garment or does he not rend it? Rabbi Mani said: He does not rend it, whereas Rabbi Ḥanina said: He does rend it. Rabbi Mani said to Rabbi Ḥanina: Granted, it makes sense that according to my position this is consistent, as I say that he does not rend his garment, and this is because there is no seven-day period of mourning. But according to you, who says that he does rend his garment, is there rending without a seven-day period of mourning afterward?

268 The Gemara asks: Is there not? But isn't it taught in a baraita reported by Isi, father of Rabbi Zeira, and some say it was taught by the brother of Rabbi Zeira before Rabbi Zeira: If at first one did not have his own garment to rend, and he acquired one during the seven-day period of mourning, he should rend it then. But if he acquired it only after the seven-day period of mourning, he does not rend it.

269 Rabbi Zeira explained the baraita after him, filling in a missing element: In what case is this statement that one does not rend his garment after the seven-day period of mourning said? In the case of the other five close relatives over whose death it is a mitzva to mourn, i.e., son, daughter, brother, sister, and spouse. But for one's father or mother, one continues to be obligated to rend his garment if he receives the garment after the seven-day mourning period as well. This apparently contradicts Rabbi Mani's statement that there is no rending without seven days of mourning.

270 The Gemara answers: When that baraita is taught, it is referring to a symbolic act meant to honor his father or mother. It is for one's father or mother that he must rend his garment, even if it becomes available only after the seven-day period of mourning. Essentially, however, the obligation to rend one's garments applies only when it is followed by a seven-day period of mourning.

271 § The Sages taught: With regard to all of the relatives mentioned in the Torah in the passage referring to priests, for which a priest becomes impure, a mourner must mourn for them. And they are: His wife, his father, and his mother, his brother and his unmarried sister from the same father, his son, and his daughter. The Sages added other relatives to this list: His maternal brother and his unmarried sister from the same mother, and his married sister, whether from the same father or from the same mother. One mourns for these relatives, although a priest would not become impure for them.

272 Just as one mourns for them, so too he mourns for their relatives' relatives, who are his second-degree relatives. That is to say, just as one is required to mourn over his close relatives, so too he is

required to mourn over his relatives' close relatives, which are known as second-degree relatives. For example, if his father's father, his son's son, his brother's son, or the like passed away, he must join his relatives in their mourning; this is the statement of Rabbi Akiva. Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar says: He mourns only over his son's son and his father's father, but not over the other relatives of his relatives. And the Rabbis say: Any relative over whom one would mourn if that person died, one mourns with him when he is in mourning.

273 The Gemara asks: The statement of the Rabbis is identical to the statement of the first tanna, Rabbi Akiva. What does their statement add? The Gemara answers: The practical difference between them is with regard to whether one mourn with him only in the same house. According to the Rabbis, one is required to mourn with his relative only while he is with him in the same house, whereas according to Rabbi Akiva, he is required to observe mourning even when he is not with him. This is like what Rav said to his son, Ḥiyya, and it is similarly like what Rav Huna said to his son Rabba, when the latter's wife was in mourning: In her presence practice mourning, but out of her presence do not practice mourning.

274 It is related that the son of Mar Ukva's father-in-law, i.e., Mar Ukva's brother-in-law, died, and Mar Ukva thought to sit in mourning over him for the seven- and thirty-day periods of mourning. Rav Huna went into his house, found him observing the rites of mourning, and said to him: Do you desire to eat mourners' food [tzudaniyyata]? The Sages said that one should observe mourning in honor of his wife only when she is in mourning over the death of his father-in-law or his mother-in-law.

275 As it is taught in a baraita: One whose father-in-law or mother-in-law died may not force his wife to paint [koḥelet] her eyelids or put rouge [pokeset] on her face while she is in mourning. Rather, he should overturn his bed, and observe the rites of mourning with her. And similarly, when her father-in-law or mother-in-law dies, she may not paint her eyelids or put rouge on her face. Rather, she should overturn her bed and practice the rites of mourning with him.

276 And it was taught in another baraita: Even though the Sages said that a husband may not force his wife to paint her eyelids or put rouge on her face when she is in mourning, i.e., that she may not treat her mourning lightly, actually, they said that she may pour his cup of wine, make his bed, and wash his face, hands, and feet, as these activities are expressions of affection between husband and wife rather than unnecessary adornment or a belittlement of the mourning. These two baraitot contradict each other: The first baraita indicates that the husband must practice the rites of mourning together with his wife, whereas the second one bars him only from forcing her to treat her own mourning lightly.

277 Rather, must one not conclude from this as follows: Here, where one is required to observe the halakhot of mourning together with his wife, the baraita is referring to the death of his father-in-law or mother-in-law. There, where one is not required to mourn, the baraita is referring to the death of his wife's other relatives for whom she is required to mourn. The Gemara summarizes: Conclude from this that this is the case. This is also taught in a baraita: The Sages said that one is required to observe the rites of mourning in honor of his wife only when she is in mourning over his father-in-law or his mother-in-law.

278 It was further related that the son of Ameimar's son died, and Ameimar rent his garment over him. His son came before him, and he rent his garments again in the presence of his son, as an

expression of empathy with his son’s pain and grief. Later, he remembered that when he rent his garments in his son’s presence he rent them while sitting, and therefore he stood up and rent his garment again while standing.

279 With regard to this issue, the Gemara reports that Rav Ashi said to Ameimar: From where do we derive that rending must be done while standing? He responded: As it is written about the deaths of Job’s sons: “Then Job arose, and rent his coat” (Job 1:20).

280 Rav Ashi challenged him: However, if that is so, one should be required to stand while performing the ritual through which the brother-in-law frees the yevama of her levirate bonds [ḥalitza], as the verse states: “And if he stands and he says: I do not wish to take her” (Deuteronomy 25:8). Here must he also stand for the ceremony? But isn’t it taught in a baraita that ḥalitza may be performed whether the man is sitting, or standing, or reclining?

281 He said to him: There, in the case of ḥalitza, it is not written: And he will stand and he will say, which would imply an obligation to stand; whereas here, in the case of rending, it is written: “Then Job arose, and rent his coat” (Job 1:20).

282 Rami bar Ḥama said: From where is it derived that rending must be performed while standing? As it is stated: “Then Job arose, and rent his coat” (Job 1:20). The Gemara asks: Perhaps he did something extra beyond what is required, and actually there is no obligation to stand; as, if you do not say that he did more than what was required of him, then how do you explain the continuation of the verse: “And he shaved his head” (Job 1:20)? Is every mourner required to act in this manner also and shave his head?

283 The Gemara concludes: Rather, this source must be rejected, and instead the halakha is derived from here, the verse that describes David’s mourning over his son: “Then the king arose, and rent his garments” (II Samuel 13:31). The Gemara asks: But perhaps he too did something extra beyond what is required, and he was not actually obligated to stand; as, if you do not say that he did more than what was required of him, then how do you explain the continuation of the verse: “And he lay on the earth” (II Samuel 13:31)? Is every mourner required to act in this manner also?

284 But isn’t it taught in a baraita: If a mourner sat on a bed, on a chair, on a large mortar [udyanei], or on the ground, he does not fulfill his obligation through any of them. And Rabbi Yoḥanan said: This is because he did not fulfill his obligation to overturn his bed, even if he lay on the ground. This indicates that there is no requirement whatsoever to lie on the ground.

285 Ameimar said to Rav Ashi: The verse does not mean that David actually lay on the ground. Rather, it was as if he were on the ground, since he overturned his bed and brought it closer to the ground. If this is the case, then Ameimar acted correctly, and a mourner should rend his garments while standing.

286 § The Sages taught: These are the activities that a mourner is prohibited from engaging in: He is prohibited from working, and from bathing, and from anointing himself with oil, and from engaging in sexual relations, and from wearing shoes. And he is prohibited from reading in the Torah, and in the Prophets, and in the Writings, and from studying in the Mishna, in the midrash, and in the halakhot, and in the Talmud, and in the aggadot. But if the public needs him to teach them these things, he need not refrain from doing so. There was an incident that the son of Rabbi Yosei died in Tzippori, and Rabbi Yosei entered the study hall and expounded there for the entire day.

[287] It was related that a calamity, i.e., a death in the family, once befell Rabba bar bar Ḥana, and he thought not to go out to deliver his exposition. Rabbi Ḥanina said to him: Is it not taught that if the public needs him to teach them these things, one need not refrain from doing so? He then thought to place an interpreter alongside him, who would sound his words to the public, as was normally done for such an exposition. Rav said to him: It is taught in a baraita similarly: Provided that he does not place the disseminator alongside him.

[288] The Gemara asks: But how, then, should he act so that he can be heard? The Gemara answers: It is like that which is taught in a baraita: There was an incident and the son of Rabbi Yehuda bar Ilai died, and Rabbi Yehuda entered the study hall. And Rabbi Ḥananya ben Akavya entered after him and sat by his side. Rabbi Yehuda bar Ilai then whispered his lecture to Rabbi Ḥananya ben Akavya, and Rabbi Ḥananya ben Akavya whispered it to the disseminator, and the disseminator sounded to the public what had been told to him. In this way, it became known that Rabbi Yehuda bar Ilai was in mourning.

[289] § The Sages taught the following baraita: For the first three days, a mourner is prohibited from donning phylacteries. From the third day and on, and including the third day, he is permitted to don phylacteries. And if new faces, i.e., people who had not yet come to console him, come, he need not remove them, although these people may falsely conclude that he had also donned phylacteries during the first two days of his mourning; this is the statement of Rabbi Eliezer. Rabbi Yehoshua says: For the first two days, a mourner is prohibited from donning phylacteries. From the second day, and including the second day, he is permitted to wear phylacteries. But if new faces come in to console him, he must remove his phylacteries.

[290] Rav Mattana said: What is the reason of Rabbi Eliezer? As it is written: “And the days of weeping and mourning for Moses ended” (Deuteronomy 34:8). The plural term “days” implies a minimum of two, and it indicates that the main portion of the mourning period is the first two full days. Rav Eina said: What is the reason of Rabbi Yehoshua? As it is written: “And I will make it as the mourning for an only son, and its end as a bitter day” (Amos 8:10), i.e., a single “day.”

[291] The Gemara asks: But also for Rabbi Yehoshua, isn’t it written in the Torah: “And the days of weeping and mourning for Moses ended,” thereby implying that this period lasts for two days? The Gemara answers: He could have said to you that Moses was different, because the mourning for him was more intense, and the people mourned for him longer than usual. The Gemara asks: But also for Rabbi Eliezer, isn’t it written in the Torah: “And its end as a bitter day”? The Gemara answers: He could have said to you that the main bitterness is only one day, but the severity of the mourning lasts for two days.

[292] Ulla said: The halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer with regard to the removal of phylacteries. A mourner need not remove them when new people come in to console him. And the halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehoshua with regard to the donning of phylacteries, and so a mourner may already don phylacteries on the second day.

[293] A dilemma was raised before the scholars: According to Ulla, who rules in accordance with Rabbi Yehoshua that a mourner may don phylacteries on his second day of mourning, is the mourner required to remove them if new people arrive on that day, or is he not required to remove them?

[294] The Gemara answers: Come and hear what Ulla said explicitly: One removes his phylacteries when new people come to console him, and he dons them again when they leave, even if he must don

and remove them a hundred times. This is also taught in a baraita: Yehuda ben Teima says: He removes his phylacteries and dons them again, even if he must do so a hundred times.

[295] Rava said: Once he dons his phylacteries, he does not remove them again. The Gemara asks: But wasn't it Rava himself who said: The halakha is in accordance with the opinion of the tanna of our mishna, who said that the most serious period of mourning is three days? How then does he rule in accordance with the baraita that a mourner may don phylacteries during these days?

[296] The Gemara answers: A mitzva is different, and since it is a mitzva to put on phylacteries, the mourner is required to do so, even during the first three days.

[297] § The Sages taught the following baraita: During the first three days after his bereavement, a mourner is prohibited from working, even if he is a poor person who is supported by charity. From this point forward, he may do work privately in his own home if he needs to do so. And similarly a woman may spin thread on a spindle in her own home when she is mourning.

[298] The Sages taught in another baraita: A mourner during the first three days after his bereavement may not go to another mourner's house to console him. From this point forward, he may go, but he may not sit among the consolers, but rather in the place of those being consoled, i.e., with the mourners in that house.

[299] § The Sages taught in yet another baraita: A mourner, during the first three days after his bereavement, is prohibited from extending greetings to others. From the third day to the seventh day, he may respond when other people address him, but he may not extend greetings to them. From this point forward, he may extend greetings and respond in his usual manner.

[300] The Gemara asks: Is he really prohibited from extending greetings during the first three days of mourning? But isn't it taught in a baraita: There was an incident and the sons of Rabbi Akiva died, and all the Jews entered to eulogize them with a great eulogy.

[301] When they were about to take leave, Rabbi Akiva stood on a large bench and said: Our brothers, the house of Israel, listen! Even had my two sons been bridegrooms, I would have been consoled on account of the honor you have shown them. If you came to console for the sake of Akiva, there are many Akivas in the marketplace whom the Jews do all not come to console. Rather, certainly this is what you said to yourselves: "The Torah of his God is in his heart" (Psalms 37:31), and you wished to show your respect for the Torah. All the more so is your reward doubled, for you have consoled mourners and shown respect for the Torah. Return now to your homes in peace. This indicates that a mourner may greet other people even on the first day of his mourning.

[302] The Gemara answers: Showing respect for the public is different. Rabbi Akiva was permitted to greet them to demonstrate courtesy and respect.

[303] § It was taught in the aforementioned baraita: From the third day to the seventh day, he may respond when other people address him, but he may not extend greetings to them. From this point forward, he may extend greetings and respond in his usual manner.

[304] And the Gemara raises a contradiction from another baraita that states: One who finds another in mourning during the first thirty days of that person's bereavement may still speak words of consolation to him, but he should not extend greetings toward him. If he finds him after thirty days, he may extend greetings toward him, but he should not speak words of consolation to him, so as not to remind him of his pain.

[305] If it was the mourner’s wife who died and he married another woman within thirty days of his first wife’s death, one may not enter his house to speak words of consolation with him, so as not to offend his new wife. If, however, he finds him alone in the marketplace, he may speak to him with gentle words and in a serious manner. This indicates that the prohibition against extending greetings lasts for thirty days and not just seven.

[306] Rav Idi bar Avin said: The two baraitot refer to different situations: The first baraita is referring to the mourner himself, who may extend greetings [shalom] to others after the completion of his seven days of mourning, as the others are at peace [shalom]. The second baraita, which speaks of a prohibition that lasts thirty days, is referring to other people, who may not extend greetings to him, as he, the mourner, is not at peace.

[307] The Gemara challenges: But from the fact that it teaches in a baraita that after the third day of his bereavement, the mourner may respond when other people address him, by inference others may extend greetings to him. The Gemara answers: This is referring to a case where people did not know that he was in mourning and unknowingly extended greetings to him.

[308] The Gemara asks: If so, if the baraita speaks of a case where the people who greeted him were unaware that he was in mourning, then there also, during the first three days of his bereavement, he should be permitted to respond when other people address him. The Gemara answers: There, during the first three days, he must inform them that he is in mourning and not respond to their greetings. Here, after the first three days, he need not inform them about his bereavement, but rather he may respond to their greetings.

[309] And the Gemara raises a contradiction from another baraita that states: One who finds another in mourning during his twelve months of bereavement may still speak words of consolation to him, but he should not extend greetings toward him. If he finds him after twelve months, he may extend greetings toward him, and he should not speak words of consolation to him. He may, however, speak to him indirectly, i.e., he may say to him: May you be consoled, without mentioning the name of the deceased.

[310] Rabbi Meir said: One who finds another in mourning after twelve months and speaks to him words of consolation, to what may this situation be likened? To a person who broke his leg and it healed, and afterward a physician found him and said to him: Come to me, for I will break it a second time and then I will heal it, so that you may know how good my medicines are and how well they work. One who consoles his friend after so much time has passed acts in a similar fashion, stirring up an old wound and then trying to heal it. In any event, it appears that one must not extend greetings to a mourner during the entire twelve-month mourning period.

[311] The Gemara answers: This is not difficult. This baraita, which says that one must not extend greetings to a mourner for twelve months, is referring to one who lost his father or mother. That baraita, which teaches that a mourner may be greeted after seven days, is referring to one who is in mourning over other relatives.

[312] The Gemara asks: There too, in the case of other relatives after thirty days, let him speak words of consolation to him indirectly. Why does the baraita say that after thirty days he should not speak words of consolation to him at all? The Gemara answers: Yes, it is indeed so. And what is meant by the words: He should not speak words of consolation to him? This means that he may not console him in his usual manner, but he may speak to him indirectly.

313 § The Sages taught the following baraita: If a mourner comes to the house of mourning from a nearby place during the first three days of mourning, he counts his days of mourning with the other mourners from the time of the burial and completes his mourning with them. This is the case even if he may end up observing mourning for only five or six days. But if he came from a distant place, he counts on his own seven complete days from the time that he was informed of his relative's death. From this point forward, i.e., after the first three days of mourning, even if he came from a nearby place, he counts seven days on his own. Rabbi Shimon says: Even if he came on the seventh day from a nearby place, he counts and completes the seven-day period of mourning with the other mourners.

314 The Master said, citing the baraita: If a mourner comes to the house of mourning from a nearby place during the first three days of mourning, he counts his days of mourning with the other mourners and completes his mourning with them. Rabbi Ḥiyya bar Abba said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: This is in a case where the principal member of the household is in the house, and therefore all the other family members follow his mourning. If, however, it is the principal member of the family who comes home, he certainly does not follow the other members, but rather he counts seven days on his own.

315 A dilemma was raised before the scholars:

316 If the principal member of the household went with the remains of the deceased to the cemetery and did not return for several days, what is the halakha? If another mourner came to the house of mourning during his absence, does he follow the principal member of the household and count from the time of the burial, or does he count from the time that the funeral procession departed, like the other members of the household?

317 The Gemara answers: Come and hear that which Rabbi Ḥiyya bar Abba said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: Even if the principal member of the household went to the cemetery, the mourner who comes home during his absence counts with them, i.e., the other members of the household who did not go to the cemetery. The Gemara asks: Does he really count and complete his mourning with them? But isn't it taught otherwise in a baraita, that he counts seven days on his own?

318 The Gemara answers: This is not difficult. This statement, that he counts with them, is referring to a case where the principal member of the household came home within three days. And the other ruling, that he counts on his own, is referring to a case where he did not come home within three days. This conclusion is similar to what Rav said to the sons of Hatzleponi when they were in mourning: Those who come home within three days should count with you; whereas those who do not come home within three days should count on their own.

319 Rava said to the people of Meḥoza: Those of you who do not follow the coffin all the way to the place of interment should begin counting your days of mourning from when you turn your faces from the city gates to return home. Since the dead were commonly transported long distances and buried far away, most of the mourners did not accompany their deceased relatives to the actual site of burial.

320 § The Gemara cites the baraita taught above: Rabbi Shimon says: Even if one of the mourners came on the seventh day from a nearby place, he counts with the other mourners and completes the seven-day period of mourning with them. Rabbi Ḥiyya bar Gamda said that Rabbi Yosei ben Shaul said that Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi said: And this is the halakha, provided that he came and found consolers still present in the house.

[321] § Rav Anan asks: If the consolers had already stirred themselves to stand up and leave but did not yet actually stand up and leave, what is the halakha? Is it considered as if the consolers have already left or not? This question was not answered, and the dilemma stands unresolved.

[322] The Gemara relates that a colleague of Rabbi Abba bar Ḥiyya learned the following principle as a tradition from Rabbi Abba. The Gemara asks: And who was this colleague? It was Rabbi Zeira. And some say a different version of this tradition: A colleague of Rabbi Zeira learned a tradition from Rabbi Zeira. The Gemara asks: And who is this colleague? It was Rabbi Abba, son of Rabbi Ḥiyya bar Abba: Rabbi Yoḥanan said: The halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel with regard to an animal that is unsuitable for human consumption because of severe organic disease or congenital defect, making it a tereifa, and the halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Shimon with regard to the halakhot of mourning.

[323] The Gemara explains: The halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Shimon with regard to mourning, concerning that which we just said about a mourner who arrives on the seventh day. The halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel with regard to defects in animals that render them tereifa concerning that which we learned in a baraita: If the animal's intestines became perforated, but the hole was stopped up by mucus, so that nothing comes out of this hole, the animal is fit. Unlike an ordinary hole in the intestines, this hole does not render the animal a tereifa and make it unfit for consumption. This is the statement of Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel.

[324] The Gemara asks: What is this mucus? Rav Kahana said: The fat [shirka] of the intestines that comes out under pressure. Someone whose name was not given said: May I merit to go up to Eretz Yisrael and learn this halakha from the mouth of its author.

[325] When he went up from Babylonia to Eretz Yisrael, he found Rabbi Abba, son of Rabbi Ḥiyya bar Abba, and said to him: Did the Master say that the halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel with regard to defects that render the animal a tereifa? He said to him: I said just the opposite, namely, that the halakha is not in accordance with Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel, and therefore such a hole in the animal's intestine makes it unfit for eating.

[326] He asked him again: What about the other ruling reported in your name, that the halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Shimon with regard to mourning? Is this accurate? He said to him: This issue is subject to dispute, as it was stated: Rav Ḥisda said: The halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Shimon, and similarly Rabbi Yoḥanan said: It is the halakha. But Rav Naḥman said: It is not the halakha.

[327] The Gemara concludes: The halakha is not in accordance with the opinion of Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel with regard to the aforementioned issue of tereifa, and the halakha is in accordance with Rabbi Shimon with regard to mourning, as Shmuel stated a principle: The halakha follows the opinion of the more lenient authority in matters relating to mourning.

[328] § It was taught in a baraita: With regard to all other deceased relatives, it is praiseworthy for one to be quick in taking the bier out for burial. But in the case of one's father or mother, acting in this manner is condemnable, as one should draw out the period of acute mourning for his parent. If, however, it was Friday or the eve of a Festival, then one is praiseworthy for expediting his parent's burial because he does this only out of respect for his father or mother, as he does not want them to remain unburied for the duration of Shabbat or the Festival.

329 With regard to all other dead, if the mourner wishes he may reduce his business due to mourning. If, however, he wishes not to do so, he need not

330 reduce it. In the case of his father or mother, he must always reduce his business.

331 With regard to all other deceased relatives, if the mourner wishes, he may remove his garment from one of his shoulders, and if he wishes not to remove it, he need not remove it. However, in the case of his father or mother, he must always remove his garment from one of his shoulders.

332 There was an incident when the father of a leading authority of his generation died, and the authority wished to remove his garment from one shoulder. Another leading authority of the generation also wished to remove his own garment together with him, in order to join him in his mourning, but due to this the first person refrained and did not remove his garment, so that his colleague would not remove his garment as well.

333 Abaye said: The leading authority of the generation mentioned here is Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, and the leading authority of the generation who was with him was Rabbi Ya'akov bar Aḥa. And some say: The leading authority of the generation was Rabbi Ya'akov bar Aḥa, and the leading authority of the generation who was with him was Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi.

334 The Gemara examines this issue: Granted, according to the one who said that the leading authority of the generation who was with him was Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, this is the reason that he refrained and did not remove his garment from his shoulder. That is to say, Rabbi Ya'akov bar Aḥa refrained from doing so because he did not wish to cause the Nasi to remove his own garment.

335 But according to the one who said that it is Rabbi Ya'akov bar Aḥa who was the leader of the generation with him, why did Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi refrain and not remove his garment from his shoulder? Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel, the father of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, was also the Nasi, and everyone is required to remove his garment from his shoulder for him, as was the accepted practice. Therefore, Rabbi Ya'akov bar Aḥa would also have been required to bare his shoulder. Why, then, did Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi prevent him from doing so? The Gemara concludes: Indeed this is difficult.

336 § The Gemara returns to the continuation of the baraita: With regard to all deceased relatives except for parents, one may cut his hair after thirty days. In the case of one's father or mother, one may not cut his hair until his colleagues have rebuked him for his hair being too long. With regard to all other deceased relatives, he may enter a place where a joyous celebration is taking place after thirty days; in the case of his father or mother, he may enter such a place only after twelve months.

337 Rabba bar bar Ḥana said: The ruling that a mourner may enter a house of joy after thirty days applies specifically to a joyous social gathering, that is to say, to the joyous meals that a group of friends would eat together, each taking a turn hosting. But this ruling does not apply to a large joyous occasion, such as a wedding feast. The Gemara raises an objection from a baraita which adds: And also for joyous social gatherings, thirty days. This implies that when the baraita speaks of joyous celebrations without further specification, it is not referring to joyous social gatherings, but even to weddings and other joyous occasions. The Gemara concludes: Indeed, it is difficult.

338 Ameimar taught the previous discussion as follows: Rabba bar bar Ḥana said an alternative version of the discussion: For a joyous social gathering one is permitted to enter immediately. The Gemara poses a question: But isn't it taught in a baraita: For joyous celebrations and for joyous social gatherings, one must wait thirty days?

[339] The Gemara answers: This is not difficult. This ruling, of the baraita, is referring to an initial gathering, when the mourner is the first in the group of friends to host. The baraita teaches that in such a situation the mourner is required to wait thirty days before doing so. That ruling, of Rabba bar bar Ḥana, is referring to a reciprocal gathering. The mourner's friends have already hosted these gatherings, and now it is his turn to host. Since he is required to host such a gathering for his colleagues, he need not postpone it. Rather, he may host the group immediately.

[340] The baraita continues: With regard to all other deceased relatives, one rends his garment the length of a handbreadth, and that suffices. In the case of his father or mother, he must rend his garment until he reveals his heart. Rabbi Abbahu said: What is the verse that teaches that the rent must be a handbreadth? "And David took hold of his clothes and rent them" (II Samuel 1:11), and taking hold cannot be done for a garment less than a handbreadth.

[341] The baraita teaches further: With regard to all other deceased relatives, even if he is wearing ten garments, one on top of the other, he rends only his outer garment. But in the case of his father or mother, he must rend them all. Failure to rend his undergarment, however, does not invalidate the fulfillment of the mitzva.

[342] Both a man and a woman are required to rend their garments. Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar says: A woman first rends her inner garment and turns it around, so that the tear is on her back. And only afterward does she rend her outer garment, so that she does not expose her chest.

[343] With regard to all other deceased relatives, if one wishes he may rip apart his garment on the hem, rather than merely expanding the neck hole, so that the tear stands out distinctly from the opening of the garment. If he wishes not to do this, he does not rip apart the hem in this manner. That is to say, one may simply enlarge the neck hole, although rending a garment in this way makes the tear less prominent. In the case of one's father or mother, however, he must always rip apart the hem.

[344] Rabbi Yehuda says: Any rending that does not rip apart his garment on the hem of the garment is nothing other than a frivolous rent of no significance, as it must be evident that one has rent his garment in mourning and that the rent is not merely an imperfection in the garment. Rabbi Abbahu said: What is the reason for Rabbi Yehuda's opinion? As it is written: "And he took hold of his own clothes and he rent them in two pieces" (II Kings 2:12). From that which is stated: "And he rent," do I not know that he rent them in two? Rather, these words teach that the rent clothes must appear as if they were torn into two pieces, i.e., the tear must be obvious and visible.

[345] The baraita continues: With regard to all other deceased relatives, one may tack the tear with rough stitches after seven days, and one may join the edges more carefully after thirty days. But in the case of one's father or mother, he may tack the tear only after thirty days, and he may never again join the edges more carefully. A woman, however, may tack the tear immediately, due to her honor, for it would be dishonorable for her to be seen with torn garments.

[346] When Ravin came from Eretz Yisrael to Babylonia, he said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: With regard to all other deceased relatives, if one wishes, he may rend his garment with his hand; and if he wishes, he may rend it with a utensil in a way that will preserve it. But in the case of his father or mother, he must rend his garment with his hand in a manner that will utterly ruin it.

[347] And Rabbi Ḥiyya bar Abba said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: With regard to all other deceased relatives, one rends his garment on the inside, meaning, he rends his inner garment and not

necessarily his outermost garment. In the case of one’s father or mother, however, he must rend the garment on the outside, i.e., the outermost garment. Rav Ḥisda said: And likewise, over a Nasi, one is required to rend his garment as he does over his father.

[348] The Gemara raises an objection from a baraita in which it was taught: The halakhot of rending for the death of other people referred to in the baraita, e.g., a Nasi, a president of the court, or one’s teacher, were likened to the halakhot of rending for one’s father or mother only with regard to the issue of carefully rejoining the edges of the rent, as in all of these cases it is prohibited to mend one’s garment with precise stitches.

[349] What, is this baraita not also referring even to one who rends his garment for the Nasi? The Gemara rejects this: No, the baraita is referring to the other people, aside from one who rends his garment for the Nasi, as rending for the Nasi is the same as rending for one’s father with regard to all aspects of the rending.

[350] It was related that the Nasi died, and Rav Ḥisda said to Rav Ḥanan bar Rava: Turn the mortar over and stand on it, and show the rent to everyone. Everyone will then rend his garment in this manner, as everyone is required to rend his garment over the death of the Nasi.

[351] § It was further taught: For mourning a Sage, one removes his garment from the right shoulder. For the president of the court he removes his garment from the left shoulder. For the Nasi he removes his garment from here and from here, from both shoulders.

[352] The Sages taught the following baraita: When a Sage dies, his study hall ceases its regular study as a sign of mourning over him. When the president of the court dies, all of the study halls in his city cease their regular study, and everyone enters the synagogue and changes their places there as a sign of mourning over him. Those who ordinarily sit in the north should sit in the south, and those who ordinarily sit in the south should sit in the north. When a Nasi dies, all study halls cease their regular study. On Shabbat, the members of the synagogue enter the synagogue for public Torah reading, which requires a congregation of ten,

[353] and seven people read from the Torah. And then they leave and pray on their own. Rabbi Yehoshua ben Korḥa says: It is not that they stroll afterward in the marketplace, but rather they sit at home in silent mourning.

[354] And furthermore, one may not speak about halakha or aggada in a house of mourning, as this is an activity that brings people joy. It was said of Rabbi Ḥananya ben Gamliel that he would speak about halakha and aggada in a house of mourning.

[355] § The Sages taught the following baraita: During the first week after his bereavement, the mourner may not go out of the opening of his house. During the second week, he may go out, but he may not sit in his usual place in the synagogue. During the third week, he may sit in his usual place but he may not speak. During the fourth week, he is like any other person.

[356] Rabbi Yehuda says: They did not need to say that during the first week the mourner may not go out of the opening of his house. This teaches us nothing new, as at that time everyone goes into his house to console him. Rather, during the second week, he may not go out of the opening of his house. During the third week, he may go out, but he may not sit in his usual place in the synagogue. During the fourth week, he may sit in his usual place, but he may not speak. During the fifth week, he is like any other person.

[357] § The Sages taught another baraita: During the entire thirty-day period of mourning, it is prohibited to marry. If one’s wife died, it is prohibited to marry another wife until three Festivals pass since her death. Rabbi Yehuda says: Until the first and second Festivals have passed, he is prohibited from marrying; before the third Festival, however, he is permitted to do so.

[358] And if he does not have children, he is permitted to marry another wife immediately due to the need to not neglect the mitzva to be fruitful and multiply. Since he has not yet fulfilled the mitzva of procreation, he is still required to marry a wife. Any delay might result in a lost opportunity for marriage. Similarly, if his wife died and left him young children, he is permitted to marry another wife immediately, so that she might take care of them.

[359] There was an incident when the wife of Yosef the Priest died, and he said to her sister at the cemetery immediately after the funeral: Go and care for your sister’s children. In other words, he alluded that he wished to marry her immediately. But even though he married her immediately, he did not engage in sexual relations with her for a long time afterward. The Gemara asks: What is the meaning of the term: A long time? Rav Pappa said: After thirty days.

[360] § The Sages taught yet another baraita: During the entire thirty-day period of mourning, it is prohibited to wear ironed garments, whether they are new garments or old garments taken out of the press, as ironed garments appear to be new. Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi disagrees and says: The Sages prohibited wearing only new garments. Rabbi Elazar, son of Rabbi Shimon, says: They prohibited wearing only new white garments.

[361] The Gemara relates that Abaye went out while he was in mourning in an old white garment, in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi. Rava, on the other hand, went out in a new, red Roman cloak, as he acted in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Elazar, son of Rabbi Shimon.

[362] It was taught in the mishna: This is because the Sages said that Shabbat counts as one of the days of mourning, but it does not interrupt the mourning period, which continues after Shabbat. It is stated that with regard to mourning on Shabbat, there is a difference in practice between the residents of Judea and the residents of the Galilee. These say:

[363] There is some mourning on Shabbat, i.e., with regard to mourning rites that can be observed privately in the mourner’s home and will go unnoticed by other people; whereas those say: There is no mourning on Shabbat at all.

[364] The Gemara explains: The ones who said that there is some mourning on Shabbat rely on that which is taught, that Shabbat counts as one of the days of mourning, implying that some degree of mourning applies on that day. The ones who said that there is no mourning on Shabbat at all base this on that which is taught that Shabbat does not interrupt the mourning period.

[365] The latter argue as follows: If it should enter your mind to say that there is some mourning on Shabbat, there is a difficulty, for now that it has been stated that actual mourning applies on Shabbat, is it necessary to teach us that this day does not interrupt the mourning period? Rather, the conclusion must be that there is no mourning on Shabbat whatsoever.

[366] The Gemara asks: But isn’t it taught in the mishna that Shabbat counts as one of the days of mourning, implying that it is just like the other days of mourning, and at least some mourning rites are practiced on it? The Gemara answers: Since the mishna wished to teach in the latter clause that the days of a Festival do not count toward the requisite days of mourning, it taught also in the first

clause that Shabbat counts as one of the days of mourning, although no mourning rites are practiced on it.

[367] The Gemara asks: And according to the ones who said that there is some mourning on Shabbat, isn't it taught in the mishna that it does not interrupt the mourning period, which would have been unnecessary to say if the mourning rites are practiced on it? The Gemara answers: This was not necessary for itself, but due to the fact that the mishna wished to teach in the latter clause that the Festivals interrupt the mourning, it taught also in the first clause that Shabbat does not interrupt it.

[368] The Gemara asks: Let us say that this is parallel to a dispute between tanna'im with regard to whether or not some mourning rites are observed even on Shabbat, for it was taught in a baraita: One whose deceased relative is laid out before him eats in another room. If he does not have another room, he eats in the house of a friend. If he does not have a friend's house available, he makes a partition ten handbreadths high between him and the deceased, so that he may eat. If he does not have material with which to make a partition, he averts his face from the dead and eats.

[369] And in any case, he does not recline while he eats, as reclining is characteristic of a festive meal; and he neither eats meat nor drinks wine; and he does not recite a blessing before eating to exempt others from their obligation; and he does not recite the formula to invite the participants in the meal to join together in the Grace after Meals, and they do not recite a blessing over him nor do others invite him to join in the Grace after Meals, as he cannot be a member of the three required to recite the formula. And he is exempt from the recitation of Shema, and from the Amida prayer, and from donning phylacteries, and from performing all of the mitzvot mentioned in the Torah.

[370] But on Shabbat he reclines at the meal, as per his custom, and eats; and he eats meat and drinks wine; and he recites blessings to exempt others from their obligation; and he recites the formula to invite the participants in the meal to join together in the Grace after Meals, and others may recite blessings on his behalf and invite him to join in the Grace after Meals. And he is also obligated in the recitation of Shema, and in the Amida prayer, and in the mitzva of phylacteries, and in all the mitzvot mentioned in the Torah. Rabban Gamliel says: Since he is obligated to fulfill these mitzvot associated with Shabbat, he is obligated to fulfill all of the mitzvot on Shabbat.

[371] Rabban Gamliel's statement is vague. The following clarifies it: Rabbi Yoḥanan said: The practical difference between them, the opinion of the anonymous first tanna and Rabbi Yoḥanan's opinion, is with regard to sexual relations. According to Rabban Gamliel, the acute mourner is obligated in the mitzva to engage in marital intercourse with his wife on Shabbat, just as he is obligated in all the other mitzvot.

[372] The Gemara asks: What, is it not with regard to this issue that they disagree: Is it not that one Sage, the anonymous first tanna, holds that there is some mourning on Shabbat with regard to private issues, and therefore the mourner does not engage in sexual relations; and one Sage, Rabban Gamliel, holds that there is no mourning on Shabbat at all?

[373] The Gemara rejects this argument: From where do you reach this conclusion? Perhaps the first tanna is saying that it is prohibited for the grieving relative to engage in sexual relations in the case dealt with only there, because his deceased relative is laid out before him and has not yet been buried. But here, with regard to the period of mourning, when his dead has been buried and is no longer laid out before him, sexual relations are not prohibited.

[374] And alternatively, perhaps Rabban Gamliel is saying that the grieving relative is permitted to engage in sexual relations only there, where the halakhot of mourning have not yet taken effect, as mourning begins only after the burial. But here, where the halakhot of mourning have already taken effect, he may also prohibit sexual relations.

[375] Rabbi Yoḥanan asked of Shmuel: Is there some mourning on Shabbat or is there no mourning on Shabbat at all? He said to him: There is no mourning on Shabbat at all.

[376] The Sages sat before Rav Pappa and said in the name of Shmuel: A mourner who engaged in sexual relations during his days of mourning is liable to receive the death penalty at the hand of Heaven. Rav Pappa said to them: It was said that sexual relations are prohibited, but not that the offender is guilty of a capital crime. And the ruling was said in the name of Rabbi Yoḥanan, and not in the name of Shmuel.

[377] And if you heard a statement on this issue in the name of Shmuel, then you heard as follows: Rav Taḥlisa bar Avimi said that Shmuel said: A mourner who did not let his hair grow wild and did not rend his garments is liable to receive the death penalty at the hand of Heaven, as it is stated following the deaths of Nadab and Abihu concerning the surviving sons of Aaron: “Let not the hair of your heads go loose, neither rend your clothes, that you not die” (Leviticus 10:6). They were instructed not to mourn, so as not to interfere with the dedication of the Tabernacle. From here it may be deduced that any other mourner who did not let his hair grow wild or rend his clothes is liable to receive the death penalty.

[378] Rafram bar Pappa said: A Sage taught in Evel Rabbati, a separate tractate devoted to the halakhot of mourning: A mourner is prohibited from engaging in sexual relations during his days of mourning. There was an incident with one who engaged in sexual relations during his days of mourning and he was punished, for after his death pigs dragged away his corpse.

[379] Shmuel offered a mnemonic device with regard to the observance of mourning rites on Shabbat, and said: Peh, ḥet, zayin are obligatory. These letters combine to create a mnemonic standing for: Uncovering the head [periat rosh], reversing the torn garment [ḥazarat kera], and standing the bed upright [zekifat hamitta]. However, nun, tav, reish, which stand for: Wearing shoes [ne’ilat hasandal], marital relations [tashmish hamitta], and hand washing [reḥitzat yadayim], are optional.

[380] This is explained: Uncovering the head, i.e., removing the head covering usually worn by a mourner; reversing the tear to the back, so that it will not be visible; and standing the bed upright in the usual position, so that it is not overturned, are all obligatory for the mourner to uphold in honor of Shabbat. However, wearing shoes, engaging in sexual relations, and washing one’s hands and feet in hot water in the evening are optional activities on Shabbat. If a mourner wishes to refrain from them he may do so. And Rav said: Uncovering the head is also an optional activity.

[381] The Gemara asks: According to Shmuel, what is different about wearing shoes that it is optional? His reasoning presumably is that not everyone wears shoes at all times, and therefore not wearing shoes will not be perceived by others as a sign of mourning. If so, the same thing may be said about uncovering the head also, i.e., not everyone uncovers his head at all times, as some people always walk around with their heads wrapped. This, too, should not be seen as a clear display of mourning, and therefore uncovering one’s head should also be treated as optional.

[382] The Gemara answers: Shmuel conforms to his standard line of reasoning, for Shmuel said: Any rending of garments that is not done at the time of the most intense grief, i.e., the time of death, is not considered proper rending of garments. And any wrapping of the head that is not done in the manner of the wrapping of the Ishmaelites, who wrap their heads on all sides, is not considered proper wrapping. Since Shmuel requires that a mourner wrap his head in this special manner, one who acts in this way on Shabbat openly displays his mourning, as people do not ordinarily wrap their heads in this manner. What is this wrapping? Rav Naḥman demonstrated the procedure by covering up his face to the sides of the beard, leaving only the center of his face exposed.

[383] Rabbi Ya'akov said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: They taught that a mourner is required to remove his head covering on Shabbat only when he has no shoes on his feet, so that he not appear too obviously to be in mourning. But if he has shoes on his feet, then his shoes prove that he is not observing the rites of mourning on Shabbat.

[384] The Gemara returns to Shmuel's statement that any rending of garments that is not done at the time of most intense grief and pain is not considered proper rending of garments. The Gemara poses a question: But when they said to Shmuel that Rav had passed away, he rent twelve garments on account of him, and said: The man of whom I was in fear, owing to his great learning, has gone and died. Similarly, when they told Rabbi Yoḥanan that Rabbi Ḥanina had passed away, he rent thirteen expensive wool [mileta] garments [itztelei] on account of him, and said: The man of whom I was in fear has gone. When each of these Sages received the news that their distinguished colleague had died, it was no longer the time of the most intense grief, i.e., the time of death, and yet they rent their garments.

[385] The Gemara answers: The Sages are different. Since their teachings are mentioned all the time, every time they are mentioned is like the time of most intense grief, as the pain over their death is once again renewed.

[386] Ravin bar Adda said to Rava: Your student, Rav Amram, said that it is taught in a baraita as follows: For all seven days of mourning, a mourner must keep the tear in his garment before him so that it will be seen. And if he comes to change clothing, he changes and rends the new garment. On Shabbat, he turns the tear to his back, and if he comes to change clothing, he changes but does not tear the second garment. From here it seems that there is an obligation to rend garments during the entire week of mourning, not only at the most intense moment of grief.

[387] The Gemara answers: When that baraita is taught, it is referring to the specific case of rending one's garment in honor of his father or mother. Owing to the special honor due to one's parents, it is inappropriate for the child to wear a garment that is not torn. Consequently, if he changes clothing, he must tear the new garment, even if it is no longer the most intense time of grief.

[388] The Gemara asks: Those additional tears that are made in honor of one's father or mother, may they be properly mended at the end of the son's period of mourning, or may they not be properly mended, like the tear made for one's father or mother at the most intense moment of grief? The Gemara answers: They disagree about this issue, the father of Rav Oshaya and bar Kappara. One said: They may not be mended, and one said: They may be mended.

[389] The Gemara comments: Conclude that it was Rav Oshaya's father who said that such rents may not be properly mended, for Rav Oshaya said: Such rents may not be properly mended. From whom

did he hear this halakha? Was it not from his father? The Gemara rejects this argument: No, this cannot be offered as a proof, as perhaps he heard it from bar Kappara, who was his teacher.

390 § Rava said: A mourner may walk about his house in a torn robe [unkali] on Shabbat, since he is not doing so in public. It was related that Abaye found Rav Yosef walking back and forth in his house on Shabbat when he was in mourning with a scarf spread over his head in the manner of mourning. He said to him: Master, do you not maintain that there is no mourning on Shabbat? He said to him: This is what Rabbi Yoḥanan said: Matters that are in private apply, and so when one is in his house he must observe the rites of mourning even on Shabbat.

391 § The mishna taught: Rabbi Eliezer says: Since the Temple was destroyed, Shavuot is like Shabbat with regard to mourning. Rabban Gamliel says: Even Rosh HaShana and Yom Kippur are considered like Festivals. The Gemara comments that Rav Giddel bar Menashya said that Shmuel said: The halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabban Gamliel.

392 And some teach this ruling of Rav Giddel bar Menashya as referring to the following case: It is taught in a baraita: Within the first thirty days after birth, an infant that dies is taken out for burial in one's bosom, that is to say, he is carried to his grave in one's arms, not in a coffin. And he is buried by one woman and two men, there being no need for a quorum of ten men. But he should not be taken out by one man and two women, because it is prohibited for one man to seclude himself with two women.

393 Abba Shaul says: The infant may be taken out even by one man and two women, for there is no concern with regard to seclusion in a time of mourning. And for such an infant, people do not stand in a line to offer their condolences to the mourners, as is ordinarily done after a burial; nor do others recite over him the mourners' blessing, which is recited in the courtyard of the graveyard after the burial; nor is the usual formula for the consolation of mourners recited during the seven days of mourning.

394 A thirty-day-old infant that dies is taken out for burial in a coffin [deluskema]. Rabbi Yehuda says: Not in a small coffin that is carried on one's shoulder, but rather in a coffin that is carried in the arms of two people. And for such an infant, people stand in a line to offer their condolences to the mourners. And others recite the mourners' blessing at the cemetery. And people recite the consolation of mourners during the week of mourning.

395 A twelve-month-old infant is taken out for burial on a bier, just as an adult is. Rabbi Akiva says: This halakha applies if the infant that dies is one year old and his limbs are like those of a two year old, so that he looks older, or if he is two years old and his limbs are like those of a one-year-old. Only then he is taken out on a bier.

396 Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar says: For one that is taken out on a bier, the public should grieve [matzhivin]. For one that is not taken out on a bier, the public need not grieve. Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya says: The halakha is as follows: If the infant was known to the public, because he regularly left the house and many people knew him, the public must occupy themselves with him and participate in his burial. If he was not known to the public, the public need not occupy themselves with him.

397 And what is the status of deceased infants with regard to eulogy? Rabbi Meir said in the name of Rabbi Yishmael: The children of the poor are eulogized from the age of three, whereas the children

of the wealthy are eulogized from the age of five. This is because a child is the sole source of joy for the poor, and so the pain and grief of the poor over the death of a child is greater than that of the wealthy. Rabbi Yehuda said in the name of Rabbi Yishmael: The children of the poor are eulogized from the age of five, whereas the children of the wealthy are eulogized from the age of six. And the children of the elderly are treated like the children of the poor, for the death of a child is particularly painful for an older person.

398 Rav Giddel bar Menashya said that Rav said: The halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, who stated it in the name of Rabbi Yishmael.

399 Rabbi Anani bar Sason taught at the entrance to the house of the Nasi: If one suffered the loss of a close relative shortly before the festival of Shavuot, his one day of mourning before Shavuot and Shavuot itself together count as fourteen days. The day before the Festival counts as seven full days of mourning because the Festival interrupts the seven-day period of mourning, and the Festival itself is counted as a seven-day Festival. Even though it is a one-day Festival, it is counted as seven days because it has the same halakha as the other Festivals. After Shavuot, then, only sixteen days are left to complete the thirty-day mourning period. Rabbi Ami heard this and became angry with him. He said: Is that to say that it is his own opinion? It is the opinion that Rabbi Elazar said that Rabbi Oshaya said.

400 Similarly Rabbi Yitzḥak Nappaḥa taught in the pavilion [kila] of the Exilarch: If one's relative died shortly before the festival of Shavuot, his one day of mourning before Shavuot and Shavuot itself count as fourteen days. Rav Sheshet heard and became angry. He said: Is that to say that it is his own opinion? It is the opinion that Rabbi Elazar said that Rabbi Oshaya said.

401 In both of these cases, a Sage presented an opinion as their own, without attributing it to the original Sage who stated it, for Rabbi Elazar said that Rabbi Oshaya said: From where is it derived that the Shavuot offerings have redress all seven subsequent days? That is to say, if someone failed to bring the Festival offering on the Festival itself, he has six more days to bring it. As it is stated: "Three times a year shall all your males appear before the Lord your God in the place that He shall choose; on the festival of Passover, and on the festival of Shavuot, and on the festival of Sukkot" (Deuteronomy 16:16). Just as the offerings of the festival of Passover have redress all seven days, as Passover is seven days long, so too the offerings of the festival of Shavuot have redress all seven days, during the week following Shavuot. From this we learn that Shavuot is treated like a seven-day Festival for all halakhic purposes.

402 Rav Pappa granted permission to Rav Avya the Elder to speak and he taught the following in public: If one's relative died shortly before Rosh HaShana, his one day of mourning before Rosh HaShana and Rosh HaShana itself together count as fourteen days, because Rosh HaShana is treated like a seven-day Festival. Ravina said: Therefore, if one's relative died shortly before Sukkot, his one day of mourning before the Festival of Sukkot, and the Festival of Sukkot itself, which is seven days, and its Eighth day of Assembly, which is considered to be a separate Festival, count as twenty-one days, and he must observe only nine more days of mourning to complete the thirty-day period of mourning.

403 It was related that Ravina happened to come to the city of Sura on the Euphrates River. Rav Ḥaviva from Sura on the Euphrates said to Ravina: Did the Master say that one day of mourning before Rosh HaShana and Rosh HaShana itself count as fourteen days? He said to him: I said that it

stands to reason that this is so according to Rabban Gamliel, who maintains that Rosh HaShana is treated like a pilgrim Festival. But I did not rule in accordance with this opinion.

404 MISHNA: Mourners do not rend their garments during the intermediate days of a Festival and do not remove their garments from their shoulders. And others do not provide them with a meal [mavrin] after the burial, except for close relatives of the deceased. And the consolers provide the first meal after the burial only while the mourner is sitting on an upright bed, and not on one that is overturned.

405 GEMARA: The mishna teaches that only the relatives of the deceased rend their clothes. The Gemara asks: And is this the case even if the deceased was a Torah Sage? But isn't it taught otherwise in a baraita: When a Torah scholar dies, everyone is his relative.

406 The Gemara clarifies: Does it enter your mind to say that everyone is his relative? Rather, this baraita should be understood as follows: Everyone is considered to be like his relative in the sense that everyone rends his garment in anguish over him, and everyone bares his shoulder over him in mourning, and everyone eats the mourner's meal over him in the public square as mourners do. The death of a Torah scholar is a personal loss for every Jew. So why is the mishna limited to only relatives? The Gemara answers: No, it is necessary for the mishna to teach this halakha in a case where the deceased is not a Torah scholar.

407 The Gemara asks: And if the deceased was an upright person who feared Heaven and performed good deeds, then aren't all those present at his death obligated to rend their garments over his death? As it is taught in a baraita: For what reason do a person's sons and daughters die when they are young? They die so that he will cry and mourn over the death of an upright person.

408 The Gemara questions the formulation: They die so that he will cry and mourn? Is security, i.e., his children, taken from him in advance to ensure that in the future he will mourn over the death of an upright person? Rather the baraita means as follows: His children died because he did not cry or mourn over an upright person who died. As with regard to anyone who cries and mourns over an upright person who died, they forgive him for all his transgressions because of the honor he accorded to the deceased. If this is the case, one also rends his clothes over an upright person. The Gemara answers: Rather, the mishna is referring only to one who was not an upright person.

409 The Gemara challenges: But if one was standing there at the time of the soul's departure, i.e., at the time of death, he is also obligated to rend his clothes. As it is taught in a baraita: Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar says: One who stands over the deceased at the time of the soul's departure is obligated to rend his clothes. To what may this be likened? To a Torah scroll that is burned, for which anyone present is obligated to rend his clothes.

410 The Gemara answers: The mishna must be referring to a person who was not standing there at the time of the soul's departure but who heard that someone who is not a close relative died, and the deceased was neither a Torah scholar nor an upright person.

411 § The Gemara relates that when Rav Safra passed away the other Sages did not rend their garments over him. They said: We did not learn from him, as he did not disseminate his Torah knowledge to the public. Abaye berated them and said to them: Is it taught in the baraita: If one's teacher died? It is taught: If a Torah scholar died, and Rav Safra was certainly a Torah scholar. And

furthermore, every day his teachings are in our mouths in the study hall, so that even if we did not learn directly from him, we should still be considered his students.

412 The other Sages thought that what was done was done, and it was now too late for them to rend their garments. Abaye said to them: We learned: With regard to a Torah scholar, as long as they are engaged in eulogizing him, then people are obligated to rend their garments, even after the time of his death. They then thought to rend their garments immediately. Abaye said to them: It is taught in a baraita: A Torah scholar's honor is at the time of his eulogy, and so you should wait until the time of the eulogy before rending your garments.

413 § The Gemara relates another incident: When Rav Huna died they thought to place a Torah scroll on his bier, as was commonly done after the death of a Torah scholar, as if to say that the deceased fulfilled everything written in the scroll. Rav Ḥisda said to them: This is a practice that he did not hold with during his lifetime; now should we stand up and do it for him when he is dead? As Rav Taḥlisa said: I myself saw Rav Huna, who wished to sit on his bed, and there was a Torah scroll placed on it. And he turned a jug over and placed the Torah scroll on it so that he could then sit on the bed. Apparently he holds that it is prohibited to sit on a bed upon which a Torah scroll lies. Therefore, it would be inappropriate to lay a Torah scroll next to his body after he died.

414 When they tried to remove his corpse from his house for the burial, the bier would not fit through the narrow door. They then thought to lower the bier from the roof. Rav Ḥisda said to them: This I learned from him, Rav Huna himself: A scholar's honor is for him to be taken out through the main opening, and not in any other manner.

415 They then thought to move him from his bier to a narrower bier so that it would fit through the door. But Rav Ḥisda said to them: I learned from him, Rav Huna himself, as follows: A scholar's honor is for him to be taken out on the first bier. As Rav Yehuda said that Rav said: From where is it derived that a scholar's honor is for him to be taken out on the first bier? As it is stated: "And they set the Ark of God upon a new cart" (II Samuel 6:3). When taking the Ark to Jerusalem, King David had it placed back on the cart upon which it had been returned by the Philistines, and a Torah scholar is considered to be similar to the Ark of the Covenant. When they saw that there was nothing else that they could do, they broke the doorway and took him out through it.

416 Rabbi Abba opened his eulogy for him: Our Rabbi was worthy that the Divine Presence should rest upon him, except for the fact that Babylonia caused it not to rest. In other words, it was only because he lived in Babylonia and not in Eretz Yisrael that the Divine Presence did not rest upon him.

417 Rav Naḥman bar Ḥisda raised an objection against this, and some say that it was Rav Ḥanan bar Ḥisda: Is it not stated: "The word of the Lord came [hayo haya] to Ezekiel the priest, son of Buzi, in the land of the Chaldeans" (Ezekiel 1:3), thereby implying that a prophet can prophesy outside of Eretz Yisrael?

418 His father tapped him with his sandal on his foot, thereby hinting to him that he should be quiet. He said to him: Have I not told you not to trouble everyone with questions in the middle of a eulogy? The Gemara answers the question: What is the meaning of the doubling of the word "came [hayo haya]"? It implies that it had already come before, i.e., that Ezekiel had already begun to prophesy in Eretz Yisrael, and his prophecy in Babylonia was merely a continuation of that prophecy.

419 § The Gemara relates that when they took Rav Huna there, to Eretz Yisrael, for burial they said to Rabbi Ami and Rabbi Asi: Rav Huna has come, and they misunderstood and thought that he was still alive. They said: When we were there, in Babylonia, we did not have strength to lift our heads before him. Now that we have come here, has he come after us?

420 They said to them: His coffin has come. Rabbi Ami and Rabbi Asi went out to meet his funeral procession. Rabbi Ila and Rabbi Ḥanina did not go out. Some say that Rabbi Ila went out, but Rabbi Ḥanina did not go out.

421 The Gemara asks: Those who went out, what is the reason that they went? As it is taught in a baraita: When a coffin is passing from place to place, the people stand in a line to show respect for the deceased, and they recite the mourners' blessing and the consolation of the mourners over it. Those who did not go out, what is the reason that they did not? As it is taught in another baraita: When a coffin is passing from place to place, they do not stand in a line to show respect for the deceased, and they do not recite the mourners' blessing or the consolation of the mourners for him.

422 The Gemara asks: If so, these two tannaitic statements contradict each other. The Gemara answers: It is not difficult: Here, the baraita is referring to a case where the skeleton of the deceased is still intact, and the mourning practices must be observed. And there the baraita is referring to a case where the skeleton of the deceased is no longer intact, and it is not necessary to observe the customs of mourning. And Rav Huna's skeleton was still intact. The reason that the one Sage did not go out was that they did not confirm for him that the skeleton was still intact.

423 The Sages of Eretz Yisrael said: Where shall we bury him? They concluded: Rav Huna disseminated Torah to the people of Israel, and similarly Rabbi Ḥiyya disseminated Torah to the people of Israel; therefore, it is appropriate to bury Rav Huna next to Rabbi Ḥiyya.

424 They asked: Who will take him in to Rabbi Ḥiyya's burial cave, as few are fit to enter it? Rav Ḥagga said to them: I will take him into the cave, for I presented my studies before him when I was just eighteen, never having experienced a seminal emission. And so too I attended to him and knew his great deeds. For example, one day one of the straps of his phylacteries turned around, the unpainted side being turned outward, and he observed forty fasts for this, as he had acted negligently, allowing the black side to face inward.

425 Rav Ḥagga took him in. The body of Rabbi Ḥiyya's son Yehuda lay buried to the right of his father, and the body of his other son Ḥizkiyya lay to his left. The spirit of Yehuda said to the spirit of Ḥizkiyya: Rise from your place, as it is not proper conduct to remain lying when the body of Rav Huna is standing here. When Ḥizkiyya's corpse stood up, a pillar of fire rose with him. When Rabbi Ḥagga saw this, he was frightened by what he saw, and so he stood up Rav Huna's coffin and went away. The Gemara comments: And he was not punished or harmed by this pillar of fire because he set up Rav Huna's coffin as protection for himself.

426 § The Gemara relates another story about the burial of one of the Sages: When Rav Ḥisda died they thought to place a Torah scroll on his bier. Rabbi Yitzḥak said to them: This is a practice that this Rabbi did not hold with during his lifetime; should we stand up and do it for him now that he is dead?

[427] They then thought not to tack, i.e., sew up, the tears that they had made in their clothes. Rabbi Yitzḥak bar Ami said to them: When the deceased is a Torah Sage, they may tack the tears once they turn their faces from the bier.

[428] The Gemara relates that when Rabba bar Huna and Rav Hamnuna died, they took them both up there, to Eretz Yisrael.

[429] When they reached a bridge that could be crossed only in single file, the camels carrying the two Sages stood in their places and would not cross the bridge. A certain Arab [Tayya'a] who witnessed what was happening said to them: What is this phenomenon that the camels have stopped moving? They said to him: The deceased Sages are showing honor to each other. It is as if one Sage is saying: The Master should go and cross the bridge first, while at the same time the other Sage is saying: The Master should go and cross first. The Arab said: By law Rabba bar Huna should go first, since he is the son of a great man, and the camel carrying Rabba bar Huna then passed first. Shortly thereafter, the molars and other teeth of that Arab fell out due to the disrespect he showed Rav Hamnuna.

[430] When they reached Tiberias a certain child opened his eulogy saying as follows: The shoot of an ancient line, i.e., Rabba bar Rav Huna, who was the descendant of great people, has ascended from Babylonia, and with him is the book of wars, i.e., Rav Hamnuna, who was great in Torah, which is referred to as the book of the Wars of the Lord (Numbers 21:14). The curses of the pelican and the bittern, which are symbols of the destruction of the Temple (Isaiah 34:11), have been doubled, to see the ruin and brokenness that has come from Shinar, i.e., Babylonia. The Lord became angry with His world and seized souls from it, and He rejoices over them when they come to Him like a new bride. God who rides upon the clouds is joyous and happy when an innocent and righteous soul comes to Him.

[431] § The Gemara continues recounting other famous eulogies. When Ravina passed away, a certain eulogizer opened his eulogy for him with the following words: Date-palms, hang your heads in sadness over the righteous man who may be likened to a date-palm. Let us make, our nights like days in weeping, over a man who made his nights like days studying the Torah.

[432] The Gemara relates that prior to Ravina's death, Rav Ashi said to bar Kippok, who was a famous eulogizer: On that day when Ravina will die, what will you say? He said to him: I shall begin my eulogy and say as follows: If the cedars went up in flame, what shall the hyssop of the wall do? If the leviathan was lifted by a hook, what shall the tiny fish of the marsh do? If dryness overtook a flowing river, what can the water of the puddles do?

[433] Bar Avin, who was also a eulogizer, said to him: God forbid that the words hook and flame should be said with regard to the righteous, as these are not expressions of honor. Rav Ashi asked him: And what will you say? He said to him: I shall say: Cry for the mourners and not for that which was lost, as that which was lost, i.e., the soul of Ravina, has gone to its eternal rest, while we, the mourners, are left with our sighs.

[434] Rav Ashi was offended by them, as their words of praise for Ravina might have been understood as a show of disrespect to Rav Ashi, since they likened Ravina to a cedar and the other Sages, Rav Ashi included, to hyssops of the wall. Due to Rav Ashi's anger, their feet turned inward and became crooked. On that day when Ravina actually died, neither of them came to eulogize him. This is what Rav Ashi said using a metaphor to describe this incident: Neither bar Kippok can perform ḥalitza, nor

can bar Avin perform ḥalitza, because their feet are crooked and so their shoes cannot be removed from their feet in the proper manner.

435 When Rava once came to the Tigris River, and he was concerned that he might be swept away by the water, he said to bar Avin: Rise and say a prayer on our behalf. He rose and said: Most of the third, a poetic reference to the Jewish people (Isaiah 19:24), has come in the water, implying that Rava was equal in importance to the majority of the Jewish people. Remember then and have mercy on us. Although we have strayed from you like an unfaithful woman strays from her husband, do not forsake and punish us like the sign of the bitter water, with which a woman suspected of adultery is tested. That is to say, do not punish us with water.

436 Apropos eulogies for righteous men, the Gemara presents the names: Ḥanin, Yoḥanan, Zeira, Abba, Ya'akov, Yosei, Shmuel, Ḥiyya, and Menaḥem; this is a mnemonic device for the stories that follow.

437 It was related that Rabbi Ḥanin was a son-in-law in the house of the Nasi. At first he did not have any children, but he prayed that God have mercy on him, and then had a child. On the same day that a son was born to him, he himself passed away. A certain eulogizer opened his eulogy for him with the following words: Happiness has been turned into sorrow; joy and suffering have become joined together. At the moment of his happiness he sighed his dying breath. At the moment he was graced with a son, his own grace was lost. And they named the child Ḥanan after his father.

438 When Rabbi Yoḥanan passed away, Rabbi Yitzḥak ben Elazar opened his eulogy for him as follows: Today is as difficult for the Jewish people as the day that the sun set at noon, as it is written: "And it shall come to pass on that day, says the Lord God, that I will cause the sun to go down at noon, and I will darken the earth in the clear day. And I will turn your feasts into mourning, and all your songs into lamentation; and I will bring up sackcloth upon all loins, and baldness upon every head; and I will make it as the mourning for an only son, and its end like a bitter day" (Amos 8:9–10). And Rabbi Yoḥanan said: This was the day on which King Josiah was killed (see II Chronicles 35:20–24). This demonstrates that the most righteous person of the generation is described as the sun.

439 It was further related that when Rabbi Yoḥanan passed away, Rabbi Ami sat in mourning for him for seven days and for thirty days as though he had lost a close relative. Rabbi Abba, son of Rabbi Ḥiyya bar Abba, said: What Rabbi Ami did, he did on his own, but this practice does not reflect the halakha. For Rabbi Ḥiyya bar Abba said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said as follows: Even for the death of his teacher who taught him wisdom, one sits in mourning over him for only one day and no more.

440 The Gemara tells of another incident about a eulogy: When Rabbi Zeira died, a certain eulogizer opened his eulogy for him saying: The land of Shinar conceived and gave birth to him, as he was originally Babylonian, but the land of beauty, i.e., Eretz Yisrael, raised the darling of Babylonia, as he later moved to Eretz Yisrael and grew up there. Woe to her, said Rakkath, a poetic name for Tiberias, for her dearest vessel has been lost.

441 The Gemara continues to discuss the death of the righteous: When Rabbi Abbahu passed away, the pillars of Caesarea, his city, ran with water as if they were shedding tears over him. When Rabbi Yosei passed away, the gutters of Tzippori, his city, flowed with blood. When Rabbi Ya'akov passed away, the stars were visible during the day. When Rabbi Asi passed away, all the trees were uprooted in a storm. When Rabbi Ḥiyya passed away, fiery stones fell from the sky. When Rabbi Menaḥem,

son of Rabbi Yosei, passed away, the faces of the statues became smooth as if they had been smoothed with a plasterer’s trowel [meḥlatzaya].

442 When Rabbi Tanḥum bar Ḥiyya passed away, every statue [andartaya] of the king was mutilated. When Rabbi Elyashiv passed away, seventy tunnels of thieves were dug in Neharde’a, because as long as he was alive there were no thieves in the town due to his merit. When Rav Hamnuna passed away, hail stones fell from the sky. When Rabba and Rav Yosef passed away, the tops of the bridges of the Euphrates collapsed and touched each other. When Abaye and Rava passed away, the tops of the bridges of the Tigris collapsed and touched each other. When Rabbi Mesharshiyya passed away, the palm trees became laden with thorns [shitzei].

443 § The Gemara returns to the subject of tearing garments in mourning: The Sages taught the following baraita:

444 And these are the rents of mourning that may never be properly mended: One who rends his garments for the death his father, or for his mother, or for his teacher who taught him Torah, or for the Nasi, or for the president of the court; or upon hearing evil tidings; or hearing God’s name being blessed, which is a euphemism for hearing God’s name being cursed; or when a Torah scroll has been burned; or upon seeing the cities of Judea that were destroyed or the destroyed Temple or Jerusalem in ruins. This is the way one conducts himself when approaching Jerusalem when it lies in ruin: He first rends his garments for the Temple and then extends the rent for Jerusalem.

445 The Gemara elaborates upon the halakhot mentioned in this baraita: From where do we derive that one must rend his clothing for his father, his mother, and his teacher who taught him Torah? As it is written with regard to the prophet Elijah, when he ascended to Heaven in a tempest: “And Elisha saw it, and he cried, My father, my father, the chariots of Israel and their horsemen” (II Kings 2:12). The Gemara interprets this verse as follows: “My father, my father”; this comes to teach that one must rend his garments for the death of his father or mother. “The chariots of Israel and their horsemen”; this comes to include also one’s teacher who taught him Torah.

446 The Gemara asks: From where may it be inferred that this is referring to one’s teacher? The Gemara explains: As the verse was translated by Rav Yosef: My teacher, my teacher, who was better for the protection of the Jewish people with his prayers than an army with chariots and horsemen.

447 And from where do we derive that these rents are never to be properly mended? As it is written: “And he took hold of his own clothes, and rent them in two pieces” (II Kings 2:12). From the fact that it is stated: “And he rent them,” do I not know that he rent them in two pieces? Rather, when the verse adds that they were torn into two pieces, it teaches that they must remain torn in two pieces forever. Accordingly, this rent must never be properly mended.

448 Reish Lakish said to Rabbi Yoḥanan: But isn’t Elijah still alive? Why, then, did Elisha rend his garments for him? He said to him: Since it is written: “And he saw him no more” (II Kings 2:12), Elijah was considered dead from Elisha’s perspective, and so Elisha rent his clothing for him.

449 § From where do we derive that one must rend his clothing for the death of the Nasi or the president of the court and upon hearing evil tidings? As it is written, when David heard about the defeat of Israel and the death of Saul and his sons: “Then David took hold of his clothes, and rent them; and likewise all the men that were with him: And they mourned, and wept, and fasted until

evening, for Saul and for Jonathan his son, and for the people of the Lord, and for the house of Israel; because they were fallen by the sword” (II Samuel 1:11–12).

450 The Gemara explains how the aforementioned halakhot are derived from the verse: “Saul”; this is a reference to the Nasi, as Saul was king of Israel. “Jonathan”; this is a reference to the president of the court. “For the people of the Lord, and for the house of the Israel”; these are a reference to evil tidings.

451 Rav bar Shaba said to Rav Kahana: But perhaps you can say that one need not rend his clothing until all these calamities occur together, and that rending clothing is performed only over a tragedy of this magnitude. He said to him: The repetition of the word “for”: “For Saul,” “for Jonathan,” and “for the people of the Lord” divides the matter and teaches that each individual misfortune is sufficient cause to rend one’s garments.

452 The Gemara asks: But do we actually rend our clothing upon hearing evil tidings? But didn’t they say to Shmuel: King Shapur killed twelve thousand Jews in Mezigat Caesarea, and Shmuel did not rend his clothing?The Gemara answers: They said that one must rend his clothing upon hearing evil tidings only in a case where the calamity involved the majority of the community of Israel and resembles the incident that occurred when Saul was killed and the entire nation of Israel suffered defeat.

453 The Gemara tangentially asks: Did King Shapur really kill Jews? But didn’t King Shapur say to Shmuel: I have a blessing coming to me, for I have never killed a Jew? The Gemara answers: King Shapur never instigated the killing of Jews; there, however, they brought it upon themselves, as Rabbi Ami said in an exaggerated manner: Due to the noise of the harp strings of Mezigat Caesarea, the walls of Laodicea were breached, for the residents of the city celebrated when they rebelled against King Shapur. Because they rebelled against him and threatened his rule, he was forced to kill them.

454 § The Gemara continues its analysis of the baraita: From where do we derive that one must rend his garments upon hearing God’s name being blessed, i.e., cursed? As it is written with regard to the blasphemous words said by Rab-shakeh: “Then came Eliakim, son of Hilkiya, who was over the household, and Shebna the scribe, and Joah, son of Asaph, the recorder, to Hezekiah with their clothes rent” (II Kings 18:37).

455 The Sages taught a baraita with regard to this issue: Both one who actually hears the curse and one who hears from the mouth of the one who heard the curse are obligated to rend their garments. But the witnesses who testify against the person who uttered the blasphemy are not obligated to rend their clothing when they testify as to what they heard because they already rent their clothing when they heard the curse the first time.

456 The Gemara asks: What difference does it make that they rent their garments when they heard the curse the first time? Didn’t they hear it again now? The Gemara rejects this argument: This will not enter your mind, as it is written: “And it came to pass, when King Hezekiah heard it, that he rent his clothes” (II Kings 19:1). This indicates that the king rent his garments, but those who reported the blasphemy to him did not rend theirs, as they had already rent their garments the first time.

[457] And from where do we derive that these rents may not be properly mended? This is derived by way of a verbal analogy between the verb rending used here with regard to Hezekiah and the verb rending used in the case of Elijah and Elisha.

[458] § From where do we derive that one must rend his garments when a Torah scroll has been burned? As it is written: “And it came to pass, that when Jehudi had read three or four leaves, he would cut it with a penknife, and cast it into the fire that was in the brazier” (Jeremiah 36:23). With regard to the verse itself the Gemara asks: What is meant by “three or four leaves,” and why did he cut the book only at that point?

[459] The Gemara explains: They said to Jehoiakim: Jeremiah has written a book of Lamentations over the future downfall and destruction of Jerusalem. He said to them: What is written in it? They read him the first verse: “How does the city sit solitary” (Lamentations 1:1). He said to them: I am king, and this does not apply to me. They read him the second verse: “She weeps sore in the night” (Lamentations 1:2). He said to them: I am king, and this does not apply to me. They read him the third verse: “Judah is gone into exile due to affliction” (Lamentations 1:3). He said to them: I am king. They read to him: “The ways of Zion do mourn” (Lamentations 1:4). He said to them: I am king. These are the four leaves, or verses, that he read first.

[460] They read him an additional verse: “Her adversaries have become the chief” (Lamentations 1:5), i.e., the reigning king will be removed from power. Once he heard this, he said to them: Who said this? They said to him: This is the continuation of the verse: “For the Lord has afflicted her for the multitude of her transgressions” (Lamentations 1:5). Immediately, he cut out all the names of God from the book and burned them in fire. This is as it is written: “Yet they were not afraid, nor rent their garments, neither the king, nor any of his servants that heard all these words” (Jeremiah 36:24). By inference, this shows that they were required to rend their clothing when they saw this.

[461] Rav Pappa said to Abaye: Perhaps you can say that they should have rent their garments due to the evil tidings contained in the scroll and not because of the destruction of the book? Abaye said to him: Were they evil tidings at that time? This was a prophecy and not an account of current events.

[462] Rabbi Ḥelbo said that Rav Huna said: One who sees a Torah scroll that was torn is obligated to make two rents, one for the parchment that was damaged and one for the writing, as it is stated: “Then the word of the Lord came to Jeremiah, after the king had burned the scroll and the words” (Jeremiah 36:27). This implies that a separate rent must be made for each of them, both the parchment and the writing.

[463] It was related that Rabbi Abba and Rav Huna bar Ḥiyya were sitting before Rabbi Abba. Rabbi Abba needed to relieve himself. He removed his phylacteries from his head and placed them on the cushion on which he was sitting. An ostrich came and wanted to swallow the phylacteries.

[464] He said: Now, had it succeeded to swallow it, I would have been obligated to make two rents. He said to him: From where do you derive this? There was an incident in which I was involved and I came before Rav Mattana asking what to do, but he did not have an answer readily available. I then came before Rav Yehuda, and he said to me: Shmuel said as follows: They said that one is obligated to rend his clothing only when a Torah scroll or some other sacred book is torn by force, and it resembles the incident that occurred with Jehoiakim.

465 § From where do we derive that one must rend his garments upon seeing the cities of Judea in ruin? As it is written: “There came certain men from Shechem, from Shiloh, and from Samaria, eighty people, their beards shaven, and their clothes rent, and having cut themselves, with offerings and incense in their hand, to bring to the house of the Lord” (Jeremiah 41:5). This indicates that they rent their garments upon seeing the destruction.

466 Rabbi Ḥelbo said that Ulla Bira’a said that Rabbi Elazar said: One who sees the cities of Judea in their desolation says: “Your sacred cities are become a wilderness” (Isaiah 64:9), and then rends his garments. One who sees Jerusalem in its desolation says: “Zion is a wilderness, Jerusalem a desolation” (Isaiah 64:9), and then rends his garments. One who sees the Temple in its desolation says: “Our sacred and our beautiful house, where our fathers praised You, is burned with fire; and all our pleasant things are laid waste” (Isaiah 64:10), and then rends his garments.

467 It was taught in the baraita: He first rends his garments for the Temple and then extends the rent for Jerusalem. And they raise a contradiction from another baraita that states: Both one who hears that Jerusalem is in ruin and one who sees the destruction, once he reaches Mount Scopus [Tzofim], rends his garments. And he rends his garments for the Temple separately and for Jerusalem separately.

468 The Gemara answers: This is not difficult. This baraita, which states that instead of making a separate rent for Jerusalem one may extend the first rent that he had made for the Temple, is referring to the case where one reached the Temple first, before seeing the rest of Jerusalem, and saw it in ruin. That baraita, which states that one must make separate rents for Jerusalem and for the Temple, is referring to the case where one reached Jerusalem first, and only afterward the Temple.

469 § The Sages taught the following baraita: And all of these rents, one may tack them together with loose stitches, and hem them, and gather them, and fix them with imprecise ladder-like stitches. But one may not mend them with precise stitches.

470 Rav Ḥisda said:

471 And the reference here is to the Alexandrian method of mending, a type of sewing performed in Alexandria, which is considered to be of exceptional quality and after which the tear is no longer visible.

472 The Sages taught the following baraita: One who rends his garment in a place that had been loosely tacked together, or from the hem of the garment, or on the gathering, or on the ladder-like stiches has not fulfilled his obligation to rend it. But if he rends it in a place that had been carefully mended, he has fulfilled his obligation, because such a garment is regarded as whole. Rav Ḥisda said: And here, too, the reference is to the Alexandrian method of mending and not to ordinary sewing.

473 The Sages taught another baraita: One is permitted to turn a garment that was rent on the upper edge upside down and then mend it in a precise fashion. Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar prohibits careful mending in this case as well. And if one wishes to sell a garment that he had previously rent in mourning, just as the seller, who had rent the garment, is prohibited from carefully mending the garment, so too the buyer, who purchases it from him, is prohibited from mending it. The seller must therefore inform the buyer that the rent was made on account of mourning and may not be mended.

474 The Sages taught a baraita: The initial rending is a handbreadth in length, and the extension, if one is obligated to rend his garment for other deceased relatives and he wishes to use the same rent for this purpose, is three fingerbreadths; this is the statement of Rabbi Meir. Rabbi Yehuda says: The initial rending is three fingerbreadths in length, and its extension is any amount, with no minimum measure.

475 Ulla said: The halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Meir that the initial rending is one handbreadth in length, and the halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda that an extension can be any length. The Gemara comments: That is also taught in a baraita: Rabbi Yosei says: The initial rending is one handbreadth, and the size of the extension is any minimal amount. By tradition, the halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei when he disagrees with any one of his colleagues.

476 The Sages taught the following baraita: If they first said to a person that his father died, and he rent his garment, and afterward they told him that his son died, and he added to the same rent, in such a case the lower portion of the rent that had been made for his son may be mended. This is because, after completing the period of mourning, one is permitted to mend a rent made for relatives other than one's parents. However, the upper portion of the rent may not be mended, as a tear made for one's father may never be carefully sewn back together.

477 If, on the other hand, they said to him first that his son died, and he rent his garment, and afterward they told him that his father died, and he added to the same rent, then in that case the upper portion of the rent, which had been made for his son, may be mended, but the lower portion of the rent, which had been made for his father, may not be mended.

478 If they said to him all at one time that his father died, his mother died, his brother died, and his sister died, then he may make one rent for all of them. Rabbi Yehuda ben Beteira says: For all of his other relatives he makes one rent, and for his father and mother he makes another rent, as one must not add to a rent made for his father and mother.

479 The Gemara asks: What is the reason for Rabbi Yehuda ben Beteira's opinion that one may not add to the rent torn for a mother or father? Rav Naḥman bar Yitzḥak said: Because they cannot be added; one has only one father and one mother and cannot add others.

480 Shmuel said: The halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda ben Beteira. The Gemara asks: And did Shmuel actually say this? But didn't Shmuel say the principle is that the halakha is in accordance with the statement of the lenient Sage with regard to mourning; yet here he rules in accordance with the more stringent opinion. The Gemara answers: The halakhot of mourning are discrete and the halakhot of rending are discrete, and it is only with regard to the halakhot of mourning that Shmuel rules consistently in accordance with the lenient opinion.

481 It was taught in a baraita: Until where may he rend his garment, if he continues to rend the same garment for additional relatives? He may continue rending until the point where the garment covers his navel. Some say: Until the point where the garment covers his heart. Although there is no absolute proof for the matter that one may rend the garment until this point, there is an allusion to this matter, as it is stated: "And rend your hearts, and not your garments" (Joel 2:13), thereby intimating that one may extend the rent in his garment only until he reaches the point where the garment covers his heart.

[482] If he tore his garment until he reached the point where it covers his navel, he should not continue rending in the same place. Instead, he should move away a space of three fingerbreadths from the first rent and make a new rent. If the garment became full of rents in the front, he should turn the garment front to back and make a rent on the other side. If it became full of rents above, he should turn it top to bottom and make a rent on what used to be the bottom. But one who rends his garment at the bottom or at the sides has not fulfilled his obligation, as rending may be done only at the top of the garment. The High Priest, however, who is prohibited from rending his garments in mourning, may tear his garment at the bottom to mark his mourning in a symbolic manner.

[483] Rav Mattana and Mar Ukva disagreed about the following issue, and both of them stated their respective opinions in the name of Shmuel's father and Levi. One said: During all seven days of mourning, if the mourner hears that another relative of his passed away, he makes a new rent; after seven days of mourning he merely adds to the first one. And one said: During all of the first thirty days he makes a new rent; after thirty days he merely adds to the first one.

[484] Rabbi Zeira strongly objects to this: According to the one who said that during all seven days of mourning he makes a new rent, why is it not enough to add to the first one? It is because he may not tack it until the end of the seven-day period of mourning, and therefore if he adds to the rent it will look like a continuation of the previous tear. But then, with regard to that which the Master said in the baraita: After a woman rends her garment, she may tack the tear immediately, would you say that here also she may add to the first rent for a new bereavement during the seven-day period of mourning?

[485] The Gemara answers: There the woman is permitted to tack the rent due to the woman's honor, as it would be dishonorable for her to be seen wearing torn garments. However, halakhically the rent is considered as if it still exists, and therefore she must make a new rent for a new bereavement and not merely add to the previous one.

[486] Rabbi Zeira asked further: According to the one who said that all thirty days of mourning one must make a new rent rather than add to the existing tear, why does he say this? It is because during the thirty days one is not given permission to properly mend the garment, and so it still appears to be torn. But then, in a case of a rent made for one's father or mother, for which he is not given permission to ever properly mend it, would you say that he should so too be forever barred from adding to the rent for a new bereavement and is instead obligated to make a new rent?

[487] The Gemara answers: There he may not properly mend the rent due to the honor due to his father and mother. Essentially, however, the tear is considered as if it had been sewn up after the thirty-day period, and therefore the son may extend it in the case of a new bereavement.

[488] The Sages taught the following baraita: One who goes out before the deceased in a rent garment that he had previously torn over another bereavement, thereby giving the appearance of having rent his garment for him, steals from the dead, as he did not rend a garment for him. And he similarly steals from the living, who see him and think that he made the tear in honor of the deceased, when in reality he is deceiving them.

[489] Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel says: In the case of one who says to his fellow: Lend me your cloak and I will go and visit my father because he is sick, and he goes and finds that his father has died, he rends the cloak and may then mend it in the proper manner. And when he returns home, he returns the cloak to his fellow and pays him the value of the rent, i.e., the depreciation in the value of the

cloak that resulted from the tear. The assumption is that the lender considered the possibility that the sick father might die, and lent the garment anyway, understanding that he might have to tear it. But if one did not inform his fellow that he was going to visit his sick father, he must not touch it, as he was not granted permission to tear the garment belonging to someone else.

[490] The Sages taught the following baraita: When a relative of a sick person dies, those around him do not inform him that this relative died, lest he lose control of his mind due to his emotional state and his grief exacerbate his physical health. And other people may not rend their garments in his presence, so that he will not know that one of his relatives passed away. And we silence the women who weep in his presence, so that he will not know that his relative is no longer alive.

[491] And the relatives rend the garment of a minor child when there is mourning in his family in order to arouse grief. Although a minor is not required to rend his garments, this will add to the grief of those who see that even the garments of children are rent. And one rends his garment for his father-in-law or mother-in-law, although he is not required to mourn for them, due to the honor of his wife, to show her that he joins in her mourning.

[492] And Rav Pappa said: A Sage taught in Evel Rabbati: A mourner should not place a young child in his lap because the child will bring him to laughter, and he will be disgraced in the eyes of other people because he laughed while in mourning.

[493] § The mishna taught: And the consolers provide the first meal after the burial only while the mourner sits on an upright bed and not on one that is overturned. The Sages taught in a baraita: With regard to one who goes to the house of the mourner, if he is confident in his friendship with him because they are close friends, they provide him with the meal of comfort while both he and the mourner sit on overturned beds. And if he is not confident in his friendship with him, both he and the mourner should be fed on upright beds.

[494] The Gemara relates that something unpleasant happened to Rava, i.e., one of his close relatives died, and Abba bar Marta, who was also known as Abba bar Minyomi, entered to visit him. Rava stood the bed upright, treating him like any other person who came to comfort him. Abba bar Marta overturned the bed because he saw himself as being on very familiar terms with Rava. Rava said: How lacking in sense is this Torah scholar. Rava had shown from the outset that he did not consider Abba bar Marta to be a close friend, yet the latter ignored this message and viewed himself as being exceptionally close to Rava.

[495] The Sages taught a baraita: If one who was going from place to place learned of the death of a close relative, so that he must now observe the rites of mourning,

[496] if he can reduce his business, he should reduce it; and if not, he may carry on with them, i.e., his business partners. He may act in partnership with the members of the group with which he is traveling, but he may not engage in business independently.

[497] § The Sages taught the following baraita: From when do the mourners overturn their beds? From when the corpse is taken out of the opening of his house; this is the statement of Rabbi Eliezer. Rabbi Yehoshua says: From when the tomb is sealed with the grave cover.

[498] There was an incident in which the Nasi Rabban Gamliel the Elder died, and once his body left the opening of his house, Rabbi Eliezer said to the members of the household: Overturn your beds. And once the tomb was sealed with the grave cover, Rabbi Yehoshua said to them: Overturn your

beds. They then said to him: We already overturned them in accordance with the Elder, i.e., Rabbi Eliezer.

[499] The Sages taught in a baraita: From when do the mourners stand their beds upright on Friday; as the rites of mourning are not observed on Shabbat, and the beds must be returned to their ordinary position beforehand? From minḥa time onward. Rabba bar Huna said: Even so, one may not sit down on his upright bed immediately. Rather, he must wait until it becomes dark to do so. And at the conclusion of Shabbat, even if he has only one more day to sit in mourning, i.e., his period of mourning concludes on Sunday, he must once again overturn his bed.

[500] The Sages taught in a baraita: With regard to one who is in mourning and must overturn his bed, he overturns not only his own bed, but rather he overturns all the beds he has in his house. And even if he has ten beds in ten different places, he overturns them all. And even if there are five brothers and one of them died, all of them overturn their beds wherever they live.

[501] If, however, it is a bed designated for the storage of garments and not for sleeping, he is not required to overturn it. It is also not necessary to overturn a dargash, but rather he stands it upright. Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel says: With regard to a dargash, one loosens its loops [karbitav], which hold up the pillows, and it falls on its own.

[502] The Gemara asks: What is the meaning of the word dargash? Ulla said: It is a good-luck [gada] bed, as it was common to have ornamental beds for good luck, which were not used for sleeping.

[503] Rabba said to him: However, if that is so, then the following statement with regard to a king is difficult, as we learned in a mishna (Sanhedrin 20a): When the mourner’s meal is served to the king and his family, all the people recline on the ground, and he, the king, due to his honor, reclines on a dargash. Is there anything upon which we would not have seated him until now, when he was not a mourner, but now, specifically during the mourning period, we seat him on it?

[504] Rav Ashi strongly objects to this: What is the difficulty raised by Rabba? One can answer: The halakha is just as it is in the case of eating and drinking, that until now, before one became a mourner, we did not feed him or give him drink, but now that he is a mourner we feed him and give him drink during the first meal after the burial.

[505] Rather, if it is difficult, this is difficult, as we learned in a baraita: It is not necessary to overturn a dargash, but rather he stands it upright. But if it is a good-luck bed, why is it not necessary to overturn it? Didn’t we learn: One who is in mourning and must overturn his bed overturns not only his own bed, but rather he overturns all the beds in his house, including this good luck bed?

[506] The Gemara rejects this: And what is difficult in this? One can answer: The halakha is just as it is in the case of a bed designated for the storage of garments, as it is taught in a baraita: If it is a bed designated for the storage of garments, and not for sleeping, one is not required to overturn it. So too, one is not required to overturn a dargash, as it is a bed that is not used for sleeping.

[507] Rather if it is difficult, this is the difficulty: It was taught in a baraita: Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel says: With regard to a dargash, one loosens the loops that hold up the pillows, and it falls on its own. And if it enters your mind to say that a dargash is a good-luck bed, it is like other beds, so what loops does it have?

[508] When Ravin came from Eretz Yisrael to Babylonia, one of the Sages, whose name was Rav Taḥalisa from the West, and who was frequently found in the market of leather workers, said to him: What is a dargash? It is a leather bed.

[509] It was also stated that Rabbi Yirmeya said: A dargash has its interlacing from the inside, i.e., attached to loops that go through holes that are made in the bed frame itself; whereas a bed has its interlacing from the outside, i.e., the strapping itself is looped around the wood of the frame, and therefore it cannot be loosened.

[510] Rabbi Ya’akov bar Aḥa said in the name of Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi: The halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel with regard to a dargash. It was also stated that Rabbi Ya’akov bar Aḥa said in the name of Rabbi Asi: A bed whose posts [naklitin] extend, meaning that they are very long so that the bed will remain high off the ground even if it is overturned, may be stood upright and that is sufficient. That is to say, one is not required to overturn such a bed.

[511] The Sages taught the following baraita: If the mourner sleeps on a chair, or on a large overturned mortar, or on the ground, he does not fulfill his obligation, even though he is uncomfortable while sleeping. Rabbi Yoḥanan said: This is because he did not fulfill the mitzva of overturning the bed.

[512] The Sages taught another baraita: One may sweep and sprinkle water on a dirt floor in the house of a mourner, and one may wash bowls, cups, jugs, and pitchers in the house of a mourner. But one may not bring incense or fragrant spices into the house of a mourner.

[513] The Gemara asks: Is that so? But doesn’t bar Kappara teach the following baraita: One may not recite a blessing either over incense or over fragrant spices in the house of a mourner? From this one may infer that one may not recite a blessing over these incense or spices, but one may bring them into the house of the mourner. This appears to contradict the previous baraita.

[514] The Gemara explains: It is not difficult. Here, the baraita is referring to the house of a mourner, into which spices should not be taken; there, the baraita that states that one may not recite a blessing over them, is referring to the house of the consolers, his relatives, into which spices may be brought.

[515] MISHNA: One does not bring the first meal after the burial to the house of mourning on a small tray [tavla], in a bowl [iskutla], or in a narrow-mouthed basket [kanon], but rather in ordinary baskets. And the mourners’ blessing is not recited on the intermediate days of a Festival, but the consolers may stand in a row when the mourners leave the cemetery and console them. And the mourners dismiss the many consolers, by telling them that they may return home after they have fulfilled the mitzva of consoling the mourners.

[516] The bier of the deceased is not set down in the street during the intermediate days of a Festival so as not to encourage eulogies. On an ordinary weekday, people would gather in the street around the bier to eulogize the deceased, but this should be avoided during the intermediate days of the Festival. And the biers of women are never set down, even if it is not the intermediate days of a Festival, due to their honor. Blood might drip from their bodies, and it would cause them dishonor if their blood stained the street.

[517] GEMARA: The Sages taught the following baraita: At first, the meal after the burial would be brought to the house of the mourner in various ways. The wealthy would bring the meal in baskets of silver and gold, and the poor would bring it in baskets of peeled willow branches. And the poor were

embarrassed, as everyone would see that they were poor. The Sages instituted that everyone should bring the meal in baskets of peeled willow branches, due to the honor of the poor.

518 The Sages taught a similar baraita: At first, they would serve wine in the house of the mourner during the first meal after the burial; the wealthy would do so in cups made from white glass, and the poor would serve this wine in cups of colored glass. And the poor were embarrassed, as everyone would see that they were poor. The Sages instituted that all should serve drinks in the house of the mourner in colored glass cups, due to the honor of the poor.

519 Furthermore, at first they would uncover the faces of the wealthy who passed away and cover the faces of the poor, because their faces were blackened by famine. And the poor were embarrassed because they were buried in a different manner. The Sages instituted that everyone's face should be covered, due to the honor of the poor.

520 Additionally, at first the wealthy would take the deceased out for burial on a dargash, and the poor would take the deceased out

521 on a plain bier made from poles that were strapped together, and the poor were embarrassed. The Sages instituted that everyone should be taken out for burial on a plain bier, due to the honor of the poor.

522 Similarly, at first they would place incense under the beds of those who died with an intestinal disease, because the body emitted an especially unpleasant odor. And those who were alive with an intestinal disease were embarrassed when they understood that they, too, would be treated in this manner after their death, and that everyone would know the cause of their death. The Sages instituted that incense should be placed under everyone, due to the honor of those with an intestinal disease who were still living.

523 Moreover, at first they would ritually immerse all the utensils that had been used by women who died while menstruating, which had thereby contracted ritual impurity. And due to this, the living menstruating women were embarrassed. The Sages instituted that the utensils that had been used by all dying women must be immersed, due to the honor of living menstruating women. And, at first they would ritually immerse all the utensils that had been used by zavin, men suffering from gonorrhea, who died, as the utensils had thereby contracted ritual impurity. And due to this the living zavin felt embarrassed. The Sages instituted that the utensils that had been used by all men must be immersed, due to the honor of the living zavin.

524 Likewise, at first taking the dead out for burial was more difficult for the relatives than the actual death, because it was customary to bury the dead in expensive shrouds, which the poor could not afford. The problem grew to the point that relatives would sometimes abandon the corpse and run away. This lasted until Rabban Gamliel came and acted with frivolity, meaning that he waived his dignity, by leaving instructions that he be taken out for burial in linen garments. And the people adopted this practice after him and had themselves taken out for burial in linen garments. Rav Pappa said: And nowadays, everyone follows the practice of taking out the dead for burial even in plain hemp garments [tzerada] that cost only a dinar.

525 It is taught in the mishna: The bier of the deceased is not set down in the street during the intermediate days of a Festival, so as not to encourage eulogies. Rav Pappa said: There are no restrictions on eulogizing on the intermediate days of a Festival in the presence of a deceased Torah

scholar, and therefore he may be eulogized in the ordinary manner during the Festival week. And all the more so a Torah scholar may be eulogized on the days of Hanukkah and Purim, which have less sanctity than the intermediate days of a Festival.

526 The Gemara comments: But this allowance to eulogize a Torah scholar during the intermediate days of a Festival applies only when the eulogy is in the presence of the deceased, before the bier. However, giving a eulogy that is not in his presence is not permitted. The Gemara asks: Is that so? But didn't Rav Kahana eulogize Rav Zevid from Neharde'a in his city Pum Nahara during the intermediate days of a Festival? Rav Pappa said: It was the day on which Rav Kahana received the news of Rav Zevid's death, and a eulogy in such a situation is considered as if it is in his presence.

527 The Gemara continues its discussion of the halakhot of mourning: Ulla said: Although hesped usually refers to a eulogy, strictly speaking, hesped is referring to striking oneself on the heart, as it is written: "Striking [sofedim] the breasts" (Isaiah 32:12). The term tipuaḥ is referring to striking with one hand against the other hand, i.e., clapping. The term killus is referring to stomping with one's foot on the ground.

528 The Sages taught a baraita: One who stomps his foot on the ground as a sign of mourning should not stomp with a sandal, but rather he should do so wearing a shoe, due to the danger of being hurt. Because a sandal is easily torn, it is possible that something sharp on the ground will puncture his foot, or that he will suffer some other injury.

529 Rabbi Yoḥanan said: Once a mourner nods his head to show that his grief has slightly diminished, the consolers may no longer sit next to him, as with his action the mourner shows that he no longer desires their presence.

530 Rabbi Yoḥanan further said: All are obligated to stand in the presence of the Nasi, except for a mourner and one who is sick. Rabbi Yoḥanan said: To all who stand before a great person one says: Be seated, and only then may they sit down, except for a mourner and one who is sick. If they stood up they do not need permission to sit down, but rather they may do so if they wish.

531 Rav Yehuda said in the name of Rav: A mourner on the first day of his mourning is prohibited from eating of his own bread. From where is this derived? From what the Merciful One says to Ezekiel when the latter is in mourning: "Nor eat the bread of men" (Ezekiel 24:17), which indicates that other mourners must eat bread made by others. It was related that when Rabba and Rav Yosef were in mourning they would exchange their meals with each other.

532 And Rav Yehuda said in the name of Rav: When a person dies in a city, all of the residents of that city are prohibited from performing work until he has been buried.

533 The Gemara relates that when Rav Hamnuna once happened to come to a place called Darumata he heard the sound of a shofar announcing that a person had died in the town. When he saw some people doing work he said to them: Let these people be under an excommunication. Is there not a dead person in town? They said to him: There are separate groups in the town, each one responsible for its own dead. Knowing that the deceased was not from our group, we continued our work. He said to them: If so, it is permitted to you, and he revoked his excommunication.

534 And Rav Yehuda said further in the name of Rav: Anyone who grieves excessively over his dead and does not allow himself to be consoled will in the end weep for another person. The Gemara relates that a certain woman who lived in the neighborhood of Rav Huna had seven sons. One of

them died and she wept for him excessively. Rav Huna sent a message to her: Do not do this. But she took no heed of him. He then sent another message to her: If you listen to me, it is well, but if not, prepare shrouds for another death. But she would not listen and they all died. In the end, when she continued with her excessive mourning, he said to her: Since you are acting in this way, prepare shrouds for yourself, and soon thereafter she died.

535 The Sages taught in a baraita with regard to the verse that states: “Weep not for the dead, neither bemoan him” (Jeremiah 22:10): “Weep not for the dead” is referring to excessive mourning; “neither bemoan him” more than the appropriate measure of time. How so? What is the appropriate measure? Three days for weeping, and seven for eulogizing, and thirty for the prohibition against ironing clothing and for the prohibition against cutting hair. From this point forward the Holy One, Blessed be He, says: Do not be more merciful with the deceased than I am. If the Torah commands one to mourn for a certain period of time, then that suffices.

536 It is stated in the continuation of the verse: “Weep sore for him that goes away.” Rav Yehuda said: This is referring to one who leaves the world without children to survive him, since mourning for him is much more intense. It was related that Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi would go to a house of mourning only for one who passed away without children, as it is written: “Weep sore for him that goes away; for he shall return [yashuv] no more, nor see his native land” (Jeremiah 22:10). Rav Huna disagreed with the interpretation of the verse and said: “Him that goes” is one who committed a transgression and then repeated it, i.e., one who sins constantly and does not repent [yashav], and therefore loses his portion in the World-to-Come, his “native land.”

537 The Gemara notes that Rav Huna conforms to his standard line of reasoning, as Rav Huna said: Once a person commits a transgression and repeats it, it becomes permitted to him. The Gemara questions the wording used here: Does it enter your mind that it is actually permitted? How could it possibly be permitted for him to sin? Rather, say instead: It becomes as though it were permitted, for after doing it twice he no longer relates to his action as the violation of a serious prohibition.

538 Rabbi Levi said: A mourner during the first three days of his mourning should see himself as though a sword were lying between his two thighs, meaning that he too may be facing imminent death. During this period he should live in dread. From the third to the seventh days he should conduct himself as if the sword were lying opposite him in the corner, but still threatening him. From this point forward it is as if the sword was moving before him in the marketplace, and the fear is not as great.

539 § The mishna teaches: And the biers of women are never set down, due to their honor. The Sages of Neharde’a say: They only taught this

540 with regard to a woman who died in childbirth, and therefore continues to bleed. But the biers of other women may be set down in the street.

541 Rabbi Elazar said: Even the biers of other women must not be set down in the street, as it is written: “And Miriam died there and was buried there” (Numbers 20:1), which teaches that the site of her burial was close to the place of her death. Therefore, it is preferable to bury a woman as close as possible to the place where she died.

542 With regard to that same verse Rabbi Elazar said further: Miriam also died by the divine kiss, just like her brother Moses. What is the source for this? This is derived through a verbal analogy between

the word “there” stated with regard to Miriam and the word “there” mentioned with regard to Moses. With regard to Moses it says: “So Moses the servant of the Lord died there in the land of Moab by the mouth of the Lord” (Deuteronomy 34:5). For what reason was it not explicitly stated with regard to her, as it is stated with regard to Moses, that she died “by the mouth of the Lord”? It is because it would be unseemly to say such a thing, that a woman died by way of a divine kiss, and therefore it is not said explicitly.

[543] Rabbi Ami said: Why was the Torah portion that describes the death of Miriam juxtaposed to the portion dealing with the red heifer? To tell you: Just as the red heifer atones for sin, so too, the death of the righteous atones for sin. Rabbi Elazar said: Why was the Torah portion that describes the death of Aaron juxtaposed to the portion discussing the priestly garments? This teaches that just as the priestly garments atone for sin, so too, the death of the righteous atones for sin.

[544] § The Sages taught the following baraita: If one dies suddenly without having been sick, this is death through snatching. If he became sick for a day and died, this is an expedited death. Rabbi Ḥananya ben Gamliel says: This is death at a stroke, as it is stated: “Son of man, behold, I am about to take away from you the delight of your eyes at a stroke” (Ezekiel 24:16). And when this prophecy is fulfilled it is written: “So I spoke to the people in the morning and at evening my wife died” (Ezekiel 24:18).

[545] If he was sick for two days and died, this is a quickened death. If he was sick for three days and died, this is a death of rebuke. If he died after being sick for four days, this is a death of reprimand. If one died after a sickness lasting five days, this is the ordinary death of all people.

[546] Rabbi Ḥanin said: What is the verse from which this is derived? It is stated: “Behold, your days approach that you must die” (Deuteronomy 31:14). This verse is expounded in the following manner: “Behold [hen]” indicates one; “approach [karvu],” a plural term, indicates two; “your days [yamekha],” also a plural term, indicates another two; and therefore in total this is five. How does the word hen indicate one? Because in the Greek language they call the number one hen.

[547] The Gemara discusses the significance of death at different ages: If one dies when he is fifty years old, this is death through karet, the divine punishment of excision, meted out for the most serious transgressions. If he dies when he is fifty-two years old, this is the death of Samuel from Ramah. If he dies at the age of sixty, this is death at the hand of Heaven.

[548] Mar Zutra said: What is the verse from which this is derived? As it is written: “You shall come to your grave in a ripe age [bekhelaḥ]” (Job 5:26). The word “ripe age” [bekhelaḥ] has the numerical value of sixty, and it is alluded to there that dying at this age involves a divine punishment.

[549] One who dies at the age of seventy has reached old age. One who dies at the age of eighty dies in strength, as it is written: “The days of our years are seventy, or if by reason of strength, eighty years” (Psalms 90:10). Rabba said: Not only is death at the age of fifty a sign of karet, but even death from fifty to sixty years of age is death by karet. And the reason that all of these years were not counted in connection with karet is due to the honor of Samuel from Ramah, who died at the age of fifty-two.

[550] The Gemara relates that when Rav Yosef turned sixty he made a holiday for the Sages. Explaining the cause for his celebration, he said: I have passed the age of karet. Abaye said to him: Master, even though you have passed the karet of years, have you, Master, escaped the karet of days?

As previously mentioned, sudden death is also considered to be a form of karet. He said to him: Grasp at least half in your hand, for I have at least escaped one type of karet.

[551] It was related that Rav Huna died suddenly, and the Sages were concerned that this was a bad sign. The Sage Zuga from Hadayeiv taught them the following: They taught these principles only when the deceased had not reached the age of strength, i.e., eighty. But if he had reached the age of strength and then died suddenly, this is death by way of a divine kiss.

[552] Rava said: Length of life, children, and sustenance do not depend on one's merit, but rather they depend upon fate. As, Rabba and Rav Ḥisda were both pious Sages; one Sage would pray during a drought and rain would fall, and the other Sage would pray and rain would fall.

[553] And nevertheless, their lives were very different. Rav Ḥisda lived for ninety-two years, whereas Rabba lived for only forty years. The house of Rav Ḥisda celebrated sixty wedding feasts, whereas the house of Rabba experienced sixty calamities. In other words, many fortuitous events took place in the house of Rav Ḥisda and the opposite occurred in the house of Rabba.

[554] In the house of Rav Ḥisda there was bread from the finest flour [semida] even for the dogs, and it was not asked after, as there was so much food. In the house of Rabba, on the other hand, there was coarse barley bread even for people, and it was not found in sufficient quantities. This shows that the length of life, children, and sustenance all depend not upon one's merit, but upon fate.

[555] Apropos Rav Ḥisda's great wealth, the Gemara reports that Rava said: These three things I requested from Heaven, two of which were given to me, and one was not given to me: I requested the wisdom of Rav Huna and the wealth of Rav Ḥisda and they were given to me. I also requested the humility of Rabba bar Rav Huna, but it was not given to me.

[556] The Gemara continues its discussion of the deaths of the righteous. Rav Seorim, Rava's brother, sat before Rava, and he saw that Rava was dozing, i.e., about to die. Rava said to his brother: Master, tell him, the Angel of Death, not to torment me. Knowing that Rava was not afraid of the Angel of Death, Rav Seorim said to him: Master, are you not a friend of the Angel of Death? Rava said to him: Since my fate has been handed over to him, and it has been decreed that I shall die, the Angel of Death no longer pays heed to me. Rav Seorim said to Rava: Master, appear to me in a dream after your death. And Rava appeared to him. Rav Seorim said to Rava: Master, did you have pain in death? He said to him: Like the prick of the knife when letting blood.

[557] It was similarly related that Rava sat before Rav Naḥman, and he saw that Rav Naḥman was dozing, i.e., slipping into death. Rav Naḥman said to Rava: Master, tell the Angel of Death not to torment me. Rava said to him: Master, are you not an important person who is respected in Heaven? Rav Naḥman said to him: In the supernal world who is important? Who is honorable? Who is complete?

[558] Rava said to Rav Naḥman: Master, appear to me in a dream after your death. And he appeared to him. Rava said to him: Master, did you have pain in death? Rav Naḥman said to him: Like the removal of hair from milk, which is a most gentle process. But nevertheless, were the Holy One, Blessed be He, to say to me: Go back to that world, the physical world, as you were, I would not want to go, for the fear of the Angel of Death is great. And I would not want to go through such a terrifying experience a second time.

559 The Gemara relates that Rabbi Elazar was once eating teruma, when the Angel of Death appeared to him. He said to the Angel of Death: I am eating teruma; is it not called sacred? It would be inappropriate for me to die now and thereby defile this sacred teruma. The Angel of Death accepted his argument and left him. The moment passed, and he lived for some time afterward.

560 It was similarly related that the Angel of Death once appeared to Rav Sheshet in the marketplace. Rav Sheshet said to the Angel of Death: Shall I die in the market like an animal? Come to my house and kill me there like a human being.

561 So too, the Angel of Death appeared to Rav Ashi in the marketplace. Rav Ashi said to the Angel of Death: Give me thirty days so that I may review my studies, for you say above: Fortunate is he who comes here to Heaven with his learning in his hand. On the thirtieth day the Angel of Death came to take him. Rav Ashi said to the Angel of Death: What is all of this? Why are you in such a hurry to take me? Why can you not postpone my death? He said to him: The foot of Rav Huna bar Natan is pushing you, as he is ready to succeed you as the leader of the generation, and one sovereignty does not overlap with its counterpart, even by one hairbreadth. Therefore, you cannot live any longer.

562 The Angel of Death was unable to take Rav Ḥisda because his mouth was never silent from study. So the Angel of Death went and sat on the cedar column that supported the roof of the study hall of the Sages. The cedar cracked and Rav Ḥisda was silent for a moment, as he was startled by the sound. At that point the Angel of Death was able to take him.

563 The Angel of Death could not come near Rabbi Ḥiyya, owing to his righteousness. One day the Angel of Death appeared to him as a poor person. He came and knocked on the door. He said to Rabbi Ḥiyya: Bring out bread for me, and he took out bread for him. The Angel of Death then said to Rabbi Ḥiyya: Master, do you not have mercy on a poor person? Why, then, do you not have mercy upon that man, i.e., upon me, and give me what I want? The Angel of Death then revealed his identity to him, and showed him a fiery rod in order to confirm that he was the Angel of Death. At this point Rav Ḥiyya surrendered himself to him.

564 MISHNA: On the intermediate days of a Festival women may wail in grief over the deceased, but they may not clap [metapeḥot] their hands in mourning. Rabbi Yishmael says: Those who are close to the bier may clap.

565 On New Moons, Hanukkah and Purim, which are not Festivals by Torah law, the women may both wail and clap their hands in mourning. On both the intermediate days of a Festival and on New Moons, Hanukkah and Purim they may not lament. After the deceased has been buried they may neither wail nor clap.

566 The mishna explains: What is considered wailing? This is when they all wail together simultaneously. And what is considered a lament? This is when one speaks and they all answer after her with a repeated refrain, as it is stated: “And teach your daughters wailing and everyone her neighbor lamentation” (Jeremiah 9:19).

567 In order to conclude on a positive note, the mishna says: But with regard to the future, the verse states: “He will destroy death forever; and the Lord, God, will wipe away tears from off all faces and the reproach of His people He will take away from off all the earth” (Isaiah 25:8).

[568] GEMARA: What do the women who wail over the dead say? Rav said: They say: Woe over him who is now departing; woe over him who is now returning the pledge, i.e., his soul, which had been deposited in his hands all the years of his life.

[569] Rava said: The women in the city of Shekhantziv, who were known for their wisdom, would say as follows: Woe over him who is now departing; woe over him who is now returning the pledge. And Rava said: The women of Shekhantziv would say about an elderly person: The bone has been removed from the jaw and the water returns to the kettle.

[570] And Rava said: The women of Shekhantziv would say at a time of bereavement: Wrap and cover the mountains in mourning, as the deceased is the son of the high and distinguished. Rava said: The women of Shekhantziv would say: Lend out a cloak of fine wool to serve as a burial shroud for a free man whose sustenance has been depleted. In other words, a wealthy person who loses his fortune would rather die than live in poverty.

[571] And Rava said: The women of Shekhantziv would say: A person runs and tumbles at the ford and still he borrows. And Rava said: The women of Shekhantziv would say: Our brothers, the merchants, will be examined at their places of business to see if they are honest businessmen. And Rava said: The women of Shekhantziv would say: Death is like death, as everyone must die, and suffering is like interest.

[572] It is taught in a baraita that Rabbi Meir would say with regard to the verse “It is better to go to the house of mourning than to go to the house of feasting, for that is the end of all men; and the living will lay it to his heart” (Ecclesiastes 7:2): What should the living lay to his heart? Matters relating to death. And these matters are as follows: He that eulogizes will be eulogized by others. He that buries others will be buried by others. He that loads many words of praise and tribute into the eulogies that he delivers for others will be similarly treated by others. He that raises his voice in weeping over others will have others raise their voices over him.

[573] And some say: One who does not raise himself with pride, but chooses his place among the lowly, will be raised by others, as it is written: “Do not exalt yourself in the king’s presence, and stand not in the place of great men. For it is better to be told, step up here, than to be degraded in the presence of the great” (Proverbs 25:6–7).

[574] The Sages taught the following baraita: When the sons of Rabbi Yishmael died, four Elders entered to console him: Rabbi Tarfon, Rabbi Yosei HaGelili, Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya, and Rabbi Akiva. Rabbi Tarfon said to them: Know that Rabbi Yishmael is a great Sage and well versed in aggadot. Let none of you interrupt the words of another, but rather each person should say something novel of his own. Rabbi Akiva said: And I shall speak last.

[575] Rabbi Yishmael, the mourner, opened and said about himself: Many are his sins. Due to this, his bereavements came in quick succession and he troubled his teachers once and then a second time to come and console him.

[576] Having been granted permission to speak, Rabbi Tarfon answered and said: With regard to the death of Aaron’s sons it says: “But let your brethren, the whole house of Israel, bewail the burning that the Lord has kindled” (Leviticus 10:6). Are these matters not inferred a fortiori: If, with regard to Nadav and Avihu, who had performed only one mitzva that is explicitly mentioned in the Bible, as it is written: “And the sons of Aaron brought the blood to him” (Leviticus 9:9), this was nevertheless

stated about them, then with regard to the sons of Rabbi Yishmael, who were well known for their performance of many mitzvot, all the more so should the entire Jewish people bewail their death.

577 Rabbi Yosei HaGelili answered and said: With regard to Abijah, son of King Jeroboam, the verse states: “And all Israel shall mourn for him, and bury him” (I Kings 14:13). Are these matters not inferred a fortiori: If, with regard to Abijah, son of Jeroboam, who did only one good thing, as it is written: “Because in him there is found some good thing toward the Lord God of Israel” (I Kings 14:13), i.e., he did only one good thing, and this was his reward, then with regard to the sons of Rabbi Yishmael all the more so should they be rewarded by having the entire Jewish people mourn for them and bury them.

578 The Gemara asks: What was this one good thing that Abijah did? Rabbi Zeira and Rabbi Ḥinnana bar Pappa disagreed about this issue. One said: He abandoned his guard post. His father, Jeroboam, had assigned him to serve as one of the guards whose mission it was to prevent people from going up to Jerusalem on the pilgrimage Festivals. And he himself went up to Jerusalem for the pilgrimage Festival. And one said: He removed the guards [pardesaot] that his father, Jeroboam, had placed along the roads so that the people of Israel would not go up to Jerusalem for the pilgrimage Festivals.

579 The baraita continues: Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya answered and said: With regard to King Zedekiah, the verse states: “But you shall die in peace; and with the burnings of your fathers, the former kings that were before you, so shall they make a burning for you” (Jeremiah 34:5). Are these matters not inferred a fortiori: If, with regard to Zedekiah, king of Judea, who had performed only one mitzva that is explicitly mentioned in the Bible, for he had Jeremiah lifted out of the mire (Jeremiah 38:10), this was nevertheless stated about him, then with regard to the sons of Rabbi Yishmael all the more so should they be rewarded by dying in peace.

580 Rabbi Akiva answered and said: The verse states: “On that day shall there be a great mourning in Jerusalem, like the mourning of Hadadrimmon in the valley of Megiddon” (Zechariah 12:11). The Gemara comments: With regard to this verse, Rav Yosef said: Had it not been for the Aramaic translation of this verse, we would not have known what it is saying, as nowhere in the Bible do we find this incident involving Hadadrimmon.

581 The Aramaic translation reads as follows: At that time the mourning in Jerusalem will be as great as the mourning over Ahab, son of Omri, who was slain by Hadadrimmon, son of Tabrimmon, and like the mourning over Josiah, son of Amon, who was slain by Pharaoh the lame in the valley of Megiddon.

582 The baraita continues: Are these matters not inferred a fortiori: If, with regard to Ahab, king of Israel, who did only one good thing that is explicitly mentioned in the Bible, as it is written: “And the king was propped up in his chariot facing Aram” (I Kings 22:35), as he did not want the Jewish people to see that he was mortally wounded and flee, and this, that he was greatly mourned, was nevertheless stated about him, then all the more so will the sons of Rabbi Yishmael be greatly mourned.

583 The Gemara discusses issues in the aforementioned verses: Rava said to Rabba bar Mari: It is written with regard to Zedekiah: “You shall die in peace,” but elsewhere it is written: “And he put out Zedekiah’s eyes” (Jeremiah 39:7). Rabba bar Mari said to him: Rabbi Yoḥanan said as follows: The first verse: “You shall die in peace,” means that Nebuchadnezzar died in Zedekiah’s lifetime and consequently the latter died in peace, having seen the death of the wicked.

584 And Rava further said to Rabba bar Mari: It is written with regard to Josiah: “Behold, therefore I will gather you unto your fathers, and you shall be gathered into your grave in peace” (II Kings 22:20), and elsewhere it is written: “And the archers shot at King Josiah; and the king said to his servants, Get me away; for I am grievously wounded” (II Chronicles 35:23). And with regard to this verse Rabbi Yehuda said that Rav said: With their many arrows, they made his body like a sieve.

585 Rabba bar Mari said to him: Rabbi Yoḥanan said as follows: The words “in peace” stated with regard to King Josiah refer to the fact that the Temple was not destroyed in his lifetime, as the verse itself continues: “And your eyes shall not see all the evil that I will bring upon this place” (II Kings 22:20).

586 The Gemara returns to examining the halakhot of consolation. Rabbi Yoḥanan said: The consolers are not permitted to speak words of consolation until the mourner opens and speaks first. As it is stated: “And they sat down with him upon the ground for seven days and seven nights, and none spoke a word to him; for they saw that his suffering was very great. After this Job opened his mouth” (Job 2:13–3:1). And afterward: “And Eliphaz the Temanite answered and said” (Job 4:1).

587 Rabbi Abbahu said: From where is it derived that the mourner reclines at the head [rosh] of the table? As it is stated: “I chose out their way, and sat as chief [rosh], and dwelt as a king in the army, as one that comforts [yenaḥem] the mourners” (Job 29:25). This indicates that the mourner sits at the head of the table, as the chief.

588 The Gemara raises an objection: But the word yenaḥem means that he comforts others, thereby implying that one who comforts the mourners sits at the head of the table. Rav Naḥman bar Yitzḥak said: The word is written as yinaḥem, meaning: Will be comforted, and therefore can be understood as referring to the mourner.

589 Mar Zutra said: A proof may be derived from here: The verse “And the revelry [mirzaḥ] of those who stretched themselves out shall pass away [sar]” (Amos 6:7) means that mirzaḥ, he who is bitter [mar] and whose mind is overwrought [zaḥ] due to grief, is made a prince [sar] over those who sit beside him stretched out below him to comfort him.

590 Rabbi Ḥama bar Ḥanina said: From where is it derived that a groom reclines at the head of the table? As it is stated: “As a bridegroom decks himself [yekhahen] with a garland” (Isaiah 61:10). Just as a priest [kohen] is at the head of the table, so too, a bridegroom is at the head of the table.

591 The Gemara asks: From where do we derive that the priest himself sits at the head? The Gemara answers: As the school of Rabbi Yishmael taught: With regard to a priest it says: “You shall sanctify him, for he offers the bread of your God” (Leviticus 21:8), meaning that you are to sanctify him with regard to all matters of sanctity: To be first to begin reading the Torah, to be first to recite the Grace after Meals, and to be first to take a portion during a meal.

592 § The Gemara returns to its discussion of death: Rabbi Ḥanina said: The soul’s departure from the body is as difficult

593 as it is for a knotted rope [tzippori] to pass through an eye [veshet] in a ship’s rigging. Rabbi Yoḥanan said: It is as difficult as it is for a halyard [pitirei] to pass through an eye [veshet].

594 And Rabbi Levi bar Ḥayyata said: One who departs from the deceased should not say to him: Go to peace, but rather he should say: Go in peace. One who departs from the living should not say to him: Go in peace, but rather he should say: Go to peace.

595 One who departs from the deceased should not say to him: Go to peace, but rather: Go in peace, as it is stated: “And you shall go to your fathers in peace; you shall be buried in a good old age” (Genesis 15:15).

596 One who departs from the living should not say to him: Go in peace, but rather: Go to peace, as David said to Absalom: “Go in peace” (II Samuel 15:9), and he subsequently went and was hanged; whereas Jethro said to Moses: “Go to peace” (Exodus 4:18), and he went and was successful.

597 And Rabbi Levi said: Anyone who leaves from the synagogue and goes to the study hall or goes from the study hall to the synagogue, i.e., he goes from the mitzva of prayer to the mitzva of Torah study or vice versa, merits to receive the Divine Presence, as it is stated: “They go from strength to strength, every one of them appears before God in Zion” (Psalms 84:8).

598 With regard to the same verse, Rav Ḥiyya bar Ashi said that Rav said: Torah scholars have no rest, even in the World-to-Come, as even there they remain in constant movement and ascent, as it is stated: “They go from strength to strength, every one of them appears before God in Zion.” Even when they are in the World-to-Come, they continue to go from strength to strength, until the final redemption will arrive in the end of days and God will appear in Zion.