

# CHAVRUTA

## SHABBAT – DAF PEH

Translated by: *Rabbi Avraham Rosenthal*

Edited by: *R. Shmuel Globus*

**It was taught** in a Baraita: **One who brings out ink** to the public domain on Shabbat – the minimum amount for which one is liable is the amount needed to write **two letters** (i.e. two single characters, such as A and B). This is when he transfers it from domain to domain **as dry ink**. Similarly, he is liable for the minimum amount of **two letters** i.e. two characters as ink that is **in the quill**. The same applies when he transfers ink that is sufficient to write **two letters** when it is **in the inkwell**.

**Rava posed an inquiry:** If he transferred the amount of ink of **one letter of dry ink** and **one letter in the quill and one letter in the inkwell** – **what is it?** Do the three types of ink join together for the minimum amount of two letters?

The Gemara concludes: **Let it stand**. The inquiry is unresolved.

\*

**Said Rava:** **One who transfers** the amount of ink of **two letters** to the public domain, **and wrote them** these two single characters **as he walked** and seemingly he did not put it down in the public domain. For he did not stop walking (and therefore the rule of “resting one’s body is the equivalent of putting down the object” does not apply). The Halachah is that **he is liable** for transferring (aside from being liable for writing), since **the writing** of the letters with the ink – **this is putting them down**. Placing ink on paper while writing is the primary way to put ink down.

\*

**And said Rava:** **If one transferred** the amount of ink of **one letter** from one domain to another, **and wrote it, and went back and transferred** the amount of ink of **one more letter and wrote it** – **he is exempt** from a sin offering for transferring, even if he did so in one period of forgetting the prohibition<sup>1</sup>.

**What is the reason?** Because **at the time that he transferred the latter**, the ink of the second letter, **the minimum amount of the former is lacking**. For the ink of the first letter already dried. Therefore, at the conclusion of the transferring, when we come to combine the two letters, we do not have the minimum amount of two letters.

\*

**And said Rava:** **If one who brought out one half** of a **dried fig** from the private domain **and he put it down** in the public domain, **and he went back and brought out one half** of a **dried fig and put it down** in the public domain. **The first** half of the dried fig **is as if a dog caught it** in its mouth, and the act of placing down is not considered to have been done by the man. **Or** it is as if **it was incinerated** before the second half of the dried fig was put down, and thus the two halves of the dried fig are not fitting to be joined to

---

<sup>1</sup> Or, he forgot that today is Shabbat.

## PEREK 8 – 80A

make up the requisite minimum amount to be liable, **and he is exempt.**

The Gemara asks: **And why** is he exempt? **Behold**, the first half of the dried fig **has been put down** when the second half was put down, and it was not actually caught in the dog's mouth or incinerated. Rather, both are now situated together at the conclusion of the transferal, and together they complete the minimum amount of a dried fig. Why do they not combine together?

The Gemara answers: **This** is what Rava said: **If he acted promptly, and picked up the first** half from where it was put down **before the placement** of the **second** half, the **first becomes like it was caught** by a dog (before being put down, and he is exempt), **or** like it was **incinerated**, because here too, when the transferring is completed, the first placement has been nullified.

\*

**Said Rava: If one brought out a half** of a dried fig, **and put it down, and went back and brought out a half** of a dried fig, **and transported it over it**, the first half, **he is liable.**

The Gemara asks: **And why** is he liable? **Behold**, the second half **was not put down?**

The Gemara answers: **For example, he transported** the second fig **within three tefachim**<sup>2</sup> of the ground upon which the first half dried fig was sitting, so it is as if it was put down—due to the concept of *lavud*, which dictates that objects in such proximity are considered attached.

The Gemara raises a difficulty: **And behold, said Rava:** One who throws an object from a private domain to a public domain, or he threw it a distance of four *ammot*<sup>3</sup> in the public domain, and the object did not land in the public domain, he is exempt. Even if the object passed **within three tefachim** of the ground of the public domain, he is exempt, according **to the Sages** who consider an object entering the airspace not to be as if it landed. Rather, it is necessary that **the placement** of the item be **on top of something**. Thus, according to the Sages, within three *tefachim* is not like being placed on the ground. It must be actually resting on the ground.

The Gemara answers: **It is not difficult.**

**Here**, where it needs to be actually placed on top of something, is **where he threw** the object and it did not land in the public domain.

**Here**, where it is sufficient to be transported close to the ground without actually being put down, is **where he transports** the object in his hand. Then it does not have to be put down, as the object is resting in his hand, and his hand is near the ground.

\*\*\*

**The Rabbis taught** in a Baraita: **If he brought out a half** of a dried fig, **and went back and brought out a half** of a dried fig, **all in one period of forgetfulness:** since he acted in ignorance throughout, and he did not find out in the interim that he sinned, **he is liable**

---

<sup>2</sup> 1 tefach: 3.1 in., 8 cm

<sup>3</sup> 1 ammah: 18.7 in., 48 cm

## **PEREK 8 – 80A**

for a sin offering.

But if he brought them out **in two periods of forgetfulness**, where he found out in between the two halves that he had sinned<sup>4</sup>, and he again forgot and brought out the second half, **he is exempt**. For the knowledge of the law in between the two acts divides the two transfers, and the two halves cannot join together to constitute the minimal amount that makes him liable a sin offering.

**Rabbi Yosi says:** Even if he transferred them **in one period of forgetfulness**, he is liable only if he transferred the two halves **to one domain**, i.e., the same public domain. Only then **he is liable**. But if he transferred the two halves **to two** different public **domains** on opposite sides of the private domain, each half to a different domain, **he is exempt**.

**Said Rabbah:** **And this** is on condition **that** the two public domains are separated specifically by a private domain. For then, **there is** a domain that creates “**sin-offering liability**” separating **between them**.

**Only then are the two public domains considered to be two distinct domains by Torah law.**

**But**, if only a *carmelit*<sup>5</sup> intervenes between them, it is **not** a separation to divide between the two domains. Thus, even if he were to transfer a half of a dried fig to one and a half of a dried fig to another, he is liable.

However, **Abaye said:** **Even** a *carmelit* is a division.

**But a tree trunk** lying across the width of the public domain is **not** a division. If he were to transfer half of a dried fig to one side of the trunk and half to the other side, he is liable.

**And Rava said:** **Even a tree trunk** is a division.

**And Rava follows his reasoning.**

**As Rava said:** **A domain of Shabbat is like a domain of *gitin*.**<sup>6</sup> Regarding *gitin* we find that a tree trunk defines a domain unto itself. This is also true regarding Shabbat, that it divides between two public domains.

The incident in Tractate *Gitin* was that the husband threw the *get* to his wife in his courtyard and the *get* fell on the tree trunk. The Halachah is that she is not divorced. Even though the husband lent her the courtyard so that she can acquire the *get*, he did not lend her the tree trunk, since it is a distinct place, and we say that a person is only apt to lend one place, not two.

\*\*\*

It was stated in the Mishnah: One who transfers *kechol* (used as an eye-cosmetic) – **enough to paint one eye**.

---

<sup>4</sup> Although he was not yet liable for a sin offering due to the lack of the minimum amount of a dried fig, nevertheless he has transgressed a prohibition.

<sup>5</sup> An area that cannot be classified either as a public domain or as a private one.

<sup>6</sup> Documents of divorce. Sing. *get*

## PEREK 8 – 80A

The Gemara asks: Why should he be liable for such a small amount? For only **one eye**, people **do not paint** – they paint two eyes or none. Why did the Sages set the amount as “one eye”?

The Gemara answers: **Said Rav Huna: Because modest women paint only one eye**, since they cover their faces and only leave one eye uncovered so they can see, thus they only paint that one eye. Therefore, *kechol* sufficient for one eye is also considered important.

**They**, the scholars of the study hall, **posed a contradiction** to Rav Huna: Note that it was taught in a Baraita: **Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar says: *Kechol*, if it is for a remedy** (*kechol* was also used to heal certain eye maladies), its minimal amount is **enough to paint** with it **one eye**.

And **if it is for makeup**, its minimal amount is enough to paint with it **two eyes**.

**This is difficult for Rav Huna, as he said enough to paint one eye is sufficient even as makeup.**

The Gemara answers: **Hillel the son of Rabbi Shmuel bar Nachmani explained: When was that Baraita taught? Regarding village women** who do not have to act with a lot of modesty, as there are not many men there, and frivolity is not common. Therefore they paint both eyes, and this is their minimal amount regarding Shabbat.

\*\*\*

It was stated in the Mishnah: **Wax – enough to put on the opening of a small hole.**

**It was taught** in a Baraita: **Enough to place on a small hole of the cork on a jug of wine**, and not of oil or honey. Wine will go out through a smaller hole than what is required to pour oil or honey.

\*\*\*

It was stated in the Mishnah: **Glue – enough to place on the end of the *shafshaf*** (a small plank, as will be explained).

**It was taught** in a Baraita: **Enough to place on top of a small plank that is on top of a hunter’s pole**. He needs to place a lot of glue there, in order that the bird will stick to the plank when it sits there.

\*\*\*

It was stated in the Mishnah: **Pitch and sulphur – enough to make a hole.**

**It was taught** in a Baraita: **Enough to make a small hole.** (See the Mishnah.)

\*\*\*

It was stated in the Mishnah: **Crushed brick – enough to make the opening of a furnace** of goldsmiths. Rabbi Yehudah says: Enough to make a tripod.

The Gemara asks: **Is this to say that the minimal amount of Rabbi Yehudah is greater** than the minimal amount of the Rabbis, i.e. the first Tanna? The amount needed to make a tripod is more than what is needed to make the opening of a furnace.

## **PEREK 8 – 80B**

And **behold, we have established** with regards to transferring a different item **that the minimal amount of the Rabbis is greater** than that of Rabbi Yehudah.

**As it was taught** in a Mishnah regarding the minimal amount of reed cord: **Rabbi Yehudah says: Enough to take the measurement of a shoe for a child**, which is less than the minimal amount of the Rabbis, enough to make a patch.

There, Rabbi Yehudah is more stringent than the Rabbis, so why here is he more lenient than them?

The Gemara answers: **Say** in the words of Rabbi Yehudah: **Enough to plaster** the cracks of the **tripod** of a **small stove**, which is smaller than making the opening of a furnace of goldsmiths.

**(Bran – enough to place on the opening of a furnace of goldsmiths)**

### **AMMUD BET**

**The Rabbis taught** in a Baraita: **One who transfers hair – enough to mix** with the **clay**, as hair is beneficial for clay and it is usual to mix it in.

**And clay** itself – its minimal amount is **enough to make the opening of a furnace of goldsmiths**.

\*\*\*

It was stated in the Mishnah: **Lime – enough to smear** with it the smallest of girls.

**It was taught** in a Baraita: **Enough to smear the small finger of the girls**. They were accustomed to put lime on their bodies in order to give it a reddish hue.

**Said Rav Yehudah in the name of Rav** i.e. the Sage who was so named: **Jewish girls who have reached puberty**, i.e. they have pubic hairs, **and they have not come of age**, i.e. they have these hairs early, and they are embarrassed by it –

**The daughters of poor people – they would smear them with lime** in order to remove the hair.

**The daughters of wealthy people – they would smear with fine flour**.

**The daughters of kings – they would smear with *shemen hamor***, as it says (Esther 2:12), **“Six months in *shemen hamor*.”**

The Gemara explains: **What is *shemen hamor*?**

**Rav Huna said: Spiced oil**.

**Rabbi Yirmiyah bar Aba said: Oil of olives that did not grow a third** of their growth. At this stage the olives are edible, but they are not ripe.

\*

**It was taught** in a Baraita: **Rabbi Yehudah said: *Anpiknun***, which was mentioned in

## **PEREK 8 – 80B**

the Mishnah in Tractate *Menachot* (88b), that one may not bring *anpiknun* oil for a *minchah*<sup>7</sup> offering, is referring to **olive oil that has not grown a third.**

\*

**Why do they smear with it, i.e. *shemen hamor*?**

Because **it causes the hair to fall out, and it smoothes the skin.**

**Rav Bibi had a daughter. He smeared her** with lime, **limb by limb**, one after the other, and did not cover them at the same time with the lime.

She became very beautiful, and many people wanted to marry her. Rav Bibi **accepted for her four hundred zuz** as dowry from her husband.

**There was a non-Jew in Rav Bibi's neighborhood. He also had a daughter. He smeared** his daughter's whole body with lime **at one time**, and not limb by limb, **and she died.**

**He, the non-Jew, said: Rav Bibi killed my daughter,** because I did like him.

**Said Rav Nachman: Rav Bibi who drinks beer – his daughters need smearing** with lime, since beer ruins the skin and increases hair. **But us, who do not drink beer – our daughters did not need smearing.**

\*\*\*

It was stated in the Mishnah: **Rabbi Yehudah says:** The minimum amount of lime is **enough to smear a *kilkul*.** Rabbi Nechemiah says: Enough to smear *undifi*.

The Gemara asks: **What is *kilkul* and what is *undifi*?**

**Said Rav:** *Kilkul* is smearing the **temples** so as to make the hair lie flat. **And *undifi* is smearing beneath the temples** in order to remove the fine hair.

The Gemara asks: Does this mean **to say that the minimal amount of Rabbi Yehudah is greater** than that of the Rabbis, i.e. the first Tanna, who said enough to smear the small finger of the daughters? For this seems to be less than smearing a *kilkul*.

**And behold, we established that the minimal amount of the Rabbis is greater!**

The Gemara answers: The minimal amount of Rabbi Yehudah is **smaller than the Rabbis, and greater than Rabbi Nechemiah.** The amount of smearing a *kilkul* is less than that of smearing a small finger, and more than that of smearing an *undifi*. Thus Rabbi Yehudah is more stringent than the Rabbis in regards to minimal amounts of Shabbat. (His smaller amount constitutes a stringency, because it will make one liable for carrying a smaller amount.)

The scholars of the study hall **contradicted** this, from a Baraita:

**Said Rabbi, i.e. Rabbi Yehudah Hanasi: The words of Rabbi Yehudah appear correct regarding** lime that is completely **dissolved** in water, which is made to smear *kilkul*.

**And the words of Rabbi Nechemiah appear correct regarding a lime egg – lime mixed**

---

<sup>7</sup> An offering of flour and oil brought on the Altar.

## **PEREK 8 – 80B**

and shaped like an egg, with which they smear *undifi*.

**And if you think** that *kilkul* and *undifi* refer to smearing lime on the hair of the temples and beneath the temples – how can Rabbi distinguish between them?

And behold, **this and that**, whether the hair of the temples or the hair of beneath the temples, are both smeared with **dissolved** lime, as both of them are hair.

The Gemara answers: **Rather, said Rabbi Yitzchak: They said in the academy of Rabbi Ami: *Undifi* is an *ah'undifa*.** This is a water urn made of pottery that has two openings, one on top and one on bottom. When a person wishes to fill it, he seals the lower opening with lime. This lime is different from the lime made for *kilkul*.

**Rav Kahana challenged this: And does a person waste his money?** For the liquid dissolves the lime and it will go out through the opening.

**Rather, said Rav Kahana: *Undifi* are measure-markings.** In the urn are protrusions that are used to indicate the amount of water. These are smeared with lime in order that they will be white and recognizable.

**As it is taught** in the Mishnah: **Measure-markings were in the *hin*<sup>8</sup> measure in the Temple, in order to indicate: Until here one measures out a half a *hin* for the wine libation that accompanies the offering of a bull. Until here is a third of a *hin* for a ram. And until here is a quarter *hin* for a lamb.**

\*

**And if you wish, I could say: What is *Undifa*? *Afuta* – the forehead.** They would smear the forehead (not where there was hair) in order that it get a reddish hue. Therefore, they would use a lime that was thicker than the lime used to remove hair.

**And this is like that Galilean who came to Babylon, where they said to him: Arise and expound for us regarding the workings of the Heavenly Chariot.<sup>9</sup>**

**He said to them: I will expound for you like Rabbi Nechemiah expounded for his colleagues.**

**And a wasp came out from the wall, and bit him on the *undifi*, his forehead, and he died.**

**And they said about him, the Galilean: From his own hand, this came to him,** since he should not have expounded regarding the workings of the Heavenly Chariot.

Thus, *undifi* means forehead.

---

<sup>8</sup> 1 hin: 4.4 quarts, 4.15 lit.

<sup>9</sup> An esoteric prophecy conveyed to Ezekiel.

## **PEREK 8 – 80B**

### **MISHNAH**

Red **clay**, the minimum amount for transferring it from domain to domain is **like** the size of a seal of merchandise sacks. These are the **words of Rabbi Akiva**.

**And the Sages say: Like the seal of letters.** They would seal their letters so that no one would read them, and this is smaller than a seal of merchandise sacks.

**Fertilizer and fine sand – enough to fertilize a stalk of cabbage.** These are the **words of Rabbi Akiva**.

**And the Sages say: Enough to fertilize a leek.** This is less than a stalk of cabbage.

**Course sand – enough to place from it on a full trowel of lime** of painters. They would mix sand in lime, and the amount needed for a trowel of lime is the minimal amount for transferring.

**A reed – enough to make a quill.**

**And if the reed was thick or cracked**, and it is not suitable for writing – its minimum amount is **enough to use it as fuel for the oven**, and **cook with it the easiest of eggs**, which is a chicken egg, when it is **beaten and placed in the heated pan**, and will cook quickly.

The minimal amount of the reed is enough to heat up this pan.

### **GEMARA**

It was stated in the Mishnah: Course sand – enough to place from it **on a full trowel of lime**.

**It was taught** in a Baraita: **Enough to place on the tip of a trowel of painters.**

The Gemara asks: **Who is the Tanna who holds that sand improves the lime?**

**Said Rav Chisda: It is Rabbi Yehudah.**

**As it was taught** in a Baraita: **A person should not paint his house with lime** after the destruction of Jerusalem, due to the mourning over Jerusalem, **unless he mixes into it straw or sand**, in order that it not be too white.

**Rabbi Yehudah says:** If he mixes in **straw, it is permissible**. But if he mixes in **sand, it is forbidden, as this is extra-strong plaster**. By adding sand to the lime, it becomes stronger. Therefore, even though it darkens it a bit, it is forbidden.

Thus, Rabbi Yehudah holds that sand improves lime.

**Rava said:** **You can even say** the Mishnah follows **the Rabbis** i.e. the first Tanna, and nevertheless we use the amount of sand added to lime as the standard measure, because **its deterioration is its improvement**. Since he is deteriorating and darkening the lime,



## **PEREK 8 – 80B**

the Sages therefore permitted him to paint with it—so it is common to mix sand in the lime, because it is then fit for use according to Halachah.

\*\*\*

It was stated in the Mishnah: A **reed – enough to make a quill**.

**It was taught** in a Baraita: A **quill** whose length **reaches** a person's **finger joints**.

**Rav Ashi posed an inquiry:** To which joint is the Mishnah referring? Is it the **upper joint** in the middle of the hand, i.e. the knuckles, **or** the **lower joint** in the middle of the finger?

The Gemara concludes: **Let it stand**. The question is left unresolved.

\*\*\*

It was stated in the Mishnah: **And if** the reed **was thick**.

**It was taught** in a Baraita: Enough to cook with it an egg **beaten with oil**, which cooks quickly, **and placed in the pot**.

**Said Mar the son of Ravina to his son:** **Did you hear** about this **easy egg** of the Mishnah – **what it is?**

**He said to him:** The **egg** of a small bird that is called *tziltzala*.

**What is the reason** that we use this as the minimal amount? **Because it is small**.

**Said Mar the son of Ravina to his son:** **If that is the reason, then say** the **even smaller egg of a bird called** *tzefirta*.

**His son** was quiet.

**He said to his father:** Did you hear anything about it?

He said to him: So said Rav Sheishet: **The** egg of a chicken.

And why do they call it an easy egg? The Sages estimated **that** there is no egg easier to cook than a chicken's egg.

**His son said to him:** And why is **this** different **from** all **other** minimal amounts **of foods** on Shabbat, **where the minimal amounts for transferring, harvesting and grinding are all** like a dried fig, and here **we estimate with** like an egg?

**Mar the son of Ravina** said to him: So said Rav Nachman: **The Mishnah also estimates with** a dried fig's **amount** of an easy egg, **and not an entire egg**.