

CHAVRUTA

SHABBAT – DAF PEH ALEF

Translated by: *Rabbi Dov Zimmel*

Edited by: *R. Shmuel Globus*

Mishnah

One who carries out a **bone** from a private domain to a public domain, and the bone is big **enough to make** from it a small measuring **spoon** – he is liable (to bring a sin offering) for transgressing the Torah prohibition of transferring from one domain to another.

Rabbi Yehudah says: One will be liable only if it is big **enough to make a key from it**. (This is a bigger size bone than the first Tanna spoke of).

Concerning carrying out **glass** – the piece of glass needs to be big **enough to sharpen with it the top of a weaving stick**. This was a stick with a sharp point which was used to separate threads that became entangled.

Concerning carrying out a **pebble or a stone** – they need to be big **enough to throw at a bird** to frighten it away.

Rabbi Elazar bar Yaacov says: They need to be big **enough to throw at an animal**. His view is that a person who wanted to frighten away a bird would not bother to pick up a stone for this purpose, rather he would just shout at it. Therefore the minimum size for a pebble or stone is somewhat larger– big enough to frighten away an animal.

Gemara

The Gemara poses a difficulty: **Is that to say that the size** of the bone according to the view **of Rabbi Yehudah is larger** than that of the Rabbis (i.e. the first Tanna)? For a key is larger than a small measuring spoon. But **note that we have already established that** in a disagreement between the Rabbis and Rabbi Yehudah, **the measurement** of the Rabbis is usually **larger**.

The Gemara resolves the difficulty: **Said Ula:** When Rabbi Yehudah spoke of a key, he was referring to the **“teeth” of the key** (the parts jutting out from the main body of the key). The amount of bone needed to make these teeth is less than needed for a small measuring spoon. Thus, also in our Mishnah, the measurement of the Rabbis is larger than that of Rabbi Yehudah.

PEREK 8 – 81A

The Rabbis taught in a Baraita: **The teeth of a key**, when they are separate to the key, **are pure**. I.e. they do not have the status of utensils to be able to contract impurity, since they have no usage except as part of a key.

But if **one fixed them in a key**, the teeth **can contract impurity**, since they are now part of a utensil.

Until now the Baraita has been referring to keys of a box or a chest.

But concerning keys of a door, even though¹ he attached them to a door and affixed them with nails, they are pure (i.e. they cannot contract impurity). Since the keys are attached to a door, and the door is attached to the ground, the keys cannot contract impurity. **For everything which is attached to the ground, it is like the ground** itself—and cannot contract impurity.

It was stated in the Mishnah: Concerning carrying out a piece of **glass**, it needs to be big enough to sharpen with it **the top of** a weaving stick, for one to be liable for it.

It was taught in a Baraita: Concerning carrying out a piece of **glass**, it needs to be big enough to cut off two threads at once².

It was stated in the Mishnah: Concerning carrying out a **pebble or a stone** – they need to be big enough to throw at a bird. **Rabbi Elazar** bar Yaacov says: They need to be big enough to throw at an animal.

Said Rabbi Yaacov in the name of Rabbi Yochanan: And it (the pebble or stone) must be big enough **that the animal will feel it** i.e. the impact of the stone.

And what is its measurement?

It was taught in a Baraita: **Rabbi Elazar ben Yaacov says: The weight of ten zuz³.**

¹ The Gemara by saying "even though" implies that the keys are pure *despite* being attached to a door. But the Gemara explains right away that they are pure *because* they are attached to the door! The Rashash explains that the Baraita is referring to the teeth of the key and not the key itself. We had just learnt if one fixed the teeth to a key they are impure. Here the Baraita is saying that even if the teeth are attached to a key (and not "to a door" as the text of the Gemara states), they will still not contract impurity.

² This is the same size of glass referred to in the Mishnah. The Baraita just gives a different example to the Mishnah.

³ A *zuz* was a silver coin. The weight of ten *zuz* – 42.5g, 1.37oz.

PEREK 8 – 81A

A sage named **Zonin** came to the **Study-hall**, and **said to them** to the Rabbis studying there: **My masters!** Regarding **stones of an outhouse** i.e. those used to wipe oneself there – **what is their measure?** How many stones, and of what size, did the Sages permit one to carry to an outhouse? (This question arises only where there is no problem of carrying from one domain to another. For the question is not about the work of transferring from one domain to another, but rather, about the laws of *muktzeh*⁴.)

Even though stones are normally forbidden to move, because they are *muktzeh*, however the Sages never forbade moving stones when one needs them to wipe oneself.

They said to him: Three stones – one **like** the size of **an olive**, one **like** the size of **a nut**, and one **like** the size of **an egg**. One would wipe oneself with different size stones, beginning with the smallest one.

He (Zonim) said to them: **Should he bring scales into the outhouse**, to weigh out their sizes?!

They the Rabbis were counted, i.e. they took a vote, **and they concluded:** One is permitted to take to the outhouse **a handful** of stones, i.e. there is no fixed number or size, rather, whatever you can fit into one hand can be taken there.

It was taught in a Baraita: **Rabbi Yosi says:** He can take there three stones, one **like** the size of **an olive**, one **like** the size of **a nut**, and one **like** the size of **an egg**. **Rabbi Shimon the son of Rabbi Yosi says in the name of his father:** He can take there **a handful** of stones.

*

The Rabbis taught in a Baraita: **It is permitted to bring into the outhouse three sharp stones.**

And what is the size of them?

Rabbi Meir says: Each of the three stones should be **like** the size of **a nut**.

Rabbi Yehudah says: Each of the three stones should be **like** the size of **an egg**.

Said Rafram bar Papa in the name of Rav Chisda: **Just like** there is **a disagreement** between Rabbi Meir and Rabbi Yehudah **here** concerning carrying stones on Shabbat, **so too** there is **a disagreement** between them **regarding** the size of **an etrog**. Rabbi Meir is of the view that an etrog can be like the size of a nut, and Rabbi Yehudah is of the view that it needs to be like the size of an egg.

⁴ This is a Rabbinical prohibition, that items which are not useful for Shabbat, cannot be moved.

PEREK 8 – 81A

They posed a difficulty: **There**, regarding an etrog, it is a **Mishnah**, and **here**, regarding stones of an outhouse, it is a **Baraita**. And since the Mishnah is more well-known than the Baraita, how could Rav Chisda make the understanding of the well-known (i.e. the Mishnah) depend on the less well-known (i.e. the Baraita).

The Gemara resolves the difficulty: **Rather**, this is what he said: **Just like** there is a **disagreement** between them **in** regards to an **etrog**, **so too** there is a **disagreement** between them **here** (in regards to carrying stones on Shabbat).

*

Said Rav Yehudah: But they did **not** permit moving **the payis** in order to wipe oneself.

The Gemara clarifies: **What is a payis?**

Said Rabbi Zeira: Clumps of “**Babylonian**” earth. It is not fit for wiping oneself, since it crumbles easily. [It is called “**Babylonian**” earth, for the earth there was moist, and when it was plowed it brought up these clumps of earth.]

*

Said Rava: It is forbidden to manipulate with a stone on Shabbat like one is accustomed to manipulate with it on a weekday. To alleviate constipation on a weekday, a small sharp stone was used to release the contracted muscles close to the rectum.

Mar Zutra challenged him (Rava): And are you suggesting that **he should endanger** himself? For if he does not alleviate himself it can be dangerous.

The Gemara answers: Rava only meant not to manipulate in the way he does on a weekday, for this can cause removal of hairs, which is forbidden on Shabbat. But to manipulate with a stone “**with the back of his hand**”, i.e. in an unusual manner, is permissible, and should be done.

*

Said Rabbi Yanai: If a person has a designated place which he uses for his outhouse, he may take there a **handful** of stones. For even if he does not use them all this time, he will do so in the course of Shabbat, so his taking them there has a purpose for this Shabbat.

But **if not**, that he has no designated place, he should only take there the measure **like the middle view**. I.e. three stones the size of a nut, which was the middle view (in a Baraita cited earlier) larger than an olive, but smaller than an egg.

PEREK 8 – 81A

A **small mortar** used **for** grinding **spices** is generally considered *muktzeh*, since it is used to do something which is forbidden on Shabbat. But it is suitable for wiping with, therefore:

Said Rav Sheishet: **If there is some evidence on it** that it has been used for wiping oneself with in the outhouse, then **it is permissible** to move it for this purpose. For this evidence shows that this object is now designated for wiping oneself.

*

They the scholars of the study hall **contradicted** Rav Sheishet, from a Baraita: **Ten things bring a person to have hemorrhoids.**

And they are the following: One who eats leaves of reeds, or leaves of grapevines, or shoots of grapevines, or parts of an animal which are not smooth (e.g. the tongue or the throat) **without** adding salt, **or the backbone of a fish, or salty fish which has not been fully cooked. Or one who drinks wine-dregs. Or one who wipes himself with lime or with clay, or with a pebble that his friend has wiped himself with.**

And some say: Even one who “suspends” himself in the outhouse. I.e. he does not sit down, rather he squats, and in this manner his bowels open up too much.

One of the items listed is a pebble that his friend has already used to wipe himself. So how could Rav Sheishet say that one could use a small mortar for wiping oneself with more than one time?

*

The Gemara resolves the contradiction: **It is not a difficulty: This** Baraita which said one should not use it again is **in** a case that the pebble is still **moist** with the dirt. **That** which Rav Sheishet said one could use the mortar another time to wipe oneself, is **in** a case that the mortar is **dry**, for the dirt has dried up.

And if you wish, I could say an alternative answer. **Here** where Rav Sheishet said you can use it again, he was referring to using a mortar which has been used **from one side** only. And Rav Sheishet is saying that it can be used to wipe oneself from the second (unused) side. **And there**, in the Baraita, it was referring to a pebble which has been used already **from both sides**. And since there is no side which has not yet been used, it cannot be reused for wiping oneself.

And if you wish, I could say an alternative answer. **This** which Rav Sheishet said one could use it again, was referring to **his** mortar. Since he used it to wipe himself, he can use it again to do so. **That** which the Baraita said one should not reuse the pebble to wipe

PEREK 8 – 81B

oneself, is referring to the pebble of **his friend**. Since his friend used it to wipe himself, now this person should not reuse this pebble to wipe himself.

*

Said Abaye to Rav Yosef: If **rain fell on it**, the mortar, **and** the traces of the first wiping **became smeared**, **what** is the Halachah? Can the mortar now be moved, since maybe it is no longer designated for wiping oneself?

He (Rav Yosef) **said to him** (Abaye): **If their mark is still recognizable, it is permitted**. For in this case it is no longer fitting to be used to grind spices, and is still designated to be used for wiping oneself.

*

Rabbah bar Rav Shila asked Rav...

Ammud Bet

...Chisda: **What** is the Halachah if one wishes **to take them**, the stones, **up with him to the roof**, to relieve oneself there? Is it considered excessive exertion on Shabbat to take them up there, and is thus forbidden Rabbinically?

He (Rav Chisda) **said to him:** **Human dignity is a great matter**, for we find **that it pushes aside even a Torah prohibition**. For we find in the Halachot of returning a lost object that if it is not befitting the honor of a person to carry such an object in the street, he is not required to return it to its owner, even though failure to fulfill this mitzvah is a Torah-ordained prohibition.

So too here, the Rabbinical prohibition of *muktzeh* is set aside for the sake of human dignity, so that people can practice proper personal hygiene and take the stones with them to the outhouse.

*

Mereimar was sitting and was saying this teaching, that one is allowed to take the stones to the outhouse because of human dignity.

Ravina contradicted Mereimar, from a Baraita: **Rabbi Eliezer says: A person may take a splinter of wood which is lying on the floor in front of him, in order to pick his teeth with it**. And we do not say that the splinter is *muktzeh*.

PEREK 8 – 81B

And the Sages say: A person **should only take** a splinter **from an animal's feeding trough**. Since it is fitting to be eaten by the animals, it is not considered *muktzeh*. Therefore one can take this splinter, but not one found elsewhere.

Now this seems to be a case involving human dignity. For a person would not want to be seen with bits of food between his teeth. Nevertheless, the Sages view these splinters as *muktzeh*.

The Gemara resolves the contradiction: **Now is this** really a good comparison?!

Over **there**, where the Sages forbade taking the splinter, it is because **a person fixes** from the outset **a certain place for his meal**. And thus, before Shabbat, he should have prepared a toothpick for himself in that place. Since he could have done so and did not, there was no reason for the Sages to permit the laws of *muktzeh* in this case.

But over **here**, concerning the use of stones for an outhouse, it is different. For **does a person fix a place for his outhouse?** Their outhouses were in the fields, and often one would find them being used, so one would need to go elsewhere. Since a person could not predict where he would need to go, the Sages permitted moving stones to wipe oneself, because of human dignity.

Said Rav Huna: It is forbidden to relieve oneself in a newly plowed field on Shabbat.

The Gemara asks: **What is the reason** that it is forbidden?

If you will say because by going into the field of his friend to relieve himself, he will be **trampling** on the newly plowed field, thereby ruining the plowing that had been done, then **even on a weekday also** it should be forbidden. So why did Rav Huna say it was forbidden to do so on Shabbat, implying that on a weekday it would be permissible?

Rather if you will say, it is forbidden **because of** the **grasses** that grow on the rocks in a newly plowed field due to the moisture. And the reason it is forbidden to relieve oneself there is because maybe he will wipe himself with one of these stones and thereby detach grasses from the stone.

This too is an insufficient answer. For **did Reish Lakish not say** the following: Concerning **a pebble that grasses grew on it, one is permitted to wipe oneself with it**. Even though sometimes one might come to detach grasses from the pebble. For the Halachah follows the view of Rabbi Shimon, that if a forbidden form of work was done unintentionally, one is not liable for this. **But one who intentionally detaches** grasses

PEREK 8 – 81B

from it (the pebble) **on Shabbat is liable** to bring a **sin-offering**. For he has detached them from their place of growth.

*

The Gemara answers: **Rather** the reason it is forbidden to relieve oneself on a freshly plowed field is as follows: **Perhaps he will take** a pebble **from above** i.e. from a mound, **and** after using it he will **throw it down to** a place **below**, i.e. into the bottom of a furrow. By doing this he will have leveled out the ground. Leveling ground is a sub-category of the work of Ploughing. **And he will be liable for the reason that Rava** gave.

For Rava said: If there was a hole and he filled it up with dirt.

If this took place **in a house** – **he will be liable** to bring a sin-offering **on account of** the work of **Building**. For by filling in the hole he has fixed up the floor of the house.

If this took place **in a field** – **he will be liable** to bring a sin-offering **on account of** the work of **Plowing**. For by filling in the hole he has improved the field.

Regarding the above-mentioned statement **itself: Said Reish Lakish:** Concerning a **pebble that grasses grew on it, one is permitted to wipe oneself with it. And one who detaches** grasses **from it on Shabbat is liable** to bring a **sin-offering**.

Said Rav Papi: You may **hear** i.e. deduce **from that** statement of **Reish Lakish** a proof that **it is permitted to move** a perforated **flowerpot**⁵ (with plants growing in it) on Shabbat. And it is not considered the work of detaching something from its place of growth (which is a sub-category of Harvesting). For Reish Lakish did not say that by lifting up the pebble from the ground, he was detaching the grasses from their source of growth.

Rav Kahana challenged it (the conclusion of Rav Papi): **If they said** that it is permitted **for an important purpose**, of wiping oneself, **did they say** that it was permitted **for no purpose**, i.e. when this reason does not apply? Rather let us say that it is Rabbinically prohibited to move such a flowerpot.

*

⁵ If a flowerpot has holes in the bottom of it, and does not have a plate underneath, it is considered as attached to the ground. For the plants derive sustenance from the ground, through the holes. It is thus considered that the plants are planted in the ground, and by picking up the pot, one could be considered as detaching the plants from the ground.

PEREK 8 – 81B

Said Abaye: Concerning a **flowerpot**, since the matter **has come into our hands**, let us say something about it.

If a flowerpot **was placed on the ground**, and somebody lifted it up **and placed it on poles** – **he is liable** Rabbinically, **on account of** doing the work of **detaching**. It resembles the Torah prohibition of detaching, since the flowerpot no longer benefits from the scent of the ground. But one has not transgressed the Torah prohibition of uprooting, since it is still attached to the ground even by placing it on the poles.

If the flowerpot **was placed on poles**, and he took it down and **placed it on the ground** – **he is liable** Rabbinically **on account of** doing the work of **Planting**. For now the pot can derive more benefit from being closer to the ground.

Said Rabbi Yochanan: It is forbidden to wipe oneself with a shard on Shabbat.

The Gemara asks: **What is the reason** it is forbidden?

If you want to **say** it is forbidden **because** of the **danger** involved, that by using the shard (which is sharp) it might damage his rectum, then **even on a weekday** it should **also** be forbidden to use.

And if you will say the reason is **rather because of** it causing **the removal of hairs** due to its sharpness, this should be permitted – for **it is something done without intention**. And Rabbi Yochanan is of the view that one is not liable for something done without intention (as the Gemara will explain later).

*

Rav Natan bar Oshaya said to them: Since a **great man** (Rabbi Yochanan) **has said something**, we should say a reason for it.

It was not necessary for Rabbi Yochanan to state that **it is forbidden** to use a shard to wipe oneself **on a weekday**, due to the reasons given above: that it is dangerous in terms of damaging one's rectum, or due to making one susceptible to witchcraft. And since on a weekday it is easy to use a pebble instead of a shard, it is therefore forbidden to use a shard.

However, on Shabbat, since the shard **has the status of a utensil** since it can be used for various purposes (and is thus not *muktzeh*), I might say **it is fine** to use a shard. I.e. it is better to use a shard (which is not *muktzeh*) to wipe oneself than a pebble (which is *muktzeh*).

PEREK 8 – 81B

Therefore Rabbi Yochanan **teaches us** that even on Shabbat one should not wipe oneself with a shard, because of the reasons of witchcraft and damaging one's rectum.

*

Rava taught it, the above teaching of Rabbi Yochanan, with the following explanation: **Because** it causes **the removal of hairs**. **And it was difficult for him** (Rava) to reconcile this statement **of Rabbi Yochanan with** another statement **of Rabbi Yochanan**.

And **did Rabbi Yochanan say** that **it is forbidden to wipe oneself with a shard on Shabbat?** For we see from this statement that his view is that **something which one does not intend** to do **is forbidden** to do.

But Rabbi Yochanan also said: The Halachah is in accordance with whatever is stated in **an unnamed⁶ Mishnah**. **And it was taught** in an unnamed Mishnah: **A Nazirite** (who is forbidden to cut his hair) **can smooth out or separate his hair**, even though by doing so he might pull out some hairs. He can do this because if any hairs are pulled out, it is considered that he did so unintentionally. **But he cannot comb** his hair with a comb, since he will certainly pull out some hair.

This unnamed Mishnah follows the view of Rabbi Shimon, that something done without intention is permitted. So if according to Rabbi Yochanan, the Halachah follows this view, how can he also say that it is forbidden to wipe oneself with a shard on Shabbat?

The Gemara concludes: **Rather, it is now clarified** that the correct explanation of Rabbi Yochanan's statement is that **of Rav Natan bar Oshaya**. The reason Rabbi Yochanan said it is forbidden to wipe oneself with a shard on Shabbat is because of the danger of witchcraft and of damaging one's rectum, and this supersedes the concern over *muktzeh*.

*

The Gemara now explains: **What is** the danger of **witchcraft** concerning a person cleaning himself with a shard?

Like that incident of Rav Chisda and Rabbah bar Rav Huna who were traveling in a boat.

A certain noblewoman said to them: Take me with you in the boat. But **they did not take her.**

She said something i.e. she uttered a certain incantation of witchcraft and **stopped the boat.**

⁶ If the view expressed in a Mishnah is not attributed to a specific Sage, it is implied that it is the normative view.

PEREK 8 – 81B

They (Rav Chisda and Rabbah bar Rav Huna) **said something** using a Name of Hashem, and **they released** the boat from the witchcraft, so it could go.

She said to them: What can I do to you....