

CHAVRUTA

SHABBAT – DAF AYIN ZAYIN

Translated by: *Chavruta staff of scholars*

Edited by: *R. Shmuel Globus*

[Said Rava: we have also] learnt in our Mishnah in accordance with Rav Nachman's view.

As it was taught in our Mishnah: **one who carries out wine** is liable, if he carries out **enough to mix a cup** with it.

And a Baraita **was taught regarding it**, i.e. regarding the Mishnah: **enough to mix a beautiful cup** with it, i.e. the cup used for the Blessing After Meals.

And the end of our Mishnah states “**and all other liquids**, one is liable only if he carries out a *revi'it*¹.” Thus one is liable for transferring from one domain to another only in the amount of a *revi'it* of liquids that are fit for drinking. And perforce, it is prohibited to carry out a measurement of wine which if mixed up with water would amount to *revi'it*. That is, a quarter of a *revi'it* of wine which when mixed with water, amounts to a *revi'it*. (And as will be explained, Rava holds the view that this is the ratio of mixing wine to water.)

And since the Baraita stated that the Mishnah is referring to a mixed cup of wine and water, used for the Blessing After Meals; this is a proof for Rav Nachman in the name of Rabbah bar Avuha. For he said that it is necessary to use a quarter of a *revi'it* of wine—which when mixed with water, amounts to a *revi'it*—for the cup used for the Blessing After Meals.

*

And Rava goes according to his reasoning.

As Rava said: all wine that does not contain three **parts** water to one **part wine**, is not wine.

Said Abaye: I have **two responses** i.e. disproofs **to this:**

Firstly, it was taught in a Mishnah in tractate *Niddah* that there is a type of *niddah* blood that has the hue of mixed wine. And the Mishnah explains: **and the mixed wine**, this refers to wine mixed from **two parts water and one part wine of Shironi wine**, wine that is grown in a place called Sharon.

¹ 86.4 gm or 2.9 fluid oz.

PEREK 8 – 77B

Thus the ratio of wine and water is one part to two. And if so, with regard to carrying out wine, the minimum amount for which one is liable should be a third of a *revi'it* of wine. And this should be true for the cup of blessing as well. This contradicts the opinion of Rav Nachman!

And a **further** argument against your, (Rava's), words, is that you say that in principle, wine needs a *revi'it*, like all liquids. But you consider the water to have already been added. But this makes no sense. For the **water** is still sitting **in the jug**, and yet it is considered to be **combined** with the pure wine, and makes the person who carries it out liable? But if when he carries out the wine, the water has still not been added, how can he be liable for carrying it out?

Rather, perforce, the prohibition is against carrying out the wine *without* the added water, since the amount of wine needed to be liable is not the same as other liquids. And this amount of wine has significance even when it is less than a *revi'it*, because it is enough to be used for a cup of blessing.

And if so, there is no proof from here for Rav Nachman, that a cup of blessing contains a *revi'it*. For it could be that it will still be less than a *revi'it* even after mixing.

*

Rava said to him: that which you said to prove from the Mishnah, **that two parts of water and one part wine of Shironi wine** is the measure of mixed wine. It is not a disproof. As **only Shironi wine** takes two parts water, since it is a **weak** wine. But generally, one adds three parts water to wine.

Alternatively, there in the case of Shironi wine – the measurement of two parts water to one part wine was **because of the appearance** created by this mixture of the wine. The Tanna did not intend to say that this is the regular way of mixing wine, but rather to say that this type of mixing gives the reddish hue that, if seen in blood, would be considered impure.

But regarding the taste of wine; **more water is required** for the regular mixing that people do to give the wine a proper taste; and three parts water are required.

And as for that **which you said**: and the **water** is still **in the jug, and** nevertheless it is considered to be **combined** with the measure of wine and therefore he is liable for carrying it out?

One can answer: **regarding the case of carrying on Shabbat – we require** him to carry **something of importance** to be liable. **And this** undiluted wine is **also** considered **important** (as is a *revi'it* of diluted wine). Since it is merely awaiting the addition of water to create a *revi'it*, it already carries the importance of a *revi'it*. Thus it depends

PEREK 8 – 77B

conceptually on the measure of *revi'it*, but not in the sense that we must see the water as already added.

And if so, consequently, a cup of blessing also amounts to a *revi'it*.

*

It was taught in a Baraita: the Rabbis determined that since a *kezayit*² of congealed wine contains a *revi'it* of liquid wine, one would be liable for carrying out a *kezayit* of **dry** congealed wine. (Since a *kezayit* of congealed wine contains a *revi'it* of liquid wine). For wine contracts when it congeals, thus from a *revi'it* of wine there remains only one *kezayit*. (A *kezayit* is the size of a half or a third of an egg. And a *revi'it* is the size of an egg and a half).

And since congealed wine cannot combine with water, it is necessary for there to be a *revi'it* of complete wine to be liable; these are the **words of Rabbi Natan**.

Said Rav Yosef: Rabbi Natan and Rabbi Yossi b'Rabbi Yehudah – said the same thing. I.e. that a *revi'it* of liquid contracts to a *kezayit* when congealed.

Rabbi Natan's statement is **what we said** previously.

And Rabbi Yossi b'Rabbi Yehudah teaches in the following Baraita: **Rabbi Yehudah says:** there are **six cases** that can be counted **among the lenient rulings of Beit Shammai and the stringent rulings of Beit Hillel**. I.e. where Beit Hillel rule stringently and Beit Shammai rule leniently.

(And in tractate *Eduyot* there are many more cases that the Tannaim testified about concerning the lenient rulings of Beit Shammai and the stringent rulings of Beit Hillel, and Rabbi Yehudah testified about six of these cases.)

And this is one of them:

Concerning **blood of an animal carcass (*neveilah*)** – **Beit Shammai** rule that it is **pure**. And it is not considered to be like the meat of a carcass, which is impure.

And Beit Hillel rule that it is **impure**, since the blood is considered to be like the meat of the carcass.

Said Rabbi Yossi b'Rabbi Yehudah: even when Beit Hillel ruled that the blood was impure, they only ruled it impure in a case where the amount of the **blood was** at least a *revi'it*, **since it can congeal and amount to a *kezayit***. Since the blood is deemed impure because we consider it to be like meat, it follows that just like the flesh needs to

² 0.9 fluid oz. or 28 cu. cm.

PEREK 8 – 77B

be at least a *kezayit* to impart impurity, so too, there needs to be a least a *kezayit* of blood in order to impart impurity.

Thus we see that Rabbi Yossi b’Rabbi Yehudah agrees with the view of Rabbi Natan, that a *revi’it* of liquid congeals to become a *kezayit* of solid.

*

And the Gemara rejects this: **Said Abaye: perhaps** this is **not so**, rather, it is possible that Rabbi Natan and Rabbi Yossi b’Rabbi Yehudah do not agree.

For **so far Rabbi Natan has not said here**, concerning carrying, **that a *revi’it* of liquid is required** to form a congealed *kezayit*. (For he said that in order to be liable, it would be sufficient to carry out a dry *kezayit*, since it is produced from a *revi’it* of wine). But he **only** said this **regarding wine, which is a thin liquid**, and has a large volume. And therefore, when it dries, it contracts greatly to create a *kezayit*.

But regarding blood, which is thick, and therefore its volume does not significantly change when it dries, behold, in order to create a congealed *kezayit*, **a *revi’it* of liquid is not required**. Even less than a *revi’it* of liquid will make a congealed *kezayit*. And therefore, carcass blood could impart impurity even when it is less than a *revi’it*.

And consequently, Rabbi Natan could differ with Rabbi Yossi b’Rabbi Yehudah.

*

Alternatively, so far, Rabbi Yossi b’Rabbi Yehudah has only said there concerning carcass blood, **that to create a *kezayit* of congealed blood, it is sufficient to have a *revi’it* of liquid**. He only said this **regarding blood, because it is thick**, and its volume loss is small.

But regarding wine, which is thin, a *kezayit* of congealed wine would be more than a *revi’it* of liquid. For in order to produce a *kezayit* of dried wine, more than a *revi’it* of liquid wine is needed. And it follows that a *revi’it* of liquid wine that congealed would be less than a *kezayit*.

Therefore, **he would be liable** for carrying out even **less than a *kezayit*** of congealed wine, as behold, it contains a *revi’it* of liquid wine, which is the prohibited amount to carry out. And this is not like the opinion of Rabbi Natan.

It was stated in the Mishnah: one who carries out **milk**, is liable if he carries out **enough to swallow**.

PEREK 8 – 77B

They (the scholars of the academy) **posed an inquiry**: should the word for swallow in the Mishnah read ‘**enough to gem’i’ah**’ spelled with an *alef*, or ‘**enough to gem’i’ah**’ spelled with an *ayin*?

Said Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak: behold, it says (Breishit³ 24:17), “**Give me now to swallow (*hagmi’ini*) a bit of water from your jug**”. The word *hagmi’ini* in the verse is spelled with an *alef*, so the word *gemiah* in the Mishnah should also be spelled with an *alef*.

They (the scholars of the academy) **posed an inquiry**:

Ammud Bet

When our Mishnah stated “apart from their shells and their pits”; should the word for pits in the Mishnah read: **gar’i’nin** spelled with an *alef* or **gar’i’nin** spelled with an *ayin*?

Said Rava bar Ula: **behold it states** “and it shall be deducted (*venigra*)’ from your valuation”. **The word *venigra*’, meaning deducted, is spelled with an *ayin*. The word for pits (*garinin*) is cognate with the word for deduct (*nigra*), since pits are ‘deducted’ – discarded from the food.**

They posed a further inquiry: when the Mishnah states (*Pesachim* Daf 75b) ‘burning embers’ (*omemot*); should the word for burning embers be spelled “**o’memot**’ with an *alef* or **o’memot** with an *ayin*?

Said Rav Yitzchak bar Avdimi: behold it states in the prophecies of Yechezkel⁴ concerning Ashur⁵, “**Cedars will not dim (*amamuhu*) his splendor in the garden of the L-rd**”. And this means that even the cedars did not darken the appearance of Ashur. That is to say, that there was not one cedar in the world that was as beautiful as Ashur. And the word ‘*a’mamuhu* meaning darkness is spelled with an *ayin*. And the word for burning coals (*o’memot*) is cognate with the word for darkness (*a’mamuhu*) because they darken when they are extinguishing.

*

They posed a further inquiry: behold it states in a Mishnah further on (Daf 151b) “one may not close (*ma’amatzin*) the eyes of a dead person of Shabbat”. Should the word for closing eyes in the Mishnah read **ma’’a’matzin** spelled with an *alef* or **ma’’a’amatzin** with an *ayin*?

³ Genesis

⁴ Ezekiel

⁵ Assyria

PEREK 8 – 77B

Rabbi Chiya bar Abba said in the name of Rabbi Yochanan: behold it states (Yeshayah 33:15), “And one who averts (*otzem*) his eyes from seeing evil” And the word ‘*o’tzem*’ meaning closing is spelled with an *ayin*. (And even though in this instance the letter ‘*mem*’ precedes the letter *ayin*, the meaning stays the same, *Ritva*).

Our Rabbis taught in a Baraita: **one who carries out animal milk** is liable if he carries out **enough to swallow**.

One who carries out **woman’s milk, or egg white**, is liable if he carries out **enough to put** into an eye healing **ointment** application. They used to rub the eye ointment with woman’s milk or egg white. And that is why it is called *meshifa* – meaning, to rub.

One who carries out *kilor* – an eye ointment – is liable if he carries out **enough to mix it with water**. That is, he carries out the amount of remedy that, after dissolving in water, is sufficient to apply to both eyes.

Rav Ashi inquired: is the amount of *kilor* that one is liable for carrying **the amount sufficient to apply** to the eyes alone, **or** must it be **sufficient to both hold the kilor in one’s fingers and apply it**. I.e. the extra ointment that sticks to the fingers after applying it.

And the Gemara concludes: The question **stands** unresolved.

It was taught in the Mishnah: one who carries out **honey** is liable if he carries out **enough to put on a sore**.

It was taught in a Baraita: one is liable if he carries out **enough to put on the head of a sore**.

Rav Ashi inquires: what is the intention of the Baraita? Does ‘**on a sore**’ mean on **the face of the entire sore**, since the entire sore can be described by using the word ‘head’?

Or perhaps **it means that it is enough to apply the honey** on the highest point of the sore?

And the word ‘head’ comes to exclude **the place** all around **the top of the sore**, which is not **included in the amount of honey one to be liable for carrying?**

And the Gemara concludes: The question **stands** unresolved.

PEREK 8 – 77B

Rav Yehudah said in the name of Rav: out of everything that the Holy One Blessed be He created in His world – He did not create one thing in vain.

He created the slug– for treating a sore.

He created the fly – for treating a hornet bite. The fly is crushed and applied to the sting.

He created **the mosquito – to heal a snake bite.**

And he created the snake – to treat a type of boil.

And he created the spider – to heal a scorpion sting. The spider is crushed and placed on the sting.

How is it done? I.e. how are slugs applied to a wound (according to the *Ritva*)?

He brings a black one and a white one and he cooks them, and he rubs the wound with it, i.e. with the preparation.

Our Rabbis taught in a Baraita: there are **five fears** in which **the fear of the weak is upon the strong** –

1. The **fear of the *mafzia*** - a small animal that has a powerful voice, its fear is **on the lion**. The lion is scared when it hears the voice of the *mafzia*, as it sounds like a large animal, and the lion flees.
2. **The fear of the mosquito –is on the elephant, when it enters its trunk.**
3. **The fear of the spider –is on the scorpion,** when it enters its nose.
4. **The fear of the *snunit* –is on the eagle,** when it enters under the eagle’s wings, and prevents it from spreading its wings.
5. **The fear of the *kilbit* – a small creature – its fear is on the *liviatan*,** the greatest of sea creatures, when it enters its nose.

And in all these cases, it is because of the small size of the animals that the big animals can not protect themselves.

Rav Yehudah said in the name of Rav: what is the verse that shows the idea that the weak can overpower the strong? It is written (Amos 5:9), “**He who causes the weak to triumph over the powerful**”, that the weak overpower the strong.

PEREK 8 – 77B

Rabbi Zeira found **i.e. met** Rav Yehudah when he was standing at the entrance to his father-in-law's house. He saw that he was in a relaxed mood, and **that** if he would ask him about anything in the world, he would answer him.

He said to him - Rabbi Zeira asked Rabbi Yehudah: **what is the reason that goats walk at the front** of the flock, **and sheep walk after them?**

Rav Yehudah **said to him**: it is **similar to the creation of the world**, where **first** it was **dark and after that** it was **light**. So too, the goats which are generally dark colored, walk before the sheep which are generally light colored.

He asked him further: **what is the reason** that **these** i.e. sheep have tails that **cover them**, **but these** i.e. goats are **uncovered** without a tail?

And he answered: **these** sheep, since **we cover ourselves** with clothing made of wool sheared **from them**, they are also covered. **But these** goats, **that we do not cover ourselves** from their shearings, are **uncovered**.

What is the reason a camel has a short tail?

Because it eats thorns. And therefore, its tail is short in order to avoid it being scratched by thorns.

What is the reason an ox has a long tail?

Because it lives in marshes, and needs to shake its tail **to chase away** the **mosquitoes**.

What is the reason the antennae of a locust (another explanation: an ant) **are soft?**

Because it lives among willows, and if its antennae **would be hard**, they would be **dislodged** when they bump into the willows, and they would break, and the locust would **be blinded**, since its sight is connected to its antennae.

As Shmuel said: if a person wants to blind a locust – remove its antennae, and it will go blind, since it cannot see without its antennae.

What is the reason that a rooster's lower eyelid rests upon its upper eyelid when it closes its eye, as opposed to other animals whose upper eyelids rests upon their lower ones?

Because **they dwell on** high places such as **boards** and beams when they go to sleep. **And if smoke rises** and goes into their eyes **they are blinded**.

Why is a door called a *dasha*? Because people say about it - **there is the way** – (*derech sham*) i.e. it is via a door that one reaches his destination.

PEREK 8 – 77B

Why is a ladder called a *darga*? Because it is a **way** that one gets **to the roof** (*derech gag*) (i.e. one reaches the roof via it.)

Why is a food dip called *matkolita*? Because people say concerning it, ‘**when will this be finished**’ (*matai tichleh dah*) i.e. when it is finished, what will we eat?

Another explanation: since it is only eaten a little at a time, it keeps for a long time and people say: when will it be finished?

Why is a house called a *beita*? Because one says regarding houses – **come and sit** – (*ba ve’aitiv*).

Why is a small, narrow house called a *bikta*? Because it is a **house that is small and narrow** (*bei ikta*).

Why is a grinder (Some explain - a measure used to measure wheat. Some explain - a piece of wood used for sitting on.), called a *kufita*? Because one says regarding such a utensil: ‘**turn it upside down and sit on it**’ (*kuf vetiv*).

Why are bricks called *livni*? Because brick buildings endure **for generations** (*livnei b’nei*).

Why is a weak fence made from thorns and palm branches called a *hutza*? Because it is a mere **partition** (*chatzitzah*).

Why is an earthenware jug called a *chatzvah*? Because it (*chotzev*) - **mines** - water from the river.

Why is a small earthenware vessel called a *kuzah*? Because one can say regarding such a utensil: a vessel so insignificant **as this** (*kazeh*) – would you not fill it with wine for me as a present?

Why is a myrtle branch called a *shtitah*? Because they dance with it in front of the bride and the dancer looks like a **fool** (*shtutah*).

Why is a large bowl that everyone uses for washing their hands and feet called a *mashichlah*? Because it **washes everyone** (*mashei kulah*).

Why is a large ornate bowl called a *mashchiltah*? Because it is specifically used by important people, such as a **bride**, to **wash** with. (*mashei kaltah*).

Why is a hand mortar called an *asitah*? Because it is hollow, and **missing** (*chasirtah*) the hollowed out part.

Why is a pestle called *buchnah*? Because it calls, “**come and I will hit it**” (*bo v’akenah*).

PEREK 8 – 77B

Why is an outer shirt called a *chaluk*? Because there is **no embarrassment** (*lo bushah*), as it covers all the undershirts that are torn.

Why is a cloak called a *gelimah*? Because **he becomes** to appear **like a shapeless form** (*kegelem*) without discernable limbs, as the cloak is so long and wide.

Why is a nice garment called a *gultah*? Because as **he sits** down, he **uncovers** himself (*gali ve'aitiv*), so that he does not sit on it and soil it and tear it.

Why is a bed called a *puriah*? Because people are **fruitful and multiply** (*parin veravin*) on it.

Why is a waterless pit call a *bor zinka*? Because **this pit is clean** i.e. empty (*bor zeh naki*) of water.

Why is a Rabbi's garment called a *sudra*? Because **the secrets of HaShem are revealed to those who fear Him** (*sod haShem lirai'av*).

Why is a king's reception room called an *apanda*? Because everyone comes through **this door** (*apitchah dein*), for either judgment or for serving the king.

The Rabbis taught in a Baraita: there are **three animals that become stronger as they age. And these are they: the fish, and the snake, and the pig.**

It was stated in the Mishnah: one who carries out **oil** is liable if he carries out **enough to anoint a small limb.**

They i.e. the scholars **of the academy of Rabbi Yannai said:** the minimum measurement of **oil** to be liable for carrying is **enough to anoint the small limb** – a joint of the little finger - **of a day-old infant.**

They challenged this from the following Baraita: one who carries out **oil** is liable if he carries out **enough to anoint a small limb and a day-old infant.**

And the Gemara asks: **is it** i.e. the Baraita **not** saying that: the minimum amount of oil required is enough to anoint **a small limb of an adult or a large limb of a day-old infant**? But someone who carries oil sufficient to anoint a small limb of a day-old infant is exempt for carrying it. And this poses a difficulty to Rabbi Yannai!

And the Gemara answers: **They** i.e. the scholars **of the academy of Rabbi Yannai would say to you:** this is **not** the correct interpretation of the Baraita.

PEREK 8 – 77B

Rather, **this is what it is saying**: if he carries out **oil**, he is liable only if he carries out **enough to anoint a small limb of a day-old infant**.

Shall we say that the definition of a small limb **is like** in the following dispute of **Tannaim?**: As it is taught in a Baraita: If he carries out **oil**, he is liable only if he carries out **enough to anoint a small limb, and a day-old infant**; these are **the words of Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar**.

Rabbi Natan says: enough to anoint a small limb.

Is it not this the issue **that they dispute?** For **Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar holds** the view that the amount of oil required is merely enough to anoint **a small limb of an infant**.

And Rabbi Natan holds the view that enough oil is required to anoint either **a small limb of an adult, or a large limb of an infant**. **But** oil to anoint **a small limb of a day-old infant** is **not** sufficient to be liable!