

p. 41

CHAPTER II.

RULES AND REGULATIONS CONCERNING PLACING OF CATTLE WITH HEATHENS, ACCEPTING CURE FROM THEM, AND CONCERNING THINGS WHICH MAY AND MAY NOT BE BOUGHT FROM THEM.

MISHNA I.: Cattle must not be placed in the inns of the heathens because they are suspicious of having sexual intercourse with them. 1 And for the same reason a female must not stay alone with them, because they are suspected of insult; nor should a male stay with them alone, because they are suspected of bloodshed.

GEMARA: There is a contradiction from the following: One may buy from them cattle for sacrificing without fear that it was instrumental in the committing of a crime or that it was separated as a sacrifice to an idol, or that it was itself worshipped. Now it is correct that there is no fear of its being separated or worshipped, for if such were the case, he would not sell it. But why should not be feared its said relation to a crime, and they not suspected? Said R. Ta'hlipha in the name of R. Shila b. Abina, quoting Rabh: With his own cattle, the heathen is not suspected, because of his economy that the cattle should not become uprooted. This, however, can apply only to female cattle; what can be said concerning male cattle? Said R. Kahana: Here, also, the same reason may apply, as the cattle become meagre from such employment. But why must one not place female cattle in the inns which are under the control of females? Said Mar Uqua b. Hama: Because the heathens are wont to visit the wives of their neighbors, and if such visitor happened not to find the hostess, he may substitute the cattle.

p. 42

[paragraph continues] And to the question of the schoolmen: How is the law with fowls? R. Jehudah in the name of Samuel, quoting R. Hannina, said: I have seen a heathen who bought a goose in the market, sexually intercoursed with it, chopped, roasted and consumed it, and R. Jeremiah of Diphte said that he had witnessed a similar affair by an Arabian.

Rabbina said: There is no contradiction between the Boraitha cited, which does not consider suspicion, and the Mishna which does, as the Mishna speaks of starting, which is forbidden and the Boraitha speaks of a case which was already done, where suspicion is no sufficient basis for forbidding. And whence do we know that such difference is considered? From a Mishna which states that a woman captured by a heathen because of a civil case is allowed to her husband, but not if captured because of a criminal case. We see, then, that although our Mishna forbids a woman to stay alone with a heathen, yet the act having taken place, she is allowed to return (hence there is a difference between starting an act and an act done). But perhaps the reason why she is allowed to her husband when captured because of a civil case, is that the heathen was afraid to touch her lest he lose his money? And such seems to be the case, as the second part states: If because of a criminal case, she is not allowed; and to this discussion nothing is to be

added. R. P'dath said: The difference between our Mishna and the Boraitha is to be explained thus: The former is in accordance with R. Eliezer of a Mishna (par. II. i), and the Boraitha is in accordance with the rabbis thereof, as according to the former, the red cow must not be bought from a heathen; and according to the latter, it may. And the reason is the above suspicion which, according to one, is considered, and according to the other, it is not. But perhaps there is another reason, as Shila explained. The reason of R. Eliezer is, in the following [Numb. xix. 2]: "Speak unto the *children of Israel* that they bring unto thee a completely red cow," which signifies that the children of Israel shall bring, but not other nations? This cannot scarcely be the reason, as the latter part states: "And so has Eliezer invalidated all the sacrifices which were bought from heathens," to which the above reason cannot apply, as concerning them such an expression is not used. But perhaps the rabbis differ with R. Eliezer concerning the red cow only because of its great value, which the heathens would not like to lose; but concerning other sacrifices, would they agree with R. Eliezer? Nay;

p. 43

in the first place there is a Boraitha: One may buy from them cattle for the purpose of sacrificing, which would be neither in accordance with the rabbis, nor with R. Eliezer; and secondly, it states there plainly: The rabbis have answered to R. Eliezer with [Is. lx. 7]: "All the flocks of Kedar . . . upon my altar." But is, indeed, "suspicion" the reason of R. Eliezer's statement; is there not a Boraitha: The sages then said to R. Eliezer: We know of a case that the red cow was bought from a heathen by the name of Dama or Remetz; and he answered: This is no evidence, as the Israelites had watched over it from the time it was created? R. Eliezer's reason was both--the expression concerning a red cow cited above, and also "suspicion."

R. Ami and R. Itz'hak of Naf'ha were sitting on the balcony at the latter's. One of them began with the last part cited above, "so has R. Eliezer invalidated all the sacrifices," etc., to which the other quoted that which his colleagues answered him, with the above-cited verse, "all the flocks of Kedar," etc., and R. Eliezer rejoined: This is no evidence either, as the nations about whom the cited verse reads will all become proselytes in the future. R. Joseph infers this from [Zeph. iii. 9]: "Yea, then will I change unto the people a pure language, that they may all call on the name of the Lord." And to the opposition of Abayi R. Joseph: Perhaps it means that they will repent from idolatry only? Abayi R. Joseph answered: The verse ends with: "To serve Him with one accord." So taught R. Papa. R. Zebid, however, reverses the order of Abayi R. Joseph, adding that both quoted the verse of Zeph.

It reads [I Sam. vi. 12]: "And the cows went straight forward," 1 etc. What does this expression mean? Said R. Johanan in the name of R. Mair: They sang a song. And R. Zuthra b. Tubiah, in the name of Rabh: They have straightened their faces to look upon the ark, and sang a song. What song was it? R. Johanan in the name of R. Mair [Ex. xv. 1]: "Then sang Moses," etc. And R. Johanan himself said [Is. xii. 4]: "And ye shall say on that day, Give thanks unto the Lord, call on his name," etc. And R. Simeon b. Lakish said [Psalm xcvi. 1, 2]: "Oh sing unto the Lord a new song; for he hath done wonderful things; his right hand and his holy arm have gotten him the victory. (2) The Lord hath made known his salvation, before the eyes of the nations hath he revealed his

p. 40

[paragraph continues] Righteousness." And R. Elazar said [ibid. xcix. 1]: "The Lord reigneth," etc.

And R. Samuel b. Na'hmani [ibid. xciii. 1]; and R. Itzchak of Naf'ha said: They sang: Sing, sing, thou ark, arise in this great journey thou that art decorated with golden embroidery which is placed in the great palace, adorned with the best ornaments. R. Ashi taught the saying of R. Itz'hak to [Numb. x. 35]: "And it came to pass, when the ark set forward that Moses said," etc. And what did Israel say? The above that R. Itz'hak said: It reads [Jos. x. 13]: "And the sun stood still . . . written in the book of Yashar." What is the book of Yashar? Said R. Hyya b. Aba in the name of R. Johanan: The book in which the birth of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, who are named Josharim (the upright) is meant, as it reads [Numb. xxiii. 10]: "May my soul die the death of the righteous." And where is the hint to be found there [Gen. xlviii. 19]: "And his seed shall become a multitude of nations." This occurred when Jehoshua "stopped the sun." [Jos. x. 13]: "And the sun stood still in the midst of the heavens, and hastened not to go down about a whole day." How many hours? Said R. Jehoshua b. Levi: Twenty-four; it was running six and stopped six, running six, and stopped six, four times; R. Elazar said: Thirty-six, it ran six and stopped twelve, etc. Samuel b. Na'hmani said: Forty-eight, it ran six and stopped twelve; ran six and stopped twenty-four. According to others, the above differ in the additional hours of that day. There is a Boraitha: As the sun stopped for Joshua, so did it stop for Moses, etc. (See Taanith, p. 52. The rabbis taught the whole paragraph.) An objection was raised from [ibid., ibid. 14]: "And there was no day like that before it or after it"? If you wish, in the time of Moses it stopped for fewer hours, or if you wish, it may be said that in Moses' time there were no hailstones mentioned [ibid., ibid. ii].

It reads [II Sam. i. 18]: "The bow, behold it is written in the book of Yashar." (What does Yashar mean? Said R. 'Hyie b. Aba in the name of R. Johanan: "Genesis" as said above.) And where the allusion? [Gen. xlix. 8]: "Thy hand shall be on the neck of thy enemies." Which is the weapon that needs the hand against the neck? It is the bow. R. Eliezer, however, maintains that the book of Yashar means Deuteronomy. And why is it named Yashar? Because there is written [vi. 18]: "And thou shalt do that which is right (Yashar) and good in the eyes of the Lord." And where is the

p. 45

allusion? [Xxxiii. 7]: "Let the power of his hands." And which is the weapon to which both hands are needed? The bow. R. Samuel b. Na'hmani said: It is the book of Judges in which [xvii. 6]: "Every man did what seemed right (Yashar) in his eyes. And where is the allusion? [iii. 2]: "To teach them war." And to which weapon, teaching is needed? The bow.

"A woman must not stay alone," etc. Let us see how is the case? If it means she must not stay alone with one heathen, is this, then, allowed with an Israelite? Is there not a Mishna: One must not stay alone even with two women? And if it means she should not stay with even three of them, is there a similar case allowed with three licentious Israelites? Is there not a Mishna: A woman may stay with two persons? And Jehuda, in the name of Samuel said: Provided they are righteous men, but, if they were licentious, even if they would be ten, she must not, as it once happened that a woman was alone with ten and was insulted. It means even when his wife is with him. As to Israelite's, his wife guards him, which is not the case with a heathen. But why not say that because they are suspected of bloodshed? Said R. Jeremiah: It speaks of a respectable woman whom they feared to kill. R. Idi, however, maintains that there is no fear of bloodshed, even with any woman, for usually her weapons are upon her (they insult, but do not kill). And what is the difference between the two reasons? If the woman was respected by the government, but not among her colleagues, then, according to R. Jeremiah, there is no fear for

bloodshed, but of insult, and according to R. Idi the same is the case with any woman. And there is a Boraitha in accordance with R. Idi--viz.: A woman, although her weapon is usually with her, must nevertheless not stay alone with heathens, because they are suspected of insult.

"*A male must not stay alone,*" etc. The rabbis taught: If an Israelite while on the road, happened to be accompanied by a heathen, he should so manage that the heathen should be on his right hand. Ismael b. R. Johanan b. Broka, however, said: If the heathen was provided with a sword, the Israelite shall manage that he shall be on his right side, and if with a cane, on his left side (so that it shall be easier for the Israelite to protect himself). If they have to ascend or to descend, the Israelite must not be on the bottom and the heathen on the top, but the contrary. Nor shall the Israelite bend himself in the heathen's

p. 46

presence, for fear the heathen may break his skull. If the heathen question him to what place he goes, he shall make the distance longer as did Jacob our father to Esau the wicked [Gen. xxxiii. 14]: "Until I come unto my Lord to Se'ir." And (17) reads: "And Jacob journeyed to Succoth" (which was much nearer than Se'ir). It happened to the disciples of R. Aqiba while on the road, to meet robbers, who questioned them, Where are you going? And they answered, To Akhau. However, when they reached the City of Khzib they separated. The robbers then questioned them, Whose disciples are you? And they answered, Of R. Akiba. To which the robbers rejoined, Well is to Akiba with his disciples, who are careful not to be afflicted by bad men. R. Mnashi was on the road to the City of Thurtha and he met thieves, who asked him where he was going, and he said, To Pumbadithe. When they reached Thurtha he separated from them. Said they, You must be a disciple of Jehuda the deceiver. To which he rejoined, Do you know him (R. Jehuda) and dare to call him deceiver? I put you under ban. The thieves then engaged in thievery for thirty-two years, but did not succeed, so that they were afterward compelled to come to R. Mnashi asking for a release. One of them, who was a weaver, did not care to come to ask for a release, and was finally devoured by a lion. Come and see the difference between the thieves of Babylon and the robbers of Palestine (the latter had praised the disciples who separated from them, and the former scolded him).

MISHNA II.: A daughter of an Israelite must not confine a heathen, because she confines a person to idolatry; however, a heathen may confine an Israelite. The same is the case with nursing, an Israelite must not nurse the child of a heathen, while the latter, being under the control of the former, may do so.

GEMARA: The rabbis taught: One must not confine a heathen because she brought up a person to idolatry, nor must a heathen confine an Israelite, because they are suspected of bloodshed; so R. Mair. The sages, however, say: The latter may, in the presence of others, but not when she is alone in the confinement. R. Mair, however, does not allow this because she may put her hand on the skull of the child and kill it, while the others standing by would not notice it. As it happened, a heathen woman who reproached her colleague of being a Jew--confiner--daughter of a Jew confiner, and she answered: Is it

p. 47

not sufficient the injury I have done to the Jews by decreasing them, killing their children at the birth, and I shed their blood like water. The rabbis, however, maintained that this counts for

nothing, as she boasted only.

"*An Israelite must not nurse,*" etc. The rabbis taught: One must not nurse a child of a heathen, because she brings up a person to idolatry, neither must a heathen woman nurse a Jewish child, because she is suspected of bloodshed; so R. Mair. The sages, however, say the latter might do so in the presence of others, but not when she is alone with the child. R. Mair, however, maintains that even in the presence of others she may smear the breasts with poison and kill the child, while the others present will not notice it. A contradiction was raised from the following: A Jewess may confine a heathen for the reward but not gratuitously? Said R. Joseph: For reward it is permissible, in order to avoid animosities. The rabbis taught: An Israelite may circumcise the child of a heathen for the purpose of proselytism, but not for the purpose of curing, and a heathen must not do so to an Israelite because he is suspected of bloodshed. The sages, however, maintain that the latter may do so in the presence of Israelites, but not when he is alone with the child. Does indeed R. Mair hold that a heathen must not circumcise an Israelite? Is there not a Boraitha: A city in which there is no Jewish physician but a Samaritan and a heathen, the heathen shall circumcise and not the Samaritan; so R. Mair. R. Jehuda, however, maintains the converse, that the Samaritan should have the preference? Reverse the names in the cited Boraitha; but how can you say that Jehuda permits a heathen to do the circumcision? Is there not a Boraitha: R. Jehuda said: Whence do we know that a circumcision which was performed by a heathen is invalid? From [Gen. xvii. 9]: "But thou, for thy part, shalt keep my covenant" (which means thou and not a heathen). Therefore, the names in the above-cited Boraitha are correctly placed and must not be reversed, as it speaks of an established physician, who would not spoil his reputation by doing harm to an Israelite, as R. Dimi, when he came from Palestine, said in the name of R. Johanan: That an established heathen physician may be trusted to do everything for an Israelite. But how can you say that R. Jehuda permits a Samaritan to circumcise an Israelite? Is there not a Boraitha: An Israelite may circumcise a heathen, but a Samaritan must not do so to an Israelite, because he is doing this in the name of his idol

p. 48

in the Mount Gerism. And R. Jose said to him: Where do we find that circumcision must be done in the name of Heaven, etc. (hence, we see that R. Jehuda does not permit a Samaritan). Therefore we must say that the names of the Boraitha in question are to be reversed, and the contradiction from one statement of R. Jehuda, to the other presents no difficulty, as R. Jehuda, of the contradictory Boraitha means R. Jehuda, the prince, whom we heard stating elsewhere just the same as the Boraitha teaches.

It was taught: Whence do we know that a circumcision made by a heathen is invalid? Daru b. Papa in the name of Rabh said: From the above-cited verse [Gen. xvii. 9], and R. Johanan maintains from [ibid., ibid. 13]. And what is the difference between them? If a woman is commanded to circumcise her child, according to Rabh she is not, and according to R. Johanan she is. But is there one who holds that a woman is not commanded to circumcise, does it not read [Ex. iv., 25]: "Then took Zipporah a sharp instrument," etc.? Well, she has done this through a messenger; or, if you wish, it may be said that she began and Moses himself finished.

MISHNA III.: One may employ their (the heathens') services for curing his personal property, but not for curing the body. However, cutting hair by them is prohibited at any place; so R. Mair. The sages, however, maintain: One may do so in a public place, but not when he is alone with him.

GEMARA: What do personal property and body mean? The former is, *e.g.*, his cattle, and body means human being. And this is what R. Jehudah said: No imperfection, not even so much as the mark of bleeding, must be taken from them. Said R. Hisda in the name of Mar Uqba: If, however, the heathen said to him that such and such a medicine is good, and such and such is bad, he may use his advice, since the heathen thinks: as he asks me, so will he ask some other one, and should I give him wrong advice, I would be ridiculed. Rabba, according to others, R. Hisda, in the name of R. Johanan said: If there is a doubt as to whether the sick will recover or die, the heathen must not be taken for curing, but if it is certain that he will die, it is allowed. But why let it be feared, perhaps he will foster his death? This is not to be taken in consideration. And whence do we know that so it is? From [II Kings, vii. 9]: "If we say, We will enter into the city, then is the famine in the city, and we will die"; and they did not take into consideration

p. 49

that should they fall in the hands of the enemy, they would be killed immediately. An objection was raised from the following: One must not interfere with the Minim and must not cure himself by them, even to delay death for but a few hours.

As it happened to ben Dama, the son of Ismael's sister, to be bitten by a snake, Jacob, of the village of Skhania, came to heal him with the name of Jesus, but R. Ismael did not allow. The patient, however, said to him: Ismael, my brother, let him cure me and I will bring you evidence from the Scripture that such is allowed. But ere he finished his soul departed, and R. Ismael exclaimed: Well is to thee, ben Dama, that thy body was pure and thy soul left thee in purity, and thou hast not transgressed the decision of thy colleagues, who say [Eccles. vii]: "Him who breaketh down a fence--a serpent will bite him." With Minismus it is different, as it is attractive and "he may be induced to follow them." But what has ben Dama to say? [Lev. xviii, 5]: "And he shall live with them," but not he shall die with them. R. Ismael, however, maintains that such is allowed only privately, but not in public; as we have learned in the following Boraitha: R. Ismael used to say: Whence do we know that if one is told to worship idols, under the threat of being killed, that he may worship and not be killed? From the above-cited verse--"he shall live," etc. But lest one say that this may be done publicly also, therefore it is written [ibid. xxii. 32]: "And ye shall not profane my holy name." Rabba b. b. Hanna in the name of R. Johanan said: A wound inside the body must not be cured by them. R. Johanan, however, when he suffered from scurvy, went to a matron of Rome for a cure (see Tract Yomah, p. 128, par. "R. Mathiah b. Hershah," the whole story, 229, par. "Whatsoever"). But how did R. Johanan do so? Was it not said that an infliction which is inside the body must not be cured, etc? With a well-known man, like R. Johanan, it is different, as they will fear to barm him. But was not R. Abuhu a well-known man, and Jacob the Minn prepared a medicine for him to place on his shoulder, and if not for R. Ami and R. Assi, who burnt (cauterized) his shoulder to get the poison out, he would have died? Yet with R. Johanan it is different, as he himself was an established physician. But was not R. Abuhu also the same? As the latter was very much respected by the government, and was badly annoying the Minim by his frequent discussions, he (Jacob the Min) made up his

p. 50

mind to do with him what Samson did [Judges, xvi. 30]: "Let me die with the Philistines."

Samuel said: An open wound (sabre cut) is dangerous, and one may violate the Sabbath for the

purpose of curing it. The remedy to stop the blood is, cress-dishes mixed with vinegar, of which the patient shall partake. R. Saphra said: An enabta (carbuncle?) is a forerunner of the angel of death. How is it cured? Put upon it a rue (plant) with honey, or radishes with strong wine. While these remedies are being prepared, put meanwhile on the sore a white or red grape according as the sore is white or red. Rabba said: A tumor is a sure symptom of inflammation. And what is the remedy against the tumor? Hit upon it with the fingers sixty times, then open it crosswise. If, however, the tumor has a white spot on the top, all this is not necessary, as it is not dangerous then.

R. Jacob suffered from pain in the abdomen, and R. Ami, according to others R. Assi, advised him to take seven red grains usually found in the wash-houses, to put them in the linen collar of an old shirt, which he should bind with a cord made of the hair of a cattle; then he should immerse it in white pitch and burn it, the ashes thereof he should apply to the sore place and relief will ensue. While the preparation of this is going on, he may meanwhile apply the kernels of blackberries. This remedy, however, is effective only in case of external pains; for internal abdominal pains grease the sore place with the molten fat of a goat that has not yet born any offspring, or burn three pumpkin leaves dried in the shade and apply the ashes; also almond-worms or olive-oil and wax may be applied, in summer on linen, in winter on cotton.

R. Abuhu suffered once from an ear-ache, and R. Johanan advised him, according to others he was told in the college, what R. Abayi, too, heard later from his mother, that the loins have been created only for curing ear-ache. In like manner said Rabba: I was told by the physician, Miniumi, that all fluids are injurious to the ear, except the *water from the loins*. Thus, take the kidney of a woolless sheep, cut it crosswise, place it on burning coals and collect the water that begins then to flow from it. This water, when it is neither too cold nor too warm, syringe into the ears. Or one may rub in the ears with the molten fat of a big chafer. The following is another good remedy for ear-ache: Fill the sick ear with olive-oil, then make of wheat-straw seven wicks, and with the hairs of a cattle attach

p. 51

to them the peel of garlic; kindle these wicks and put them into the olive-oil in the ear, taking, of course, precautions against burning the patient; when one wick has been thus burnt to the end, take the next one, etc., until the pains cease. However, seven ordinary wicks would also do, if dipped in hayseed-oil (?); but in this case one must be heedful of the wind. Here is yet another remedy: Put into the ear dyed unbeaten cotton and, taking heed of the wind, keep the ear over the fire. Also this remedy is recommendable: Take a rush that was cut down one hundred years ago, fill it with mineral salt, burn all this and strew the ashes in the ears. It must also be noted that for secreting ears the remedies must be dry, while for aching ears that do not secrete, moist remedies must be used.

Rabha b. Zutra said in the name of R. Hanina: It is allowed to straighten the ears on Sabbath. Observed R. Samuel b. Jehudah: Provided it is done with the hand and not with medicine. According to others the converse is allowed, *i.e.*, to straighten the ears on Sabbath by means of medicine and not by the hands, for it is to be feared that with the hand one may make a wound.

R. Zutra b. Tubia said in the name of Rabh: He who is in danger of losing an eye is allowed to accept cure on Sabbath. This, however, was understood to be allowed only when the medicine was prepared *before* Sabbath; but to prepare it on Sabbath and carry it through the public

grounds is not allowed. Hereupon said one of the rabbis, named R. Jacob: I have heard it from R. Jehudah that it is allowed under the said circumstances to prepare the medicine on Sabbath and carry it through the public streets. R. Jehudah allowed to cure eye-diseases on Sabbath. Thereupon said R. Samuel b. Jehudah: Who will listen to this R. Jehudah who thus profanes the Sabbath? But it happened that he himself got sore eyes, and he sent to consult the same (R. Jehudah) as to whether or no it is allowed (to cure them on Sabbath)? And the answer came back: Everybody is allowed, but not you (who were so indignant at my decision); was it, you think, my own opinion? Nay; it was the master, Samuel, whose servant got an inflamed eye on Sabbath; she cried the whole day and none paid attention to her, and on the morrow her eye jumped out of its orbit; then said the master, Samuel, in his sermon: It is allowed to cure on Sabbath eye-diseases if there be danger of losing one's eye; and why? Because the optic nerves are dependent on the heart.

p. 52

What kind of eye-diseases is allowed to cure on Sabbath? Said R. Jehudah: A secreting eye, a wounded eye, an eye covered with blood, and an inflamed eye. In the beginning of the sickness as well as during its becoming better, it is not allowed to apply medicine on Sabbath; nor is it allowed to use on Sabbath such medicine as would tend to sharpen the eye-sight.

R. Jehudah said: The sting of a wasp, the pricking of thorns, if the wounds caused by either are swelling, likewise an eye-disease complicated with fever, are all dangerous. The high temperature in these cases must, therefore, be reduced by the application of radishes, while low temperature is banished by that of sea-radishes; to apply the one for the other entails danger. The sting of a lizard must be cured with warm medicines, while that of a hornet with cold ones; to reverse the medicines, the one for the other, also here entails danger. Likewise are recommendable warm medicines for the pricks of thorns, and cold ones for the chapped skin; to reverse is dangerous.

He who had his blood let should not eat almonds, nor sit near the fire. He who has diseased eyes should not have his blood let, for it is in this condition dangerous. After eating fish one should wait two days before having his blood let; and after bleeding one should not eat fish for two days. Fish on the third day after bleeding is harmful.

The rabbis taught: After bleeding one should not eat milk, cheese, onions, almonds; but if one has carelessly eaten some of these, he should, according to Abaye, drink a little wine mixed with vinegar. But in this case, one must go outside of the city for his natural exigencies, and notably toward the east, in order that the ill odor might not reach the city (being carried off by the east wind).

R. Jehoshua b. Levi said: It is allowed to cure on Sabbath the *onkly*. What is *onkly*? Said R. Aba: It is the *stomachus* of the heart (or the fleshy valve of the heart, called *nibla*). And how is this disease cured? By an ointment prepared of cumin, soap, mint (fern), wormwood, cedar-blossom and hyssop. All these are to be dissolved in wine, and is good for the heart; your sign is [Psalm, civ. 15]: "*Wine* gladdens the human heart." Against flatulence (*mach*) use the same, but dissolved in water; your sign is [Gen. i. 3]: "And the wind (*mach*) of the Lord flits over the water." Against pains in the uterus (*kuda*) use the same dissolved in beer, and your sign is [ibid. xxiv. 15]: She had her pitcher (*kuadah*) on her shoulder."

R. Aha b, Rabba prepared of the above herbs a powder of which he dissolved about a handful and drank it. R. Asha used to prepare a powder of each of these herbs and drink a dose from each. Said R. Papa: I had tried all this but without avail, until an Arabian merchant advised me to fill a new pitcher with water, put therein a spoonful of honey, leave, then, all this in the open air over night and drink it next morning; I have done so, and it really helped me.

The sages taught: Six things are good for all diseases, and they are as follows: green colewort, sea-radishes, the water from dry *sisin* (a Syrian plant), the stomach, the uterus (of cattle), and the raw meat of a cow. Other sages add yet small fishes, which possess besides medicinal yet the property of making one fecund and robust. Furthermore, ten things there are that are detrimental to the sick--viz.: meat of an ox, fat, roasted meat, poultry, roasted eggs, almonds, a hair-cut, a bath, cheese, and liver. Others add yet nuts and gourds.

The disciples of R. Ismael taught: Why are gourds called *keshuin* (heavy)? Because they are as harmful and heavy to the human body as daggers.

"*And cutting hair.*" The Rabbis taught: An Israelite who cuts his hair by a heathen, may look in the looking-glass (so that the heathen shall be afraid to kill him). An Israelite who cuts the hair of a heathen, when reaching the surrounding of his hair, which is usually for the purpose of worshipping the idol, may drop his work. The master said: An Israelite who cuts his hair by a heathen shall look in the looking-glass. Let us see how is the case: If it was in public then to what purpose is the looking-glass, and if privately, what can the looking-glass help (if the heathen would like to kill him suddenly)? It means privately; but as soon as he has a looking-glass in his work-shop, it seems to be a respectable place, so that there is no fear of killing. R. 'Hana b. Bizna used to cut his hair by a heathen, in the by-streets of N'hardea. At one time he said to him, 'Hana, 'Hana, thou hast a fine neck for the shears. Said he: I may take this as a punishment for not following R. Mair's decision. (Says the Gemara): Did he then follow the decision of the rabbis? The rabbis also permitted in public only, but not privately. He thought that the sideways of Nahardea are considered public, as many people pass there.

MISHNA IV.: The following things of the heathens are prohibited, and the prohibition extends even to the deriving of

any benefit therefrom--viz.: wine, vinegar, and pieces of wine extract, and skins in which there are holes opposite the heart. R. Simeon b. Gamaliel adds: Provided the hole is made round, but not if lengthwise. Meat which is entered for the idol is not prohibited, but which comes out of it is prohibited, as it is equivalent to the offerings of the dead. Such is the decree of R. Aqiba. With pilgrims while going for worship one must not interfere, but with those who are coming from, one may.

The bags of the heathens, the pitchers which contain wine of an Israelite, are forbidden to derive any benefit from them. So R. Mair. The sages, however, maintain: They are forbidden, but not to derive benefit. The pressed grapes of which wine was made as well as their kernels are prohibited for any benefit. So R. Mair. The sages, however, forbid only the wet ones, but not the

dry ones. Fish-oil and cheese of the village Aunyiki made by the heathens are, according to R. Mair, prohibited for any benefit, and according to the sages the using is prohibited, but not the benefit. Said R. Jehudah: R. Ismael questioned R. Jehoshua while they were on the road: Why have the sages prohibited the cheese of the heathens, and he answered: Because they use the rennet of a carcass to curdle milk. Said he to him: The rennet of a burnt-offering is more rigorous than of a carcass, and nevertheless a priest, who is not so particular, consumes it while raw. This, however, the sages did not admit, but even they allow no benefit therefrom, although its use, when made, is no transgression. Answered R. Jehoshua: The prohibition was because they curdle their milk with the rennet of the calves, which was sacrificed to the idol. Thereupon rejoined R. Ismael: If such is the case, why was not prohibited all benefit thereof? R. Jehoshua, however, was not prepared to answer him this question, and called his attention to another thing: Ismael, my brother, how do you read ([Solomon's song, 1, 2]) Thy caresses? And he answered: I read thy as masculine. To which Jehoshua answered: It is not so, as further on (3) it reads feminine, and this is evidence that also verse 2d uses thy in the feminine.

GEMARA: Whence is it deduced that wine is prohibited? Said Rabba b. Abuhu from [Deut. xxxii. 38]: "They that ate the fat of their sacrifices, and drank the wine of their drink-offerings," *i.e.*, as from a sacrifice no benefit must be derived, the same is the case with wine. And whence do we know that such is the case with a sacrifice itself? From [Psalm cvi. 28]:

p. 55

[paragraph continues] "And they joined themselves unto Ba'-al-pe'or, and ate the sacrifice of the dead," hence, as from a dead one no benefit must be derived, so is it with a sacrifice. But whence does it follow that no benefit is to be derived from a dead? From the analogy of expression "there," which is to be found in [Numb. xx. 1]: "And Miriam died there," and in [Deut. xxi. 4]: "And shall break there," hence, as from the latter no benefit must be derived, the same is the case with a dead. But whence do we know that so is the case with the heifer? Said the disciples of R. Janai, in verse 8 of that passage it is mentioned: "Atone for thy people," etc., and from the sacrifices which atone, it is known no benefit must be derived.

"Wine-vinegar," etc. Is this not self-evident, that because the wine becomes sour the prohibition no longer holds? Said R. Ashi: It comes to teach that if there was sour vinegar in the hands of the heathens, there is no necessity to seal it with two seals, one on the top of the other as it is necessary for wine; and the reason is that the heathens do not offer vinegar to the idols, nor is the fear, perhaps they will change it, to be taken into consideration, as it is to be supposed that the heathen will not trouble himself to break the seal for this purpose. Said R. Ilai: We have learned elsewhere that cooked wine of the heathens is prohibited, and to the objection that this is self-evident, as the prohibition is not annulled by cooking, R. Ashi said: It means to teach us that our cooked wine seals with one seal, and in the possession of a heathen is valid for the reason stated above.

The rabbis taught: Cooked wine and *aluntith* (oil wine) of the heathens are prohibited; however, an *aluntith* of an Israelite when in the possession of a heathen is allowed. As we have learned concerning Sabbath the difference between oil-wine and honey wine (see Sabbath, p. 316, par. "One may make honey wine"). Rabba and R. Joseph both said: Wine mixed with water is not affected when it remains uncovered overnight, and to cooked wine, the prohibition of offering-wine does not apply.

The schoolman propounded a question: How is it with cooked wine? Does the uncovering affect it or not? Come and hear: Jacob b. Ibi has testified that the case of uncovering does not apply to cooked wine.

R. Janai b. Ismael once took sick and R. Ismael b. Zirud and the rabbis came to make him a sick-call, and while sitting there they questioned if the case of uncovering applies to cooked wine. Said Ismael b. Zirud to them: Resh Lakish said in the

p. 56

name of a great man, who is R. Hyye, that to such the case of uncovering does not apply. And to their question as to the validity of this Halakha, R. Janai b. Ismael made a gesture with his hand as if saying, "upon me and my neck."

Samuel and Ablat were sitting together, and cooked wine was brought for them. The latter, who was a heathen, removed his hand in order not to touch the wine and make it invalid. Said Samuel to him: It was already said that concerning cooked wine no fear of offering is to be entertained.

The servant of R. Hyye had uncovered cooked wine and she came to ask her master, to which he answered, it was decided: to cooked wine no uncovering applies. The servant of Ada b. A'habah had uncovered the mixture of wine and came to ask his master if it is valid, to which he answered: It is decided that the case of uncovering does not apply to mixed wine. Said R. Papa to him: Provided the wine is mixed with much water, but if not, the snake drinks of it, hence such is affected by uncovering. Is that so? It happened with Rabba b. R. Huna, who was on a boat and had wine with him. Once, perceiving a snake coming to partake of it, he said to his servant: Blind the eye of this by making the wine unfit. And he took a little water and put it in the wine; the snake then turned back. The answer is that for raw wine the snake usually risks his life to get it, which he does not do for mixed wine.

But was it not told of R. Janai or Bar Hedia who, while in the City of Akhburi, saw the people there drink mixed wine, the remainder of which they put in a pitcher, covered it with cloth, and put it aside; then they saw a snake putting water into the pitcher until it became full, and then drinking the wine which was coming up to the top of the water (hence you see that a snake drinks out of mixed). The explanation is that it may drink from that which is mixed by itself, but not from that which is mixed by some one else. Said R. Ashi, according to others, Mesharshia: Should one rely upon suppositions in a case which is dangerous? (Therefore there is no difference between mixed and raw wine; neither must be used if it was uncovered, for fear that a snake drank from it.) Said Rabba: The Halakha prevails thus: to mixed wine both uncovering and offering apply, while to cooked wine neither applies.

The servant of R. 'Helkiha b. Tubi had uncovered a *kista* of water and fell asleep nearby; when he came to ask his master if

p. 57

this water may be used, he answered: The snakes are said to fear a sleeping man, provided it is in the day-time, but not at night. (Said the Gemara): In reality it is not so. The supposition that a

snake fears a sleeping man is not substantiated, and the time makes no difference, whether day or night. Rabh vowed not to drink water at the house of Gentiles, saying: They are not careful to cover the water, but in the house of a widow he drank, saying that although she does not know the Halakha of uncovering, she nevertheless uses it, because she did so while her husband was alive. Samuel, however, used to do the contrary. At a widow's house he would not drink, saying that, as she is without her husband, she usually does not care to cover; while the Gentiles, although not particular in covering, are at least particular in cleanliness, and they cover the water that nothing should fall in and spoil it. According to others Samuel did not drink even from the last. R. Jehoshua b. Levy said: There are three kinds of wine to which the case of uncovering does not apply--viz.: (a) wine that is both sweet and bitter; (b) that is so strong that it breaks each leather bag, and (c) wine that will become sweet when warmed in the sun. Rabha said: To wine which begins to become sour the first three days, both cases of uncovering and offering apply, but if after three days, neither case applies. The sages of Nahardea said that even in the latter case uncovering applies, as it happens sometimes that a snake drinks such.

The rabbis taught: To fermenting wine no uncovering applies; and for how many days is it considered fermented? For three days. Nor does it apply to cress-dish (chopped cress mixed with wine or oil). However, the men of exile consider uncovering also here, provided in the mixture vinegar was not used. To Babylonian Khutha'h it does not apply; however, the men of exile do apply it.

Said R. Menashi: If there are traces of snake bites in it, it must not be used. Hyah b. Ashi in the name of Samuel said: To dripping water uncovering does not apply. Added R. Ashi: Provided the dripping is constant. Samuel said: To the opening of a fig when it is torn off, uncovering does not apply, and this is in accordance with R. Eliezer in the following Boraitha, who says: One may eat grapes and figs at night without fear, as it reads [Psalm cxvi. 6]: "The Lord preserveth the simple." R. Saffra said in the name of R. Jehoshua of Rome: There are three kinds of poison coming from the mouth of the snake:

p. 58

that of a young one sinks, of a middle-aged, remains in the middle, and of an old one, floats on the top. Shall we assume that the snake becomes weaker as it grows older, in spite of this Boraitha: There are three who become stronger as they grow older--viz: a fish, a snake, and a pig? Yea, their strength is stronger, but the poison is weaker. But to what purpose is the teaching that "from a young one it sinks," etc.? To that we have learned in the following Boraitha: From a barrel which became uncovered, although nine persons drank from it and remained alive, the tenth person must not drink, as it once happened that nine men drank from such and did not die, the tenth, however, drank and died; and R. Jeremiah said: That was because the poison sank and was at the bottom. The same is the case with a melon, which became uncovered; one must not partake of it even if nine persons before him partook of it and were not harmed, as it once happened that nine were not harmed and the tenth, who partook of it, died.

The rabbis taught: One must not pour water which has been uncovered in the public streets, and must not water cattle with it. The rabbis taught: One must not pour uncovered water into public grounds, nor wetten therewith one's own house, nor knead clay, or water one's own or the neighbor's cattle therewith, nor wash his face, hands, or feet therewith. But, have we not learned in another Boraitha that he may water his *own* cattle with it? This means but his cat, as the poison of a snake does not harm a cat, which devours a snake. But if so, why not water with it

the cat of his neighbor? Because it becomes meagre, and his neighbor might want to sell it at that time. His own, however, he may, because in time it recovers and becomes fat again.

R. Assi in the name of R. Johanan, quoting R. Jehudah b. Bathyra, said: There are three kinds of wine which are prohibited:

From that which was sacrificed to the idol, one must derive no benefit, and its size of an olive defiles a rigorous defilement him who touches it. Wine of the heathen in general (about which it is not certain that it was sacrificed) is also forbidden to derive any benefit, and the size of a quarter of a "lug" defiles just as other beverages which do not defile men and vessels by touching. But from the wine which was deposited with a heathen by an Israelite benefit may be derived, but to drink it is forbidden. But is there not a Mishna: Fruit deposited with a heathen are considered as the heathen's, concerning tithe on

p. 59

the Sabbatical year? It speaks of the case when the heathen has separated a corner for the wine deposited. But if so, why is it forbidden to drink? We are aware of the following: R. Johanan happened to be in the city Prud (the place where Bar Kapahara was residing), and he asked: Is someone aware of the teaching of Bar Kapahara which would be new to me? And R. Tau'hum of the same city taught before him: If one has deposited his wine with a heathen, he may drink it. To which R. Johanan applied [Eccles. xi. 3]: "On the place where the tree falleth, it will remain," *i.e.*, although the sage is dead, his fruit (teaching) remains. Hence we see that even to drink the wine is allowed? Said R. Zera: This presents no difficulty. R. Johanan is in accordance with R. Eliezer, who permits the drinking also (Sabbath, p. 263), while the Boraita is in accordance with the sages who do not. R. Hiya b. R. Hiya b. Na'hmani in the name of R. Hisda, quoting Rabh, or quoting Zebra, according to others R. Hisda, said: Abba b. Hama told me that Zehri said: The Halakha prevails with R. Elezer. R. Elazar said: Everything which is deposited with a heathen is preserved if it was sealed with two seals, except wine, which is not considered preserved even with two seals. R. Johanan, however, maintains that two seals preserve wine, too. Both, however, are in accordance with the rabbis. One holds that the rabbis differ with R. Elezer in case it only had one seal, and the other holds they differ with him, even regarding two seals. What is meant by a seal within a seal? Said Rabha: If the cork in the opening of a barrel was besmeared with clay and sealed, it is considered a seal within a seal, but not if there was only one of the two.

If there was a basket over the barrel attached to it, it is considered a seal within a seal, but not otherwise.

If one leather bag full of wine was placed in another, mouth downward, it is considered two seals, but not, if mouth upward. However, if the opening was placed inside, and the outer bag was tied and sealed, it is considered a seal within a seal.

It was taught: Why did the sages forbid date-beer of the heathens? Rami b. Hama in the name of R. Itz'hak said: As a safeguard against intermarriage. R. Na'hman, however, said: Because of uncovering. Uncovering what? If the barrel, we, too, do uncover, and if during the process of brewing, we also do the same. It speaks of those places where they used to clear the water before using it for the beer, and at that time they

usually uncovered it. But if so, let, then, old beer be permitted, as there is no fear of poisoning (which would not have let it become old)? The *old* is forbidden as a safeguard, lest one use the *new*.

R. Papa used to stand outside of the store of the heathen and drink his beer; R. Abayi drank it when it was brought to his house, but not elsewhere; and the reason of both was the safeguard against intermarriage. The latter, however, was more particular, and did not wish to at all interfere with the heathens. Samuel b. Bisna happened to be in the City of Marguan (the Israelites of which were suspected of drinking wine of the heathens), and he drank neither wine nor beer, which was brought to him. It is correct that he did not drink wine, because of the suspicion that it was sacrificed, but why not beer? As a safeguard to wine.

Said Rabh: The beer in question is permissible to everyone, but Hyia, my son, must not drink of it, because he is sick, and it may harm him. Said Samuel: All the reptiles have poison, but their poison does not kill, that of a snake excepted.

The same said to Hyia b. Rabh: Come and I will tell you the good things which were said by your father. The sick heathens who become swollen, and whom uncovered water does not harm, surely ate reptiles, so that their bodies contain poison, which prevents the harming effects of the snake poison. R. Joseph said: The beer-vinegar is forbidden, because they mix into it the dregs of wine which was sacrificed. Said R. Ashi: If it was brought from the storehouse, it is permissible, for if it were mixed with dregs it would be spoiled. (See appendix.)

"*The sages did not admit.*" There is a contradiction from the following: The wine which was placed in the bags of goatskins by the heathens must not be consumed, but one may derive benefit from it. R. Simeon b. Guda, however, testified before the son of Rabban Gamaliel that his father drank of such, in the City of Akuh, and they (the sages) admitted it? The expression not admitted in the Mishna means the other sages, but his son has admitted. And if you wish, it may be said that to one Tana by the name of Gudah, he has not admitted, but to the Tana Gudeah he has admitted.

"*Skins in which there are holes.*" The rabbis taught: What is considered a holed skin? If it is torn opposite the heart, and is round, and if there is a "Kartub" (a small liquid measure equal to 1/64 of a lug) it is prohibited, but not if such was not

found. Said R. Huna: Provided it was not salted, but if salted it may be supposed that the salt has absorbed the blood.

"*R. Simon b. Gamaliel,*" etc. Said R. Joseph in the name of R. Jehudah, quoting Samuel: The Halakha prevails with him.

"*Meat entering for the idol,*" etc. Who is the Tana that holds thus? Said Hyia b. Abba in the name of R. Johanan: It is not in accordance with R. Elazar, who said elsewhere that in general

the thought of a heathen is directed to his idol.

"*Meat which comes out,*" etc. And what is the reason? Because if it was already with the idol, it is impossible that there was no sacrifice. And this is in accordance with R. Jehuda b. Bathyra of the following Boraitha: Whence do we know that a sacrifice to the idol defiles in a tent? From [Psalms, cvi. 28]: "And they joined themselves unto Ba'al-pe'or, and ate the sacrifices of the dead," and as a dead defiles in a tent, so does the same the sacrifice of an idol.

"*With pilgrims,*" etc. Said Samuel: A heathen pilgrim is prohibited only when on his way to the idol, because he *goes* to worship the idol, but when here turns there is nothing the matter, as no consideration should be paid to what was done. The reverse is the case with an Israelite. When he goes there, one may interfere in hope to induce him to retract, but when he returns one must not, because as he is enthusiastic he will go again. But is there not a Boraitha to the effect that with an Israelite pilgrim one must not interfere either when he goes or returns? Said R. Ashi: That Boraitha speaks of an apostate Jew, of whom it is sure that he will not retract.

"*Coming from,*" etc. Said Resh Lakish: Provided they are not conjoined, but if they are, it is supposed that they will return there.

"*The bags of the heathens,*" etc. The rabbis taught: New bags, which are not pitched as yet, are permissible, but those which are pitched are prohibited (if they have absorbed the wine). If, however, the heathen has pitched them and put in wine in the presence of an Israelite, the wine is permissible.

But if the heathen puts the wine in, what is the Israelite's presence good for? Explained R. Papa: The heathen pitched it, and an Israelite put in the wine in the presence of another Israelite. But to what purpose is the other Israelite's presence? Perhaps the Israelite, while busy with pouring in the wine, would not notice that the heathen meanwhile devotes it. R.

p. 62

[paragraph continues] Zebid, however, said: R. Papa's explanation is not necessary, as it is said before, the heathen that pours in the wine, but the wine loses its identity when mixed with the pitch, just as water does when poured into clay. Said R. Papa: We may infer from R. Zebid's statement that if a heathen puts wine in an Israelite's salt, it is permissible. R. Ashi, however, opposed, saying that there is no comparison, as in the pitch the wine is lost, but not in the salt, as the taste of it remains. There was a merchant, Bar Abi, who took away pitchers of R. Itzhak b. Joseph, kept wine in them, and thereafter returned them, and he asked in the college what to do with them? Said R. Jeremiah to him: In such a case R. Ami has decided for practice one shall fill them with water for three days and after the water is poured out he may use them. Said Rabha: He must change the water every day. The schoolmen understand that this was said only concerning our bags, but not if the bags were the heathen's. However, when Rabbin came from Palestine he said that there is no difference between ours and theirs. R. Aha b. Rabha meant to say, in the presence of R. Ashi, that this is only concerning bags and not pitchers. Said R. Ashi to him: There is no difference between bags and pitchers. R. Jehudah the second questioned R. Ami: How is it if he has returned the pitchers to the pottery, and they were burned there. May they be used or not? And he answered: Brine extracts what is absorbed by them, so much the more does fire. So, also, was it taught by R. Johanan, according to others by R. Assi, in the

name of the former: Pitchers of the heathens, which were returned to the pottery, as soon as the pitch falls off from them, are permissible. Said R. Ashi: Don't teach until it falls off, but even when it weakens so as to fall off they are allowed.

If this was done by burning them out simply with pieces of wood R. Aha and Rabbina differ. According to one it is permissible, and according to the other it is not, and the Halakha prevails with the latter. The schoolman propounded a question: How is it to keep beer in the same? R. Na'hman and R. Jehudah prohibit it, and Rabha permits. Rabbina permitted Hyia b. Itzchak to put beer in them. He, however, put wine in them. Nevertheless, Rabinna did not care to forbid him, saying that this occurred only unintentionally, and he would not do it again. R. Itzchak b. Bisna had vessels made of clay and ordure, in which there was once sacrificed wine, and he filled them with water, put them in the sun, and they burst. Said R.

p. 63

[paragraph continues] Abba to him: You have lost them in vain. True, the rabbis said to fill them with water, but did they say to put them in the sun? R. Yusna said in the name of R. Ami: Vessels of natron, in which there was wine, have no remedy. What is meant by natron vessels? Said R. Jose b. Abin: Vessels made of alum crystal. Rupila took away such pitchers from Pumbedith, kept wine in them, then returned them; and when R. Jehudah was questioned as to what to do with them, he said: He kept wine in them only temporarily, therefore he may rinse them with water and they are allowed. Said R. Evira: The pitchers of red earth which do not absorb much, he may rinse with water, and they are allowed. Said R. Papa: The same is the case with the clay pitchers of Michsi. Clay *buchals* R. Asi prohibits and R. Ashi permits. In case the heathen drank from them the first and second time, all agree that they are forbidden; they differ, however, with regard to the third time (*i.e.*, when the first two times an Israelite drank from them; and the Halakha prevails, that if the heathen drank the first and second times, they are prohibited, but if the third, they are not). Said R. Zebid.: Vessels enamelled with white and black are permissible, but if with green, they are not, because they contain alum crystal. However, if there were splits in them they all are forbidden.

Maremar lectured: Enamelled vessels, no matter of what color, are permissible. But why is wine different from leaven on Passover, concerning which a similar question was propounded to Maremar, and he prohibited them all? Because leaven is usually used hot, while wine is usually used cold. R. Aqiba happened to be in Ginzek, and he was questioned the following: Fasting a couple of hours only, is it considered or not? And he did not know the answer. Pitchers of heathens are allowed or prohibited? Finally, in what garments did Moses worship the seven days before he consecrated Aaron to the high priesthood? And he, not knowing the answers, came with these questions to college. He was told: A fasting of hours is considered, and if one finished his fasting at sunset, he may recite the prayer of fasting. The pitchers of heathens, after they were empty for twelve months, are permissible. Moses has worshipped the seven days in a white gown. R. Kahanah taught: In a white shirt which had no seam.

"*The pressed grapes*," etc. The rabbis taught: The pressed grapes of which wine was made, with their kernel, are forbidden when they are still wet, but not when they are dry. And which

p. 64

are to be considered wet? Before twelve months has elapsed, and thereafter they are considered

dry. So R. Jehudah in the name of Samuel. It was taught: Rabba b. b. Hanna in the name of R. Johanan said: The prohibition of them extends even to the deriving of any benefit from them, and when they are allowed, they may even be consumed. R. Zebid said: The dregs of wine of the heathens, after twelve months, are allowed. Their enamelled pitchers, after twelve months of non-usage have elapsed, are allowed according to R. Habiba b. Rabha. R. Habiba said: And the same is the case with their thick leather bags. R. Aha b. R. Aika said: The same is also the case with their *pomace* of grapes. And R. Aha b. Rabha said: The same is also the case with their enamelled white and black pitchers.

"*Fish-oil*," etc. The rabbis taught: Fish-oil made by a heathen specialist is permissible. R. Jehudah b. Gamaliel, in the name of R. Hanina his brother, said: The same is the case with *Hillek* (small fish, which have no fins or scales) if they come from a heathen specialist. R. Abimi b. R. Abuhu taught: Fish-oil from a specialist is allowed. He taught it, and he himself explained it thus: The first and the second time when there is considerable fat in it he has to use no wine, so it is allowed, but not in the third time, when wine must be used. There was a boat with fish-oil, which came to the port of Akhu, and R. Aba of the same city appointed a watchman to guard it. Said Rabha to him: Who, then, watched it until now? And he rejoined: Until now? for what purpose was it necessary to watch? surely not for fear perhaps they would put wine in it, as in their place wine costs four-fold as does fish-oil, while here it is the reverse. Said R. Jeremiah to R. Zera: But perhaps while this boat passed the City of Zur, where wine is cheap, they have poured wine in it? And he answered: It would have been a difficulty for this boat to reach Zur, as there are (along the coast from Zur to Akhu) bays formed by protruding rocks and shallow waters caused by melting snows.

"*Cheese of Anuyiki*." Said Resh Lakish: Why did the sages forbid the cheese of Anuyiki? Because most of their calves are slaughtered for the sake of their idols. (Says the Gemara): Why the most, when even if the minority were slaughtered for that purpose, the same would be the case, as R. Mair considers the minority also? The expression "*the most*" was necessary in order to indicate that only a minority are slaughtered not for this purpose, but if it were said "*the minority*,"

p. 65

then it would be understood that the majority are slaughtered not for this purpose, and as the cattle are also slaughtered not for this purpose, the minority then would be a minority of a minority, to which even R. Mair does not pay any attention. Said R. Simeon b. Elyakim to Resh Lakish: Your reason that the calves are slaughtered for the sake of the idol contradicts your own statement made elsewhere--viz.: that the slaughtering for the sake of the idol is not to be taken into consideration (in opposition to R. Johanan, who says that it is), and he answered: May you in the future be more successful in distinguishing matters. I speak of him who expressly says: I am worshipping the idol with this slaughtering.

"*Calls his attention to another thing*." [Solomon's Song, 1, 2.] What does this passage mean? When R. Dimi came he said thus: The assembly of Israel said before the Holy One, blessed be He: Lord of the Universe, sweet are to me the words of thy friends (the sages who are explaining the law) more than the essence of the Torah. But what was the reason that he called his attention to this passage? Said R. Simeon b. Pazi, according to others, b. Ami: He called his attention to the beginning of this chapter, "He may kiss me," etc., and the meaning was this: Ishmael, my brother, compress your lips, one upon the other, and hasten not to propound questions. But why?

Said Ulah, according to others, R. Samuel b. Aba: This was a new decree, to which the reason could not be given at that time. And what is the reason? Said R. Simeon b. Pazi in the name of R. Joshua b. Levi: It is that perhaps it was uncovered and was poisoned by a snake. If so, why did he not tell him so? This is as Ula said elsewhere. When a new decree was promulgated in the west, they did not give the reason until twelve months had elapsed, for fear there may be one who would not care for such a reason, and would not accept the decree. R. Jeremiah ridiculed this statement, since, according to it, old cheese should be allowed, as R. Hanina said: A dry or an old one is permissible, because poison would not have allowed it to become old or dry. Said R. Hanina: The reason was that there is no cheese in which some skimmed milk does not remain, and this is forbidden, because the heathen mixes all milk with milk of such cattle that is forbidden to eat. Samuel, however, said: Because they curdle the milk with the skin of the rennet of a carcass. But how is it if with the rennet itself, would it be allowed? Did indeed Samuel say so? Is there not

p. 66

a Mishna: The rennet belonging to a Gentile as well as that of a carcass, is forbidden, and the question: What does a Gentile's rennet mean. Samuel explained: The rennet of those cattle which the heathen has slaughtered is considered as one of a carcass. Hence, the rennet itself is also prohibited? This presents no difficulty, as Samuel's explanation had been made before R. Jehoshua retracted his statement, that the rennet itself is to be considered. And his statement cited above was after the retraction of R. Jehoshua was known, and that Mishna in tract Chulin remained uncorrected.

R. Malchia in the name of R. Aba b. Ahaba said: The reason is that they besmear the top of the cheese with the fat of swine. R. Hisda said: Because they curdle it with vinegar. And R. Na'hman b. Itz'hak said: Because they curdle it with the juice of the trees of "*Orlah*." But, according to R. Hisda and R. Na'hman b. Itz'hak, it should be forbidden to derive any benefit from *them*? This difficulty remains unsolved.

R. Na'hman b. R. Hisda lectured: It reads [Songs of Solomon, 1-3]: "To the smell are thy fragrant oils pleasant," a scholar is equalled to a glass of perfume, which, if uncovered, gives forth a good odor, while it does not if covered. And not only this, but matters the reasons of which were sealed from him, finally become apparent [ibid., ibid.]: "The maidens ("*alomoth*") love thee." Do not read "*alomoth*" (maidens), but "*alumuth*" (hidden things). Furthermore, the angel of death becomes his lover, as the word *alomoth* is to be divided into two words, *al-moveth*, which means death. And furthermore, he inherits two worlds: this world, and the world to come, as the same word may be read "*olumuth*," which means "worlds."

MISHNA V.: The following things of the heathens are prohibited, but not for deriving benefit from them: Milk which the heathen himself milked not in the presence of an Israelite, their bread and oil. Rabbi in his court, however, permitted the consumption of their oil. Cooked and soaked herbs, in which they usually pour wine, and small salted fish (which is called trith), the brine of fish in which there is no fish, and 'hillek, the brine of 'hilteth, and *sal-condire*--all these are forbidden to eat, but one may derive benefit from them.

GEMARA: What is the reason for the prohibition of milk? If, *e.g.*, that the heathen might substitute for the milk of a cow that of an ass, there is no fear, for from a cow it is white, while

from an ass it is green; and if because he may mix it with above, let him curdle it; and, as the Master said, the milk of an ass cannot be curdled? Yea; this is when he needs it for cheese, but how shall he test it when he needs it as it is? Even then he can test it by taking part thereof for curdling?

This cannot prove, as there is some bad milk of a cow, which cannot be curdled. And if you wish, it can be said that even for cheese curdling is no test that the milk was not contaminated, as the unclean milk remains in the holes of the cheese (as said above).

"*And bread.*" Said R. Kahanah in the name of R. Johanan: Bread was not permitted by Rabbi and his court, as it was with oil. But is there one who says that it was? Yea; as R. Dimi, when back from Palestine, related: It once happened that Rabbi went to a field, and a heathen brought him fine bread, the size of a "*saah*," and Rabbi exclaimed: How nice this bread is! Why should the sages forbid it? And by this exclamation the people thought that Rabbi had permitted it. In reality, however, he did not. R. Joseph, according to others, R. Samuel b. Jehudah, said: It was not as R. Dimi related, but it once happened that Rabbi went to a certain place, and seeing that there was a difficulty to obtain Jewish bread for the disciples, he exclaimed, "Is there no baker here!" People thought that he meant a heathen baker, but he probably meant a Jewish one. Said R. Helbu: Even if he meant a heathen baker, it is permitted only when there is no Jewish baker, otherwise it is not. And R. Johanan said: Even if he meant a heathen baker, it is permissible only in the field, but not in the city, by reason of the fear of intermarriage. Aiban used to bite and consume heathen bread at the boundaries of the field, and Rabha or R. Na'hman b. Itz'hak told his disciples not to have any conversation with him, because he eats heathen bread.

"*And their oil.*" Concerning oil, Rabh said: Daniel has decreed the prohibition, and Samuel said: Because *they* are boiled in forbidden vessels. Said Samuel to Rabh: According to my theory, it is correct that R. Itz'hak b. Samuel b. Martha related about R. Simlayi, who preached in the City of Nezibin, that concerning oil R. Jehudah (Rabbi and his court voted and permitted it). Their reason may have been that the absorbed fat in the vessels which spoils the oil does not affect its validity, and therefore they permitted. But according to your theory that Daniel had so decreed, is it possible that R. Jehudah the

prince, should abolish the decree of Daniel? Is there not a Mishna: A court must not abolish the decree of another, unless it is greater in wisdom and in number? And he answered: You speak of Simlayi the Ludian, such people do not care to observe the decrees of the rabbis. Said Samuel: Then allow me to send this message to him (Simlayi), and Rabh became confused. Thereupon he said: If they have not given proper attention to that which is written concerning Daniel in the Scripture, should we do the same? Does it not read [Daniel, i. 8]: "Nor the wine of his banquets." ¹ Hence we see that the Scripture speaks of two banquets, one of wine and one of oil. However, he differs with Samuel in the explanation of "resolved in his heart," as according to him (Rabh) "he resolved in his heart, and decreed same for all Israel." Samuel, however, explains it: He so resolved for himself, but not for Israel. But how can we say that Daniel decreed so, after Bali-Abimi of Nirtah said in the name of Rabh: The decrees, concerning their bread, wine, oil, and their daughters were included in the eighteen decrees (which are mentioned in Tract Sabbath). Now, should you say that Daniel's decree was not accepted until after the

disciples of Hillel and Shammai came, decreed so, and it was then accepted? Then, how is to be understood the testimony that Daniel has thus decreed? Rabh has testified that Daniel's decree was only for the cities where other oils are to be found, but not for the field. And the rabbis mentioned above decreed that the same should be even in the field. But after all, how could Rabbi abolish their decree despite the Mishna cited above: That one court must not abolish the decree of another, etc.? And, secondly, did not Rabba b. b. Hanna say in the name of R. Johanan, that even in cases where one court may change the decree of another, it cannot do so with regard to the above eighteen decrees, as concerning them, even if Elijah with his court should come and abolish them, he must not be heeded? Said R. Mesharshia: The reason is that the decrees in question were spread among the majority of Israel; as to oil, however, its decree was not accepted by the majority of Israel. As so said Samuel b. Aba in the name of R. Johanan: Our masters investigated concerning oil, and found that the prohibition was not accepted by the majority, therefore, adhere to the rule declared

p. 69

by R. Simeon b. Gamaliel and R. Eliezer b. Zadok, that a court must not enact anything which the majority of the congregation could not possibly follow. [1](#)

R. Jehudah the second leaned upon the shoulder of R. Simlai when walking in the street, and said: Simlai, you were not in college yesterday, at the time we permitted oil of the heathens. And he answered: I hope that you will soon permit their bread also. Rejoined R. Jehudah: Then the people would name us the *all-permitting* court, as so they named R. Josh (Tract Idioto Mishna). Then to Simlai's remark: R. Josh has permitted three things, and you, master, have only permitted one, and should you permit one more, it will be only two. Jehudah answered: I have already permitted another thing concerning the validity a divorce attains after twelve months had elapsed before the husband returns; and it happened that before the elapse of such period the man died, and I have permitted the woman to remarry. [2](#)

"Cooked," etc. Whence is this deduced? Said R. Hyia b. Aba in the name of R. Johanan, from [Deut. ii. 28]: "Food shalt thou sell me for money, that I may eat; and water for money shalt thou give me, that I may drink," which means, like water, which does not, since its creation, change by fire, eatables are not changed since their creation, by fire. (But that which was changed is not permissible.) But as there is not mentioned "*fire*" in the Scripture, this is but a decree of the rabbis, and the verse is brought only as a hint to this. R. Samuel b. Itz'hak said in the name of Rabh: To everything which can be consumed raw, the prohibition of cooked by a heathen does not apply. So it was taught in the college of Sura. In the college of Pumbeditha, however, it was taught as follows: R. Samuel b. R. Itz'hak in the name of Rabh said: To everything which is not served on the table of noblemen to relish the bread, the prohibition of "cooked by a heathen" does not apply. And what is the difference between the two versions? Small fish, mushroom and disa (a thickly cooked barley or meal). All these three cannot be consumed raw, but they are not served on the tables of noblemen. Hence, according to the first version, if

p. 70

prepared by a heathen, must not be consumed, and according to the second, it is permissible.

R. Assi said in the name of Rabh: To small salt fish cooking of a heathen does not apply. Said R. Joseph: If the heathen roasted it, an Israelite may rely upon it for aneb tabshilin. ¹ But if he has prepared from this a mush of harsana (a dish of small fish with flour) it is forbidden. Is this not self-evident? Lest one say that the fish is the main thing of this dish, it comes to teach us that the flour is the main thing. R. Johanan said: If a heathen singed the head of an animal, it is permissible to partake of it even from the ear (although the ear is nearly cooked by the singeing). Said Rabbina: From this we may infer that if he threw a tent-pin in the stove (to dry it), and an Israelite has deposited upon it a pumpkin, it may be used. Is this not self-evident? Lest one say that the heathen intended to cook the tent-pin (hence the pumpkin would be cooked by him), he came to teach us that his intention was only to dry and not to cook it. R. Jehudah in the name of Samuel said: If an Israelite placed meat upon live coals and a heathen came and turned it, it is permissible. But let us examine the case. If without turning, it would not be cooked, then it was cooked by the heathen, and must not be permissible; on the other hand, if it would be cooked without turning, then its permission is self-evident. It speaks of the fact that if he did not turn it, it would cook in two hours, but by turning, it was cooked in one hour; and lest one say that the hastening of the cooking be taken into consideration, he teaches us that it is not so.

But did not R. Assi say in the name of R. Johanan that, when the food has been cooked to the extent that Ben Drusai ² habitually eats it, the heathen may then complete its cooking, but not otherwise, and should not the above-mentioned fried meat be accordingly prohibited? This quotation intends to say as follows: If the meat was put into the pot by the Israelite and then placed upon the fire by a heathen, it is permissible. There is a Boraitha to this effect: The Israelite may put the meat upon the coals and let the heathen do the turning till he returns from the synagogue or college. Similarly, a Jewish woman may place the pot upon the fire and then leave the heathen woman do the skimming till she returns from the synagogue

p. 71

or bath-house. In these cases there is nothing to fear. The schoolmen propounded a question whether that meat is permissible which was put upon the coals by a heathen and turned about by an Israelite? Said R. Na'hman b. Itz'hak: The answer thereto can be inferred *a fortiori*--viz.: if the completion of the cooking by the heathen's hand is allowed, so much the more is it so, if by the hand of Israelite. It was taught so, too: Rabba b. 'Hana, according to others, R. A'ha b. b. 'Hana, said in the name of R. Johanan: It is only then prohibited when the heathen prepares the food all alone, without the aid of the Israelite. As to bread, Rabbina said: The Halakha, is thus: When the Israelite heats the oven and the heathen places the bread therein, or *vice versa*, or, finally, the heathen does both the things and the Israelite was but fixing a little the fire during the heating, the bread is allowed. However, fish salted by heathens are allowed by 'Hiskia, but prohibited by R. Johanan; and an egg roasted by a heathen Bar Kapara allows, but not R. Johanan. But when R. Dimi came from Palestine, he said that in both fish and egg 'Hiskia and Bar Kapara allow, and R. Johanan does not. R. Hyye Parvah called once on the Exilearch, where he was asked whether it is allowed to eat an egg roasted by a heathen, and he replied that 'Hiskia and Bar Kapara allow it and R. Johanan prohibits it; the rule "The majority rules" is to be followed. Thereupon exhorted R. Zebid: Do not listen to R. Hyye, for Ahayi says that in this case the Halakha prevails according to R. Johanan. The Exilearch's servants became therefore so enraged that they poisoned R. Zebid with a drink of vinegar, from which he died.

The rabbis taught: Kaprises, Kaplututh, Hamtlia, warm water and roasted ears of corn coming

from the heathens are allowed; roasted eggs are prohibited. Oil was allowed by R. Jehudah, the prince, and his court by vote. There is a Boraitha: Hamtlia is called also Peshlia and Shietta. But what, indeed, is it? Rabha b. b. Mana said in the name of R. Johanan: It is now forty years since it was imported from Egypt; he himself said, it is already sixty years. In reality, both concur, for R. Johanan made his statement twenty years ago. The preparation thereof is as follows: Take parsley-seed, glue-seed, juice of fenugreek; keep them all in lukewarm water until the seed coats burst; then fill with water new earthen pots, and, on putting therein some red earth, plant in it the seeds; now go to bathe, and no sooner do you come back than the planted seeds

p. 72

will have borne their fruit, which is highly refreshing, so that on eating thereof you are cooled up from top to toe. Said R. Ashi: I was told by R. Hanina that all this is but a mere fable.

The rabbis taught: If dates of which beer was already once brewed be warmed anew in other vessels, the question arises as to whether these vessels are big or small: if big, the dates in question are prohibited; if small, they are allowed, for in small vessels the heathen surely cooks nothing unclean. What determines the size of vessel? R. Janai said: A vessel is said to be small when through its mouth the swallow is not able to pass. But could not the bird be cut into pieces and then made to pass through the opening of the vessel? Well, the foregoing determination is to be understood as follows: The opening of the vessel must be so small that the head of the said bird could not enter. But is there not a Boraitha: Dates are allowed regardless of the size of the vessel they are in? Yea; nevertheless there is no implicit contradiction here, for he who prohibits the big vessels is of the opinion that if the taste left by the old vessel were even injurious to the food, it is nevertheless prohibited; while the others who allowed it maintain that if the flavor left by the old vessels be favorable to the food, it is prohibited, but if unfavorable, it is allowed; therefore they have also allowed in this case the big vessels of the heathens. R. Sheshith said: A heathen's cooked oil is prohibited. Wondered R. Saphra: Why, there is nothing to fear in this case, for were the heathen to put into the said oil fat he would thereby impart to it an insipid odor; nor can the prohibition be based upon the mere fact that it was cooked by a heathen, as we have learned above: All that may be eaten in a raw state, may also be eaten when cooked by a heathen, and oil is eatable uncooked; as for the absorption by the vessel, it makes the taste of the oil bad, and hence it cannot be prohibited therefor. R. Assi was asked whether dates cooked by a heathen are permissible. Sweet dates, that are eatable when raw, are certainly allowed, but not bitter ones, which are not eatable when raw. The chief point here is: What about dates that are neither sweet nor bitter (and are, in case of necessity, eatable when raw)? And he answered: A distinguished man, Levi, has already prohibited them. Sthithah (a dish prepared from young ears of corn) of a heathen, Rabh allows, the father of Samuel and Levi prohibits. (Says the Gemara): If prepared of wheat or barley flour, all agree that it is allowed. A food of peas and vinegar is declared prohibited also by

p. 73

[paragraph continues] Rabh. Their point of difference concerns solely a food of flour and water, which the father of Samuel and Levi prohibits, fearing that, if this were allowed, people would later eat also foods prepared with vinegar; Rabh, on the other hand, does not entertain this fear. Others word this discussion as follows: Pea flour prepared by the heathen with water is prohibited by Rabh, who fears lest food with vinegar be eaten; only foods prepared of wheat or barley flour are permissible, as for their preparation no vinegar is required. The other party,

however, prohibits also these foods, fearing lest one might then allow oneself also peas prepared with vinegar.

Rabh said: Barsillai sent to David two kinds of this Sthithah, as it reads [II Sam. xvii. 28]: "Bedstead, pans, earthen pots, wheat, barley, flour, ears of corn, beans, lentils, oatmeal." That nowadays we buy of the heathens in the markets of Nahardea these articles in the basketfuls, is a sign that Samuel and Levi's prohibition is disregarded.

"And pressed preserves into which they habitually put wine." Its benefit is, according to R. Hiskia, only then allowed when it is not known that there is wine in it. But if it is definitely known that there is wine in it, it is prohibited. Why then do the rabbis allow the use of muries which, we know, all prepare with wine? Because here wine is used merely to destroy the fishlime of the muries, while in the above it is used to render the preserves more palatable. However, R. Johanan said that even when it is known that there is wine in the preserves their benefit is none the less permitted. What difference is there between muries and preserves, that R. Mair prohibits the use of the former, but allows that of the latter? In case of the muries which is taken with bread, one cats the wine contained therein, while in the case of preserves you consume only the preserved fruits, the wine remaining in the vessel.

"Pressed fish cut in small pieces and Hilac are forbidden." What is Hilac? R. Na'hman Hanan b. Aba said in the name of Rabh: Hilac is Sulthenuth. This fish, though it has the marks of the clean fish, is prohibited, because it so closely resembles the other unclean fish with which it is drawn out that it becomes impossible to distinguish it.

The rabbis taught: Those fishes which, when young, do not exhibit their signs of clean fish, but grow them later, as is the case with the Sulthenuth and the Epitz, are allowed to eat. Such fishes that show the signs of the clean order when fished

p. 74

out, but lose them later, such as the Akunas and Apunas, Chotospeteis, Achspeteis and Utanas, are allowed. R. Abuhu heralded at Cæsaria that it is permitted to buy of anybody the fish oil and rye, for it is imported only from Pelusium and Aspamia (Spain), where there are no fishes of the unclean order. Abayi likewise allows to buy of heathens the fish Zachanthra from the river Dahab. Why is this permitted? Presumably because the bed of the river is of such a composition that fish of the unclean order can not live there. Said Rabbina: Now that the two rivers Gusa and Ganda have been united with the Dahab river the Zachanthra is again prohibited (as the former two shelter unclean fish). Abayi said: The sea-donkey is allowed, but not the sea-ox; and you remember this by the following mark: the unclean (on earth?) is clean, while the clean is unclean. R. Ashi said: Separnuna is allowed, Kadeshnuna is not; according to others he said that Kaharnuna is forbidden. R. Aqiba, when in Ginsek, was offered a fish that resembled the Hipusha, which is of the unclean order; he took a basket, put therein the fish, then, upon removing it from the basket, he found scales there, and allowed the fish. R. Ashi applied on a similar occasion in Matduria the following test: he held out the fish, which resembled the unclean Zehrpeha, against the sun-rays, and perceived scales, whereupon he allowed it. He happened to be once in another town, where he was offered a fish similar to the unclean Separnuna, so he had it covered with a white vessel, and, as he discovered scales on the walls of the vessel, allowed the fish. Rabba b. 'Hana came once to Arka Dagma, where he was given the fish Zachanthra; but as he heard the house servants call it Bati, he thought it may be an unclean

fish, and refrained from touching it; in the morning, on examining the fishes, he found among them some of the unclean order, whereupon he applied to himself the verse: "No wrong can come unawares to the righteous" [Prov. xii. 21].

"*And the berries of the Chalthith are forbidden.*" This prohibition is based upon the following fact: These berries must be cut off with a knife from which they imbibe what may have penetrated it from some prohibited food, although the master says that if by the withdrawal the food loses in taste, such food is permitted; here, however, the strong sap of the Chalthith berries restore the fat possibly extracted from the knife, hence they are forbidden. R. Levi's slave used to sell Chalthith; upon the death of R. Levi, R. Johanan was asked whether it

p. 75

was allowed henceforth to buy of the slave the Chalthith, to which he replied: We always repose in the slave the same confidence which we showed his master (we must thus trust also after the death of his master that he will not sell unclean for clean things). R. Huna b. Miniumi, having bought once blue wool for tshitzes from the house of R. Amram the pious who was dead already, betook himself to R. Joseph to ask him whether the use of the said wool is allowed; as he was unable to give a satisfactory answer, R. Huna went away, when he chanced to meet Hanan the tailor, to whom he disclosed his perplexity and the tailor said: How could the poor Joseph know this? I, myself, bought once such blue wool for the same purpose in the house of Rabnah, the brother of R. Hyys b. Aba; it was after the death of Rabnah, so I asked R. Mathna whether or not the use of the wool is allowed, and he knew no answer; I then went to R. Jehudah of Hagrana, and he said: At last you resort to me with a question. So said Samuel: We are to trust the wife of a scholar as we have trusted her husband. Such is the opinion also of the rabbis, who teach that the wife enjoys our confidence on the same basis with her husband, which relation holds good also with regard to master and slave; upon the death of the man his house claims our confidence until sufficient reason appears to call for the withdrawing of it therefrom. The same is the case with a stationery selling blue wool for tzitzes, you may buy here so long as there is no just reason for not buying.

The rabbis taught: The widow or daughter of an Amharez, who is to marry a scholar, likewise the slave of such who is to be sold to a scholar, must take the oral oath that they will observe the commandments and prohibitions of the sages. On the other hand, if the converse is the case, they are each free from this oath, since they are now as trustworthy as ever before; this, however, is but R. Meir's view, while R. Jehuda finds the oath necessary also in this second case. R. Simeon b. Elazar said: I knew a woman who would aid her husband, who was a scholar, to put on his Tephilis; upon his death she married a contractor, 1 whom she would aid in putting on his amulet. Rabh said: Fat, meat, wine, and blue wool for *tzitzes* should when sealed with only one seal, never be forwarded through a heathen; but Chalthith, bread, muries and cheese may be forwarded with one seal. In case of bread, the heathen will surely not replace it,

p. 76

as this could be easily discovered, the difference between fresh and stale bread, between wheat or barley bread, being too salient, and there is no reason to believe that as there is one seal he will exchange a bread for its equal. But why in the case of cheese Rabh finds one seal sufficient, while for fat, which is not dearer than cheese, he requires *two*? Said R. Kahana: Rabh did not mean fat, but fish cut in pieces and lacking the marks by which they might be discerned from

meat. But if such be the case, they could indeed be taken and exchanged for meat? Rabh considers two sorts of meat: fish-meat and meat proper. Samuel, however, put it thus: Meat, wine, blue wool that are to be forwarded through a heathen, require each two seals; muries, Chilthith and cheese, only one seal; fish is like meat, hence needs no special mention (and bread he does not quote at all, for here is nothing to fear).

The rabbis taught: One should not buy of a tradesman in Syria wine, muries, milk, salcondrit salt, Chilthith, cheese, unless the seller is positively known to be a specialist, otherwise he is suspicious of mixing something forbidden into the said articles. However, if an Israelite is visiting such a tradesman in Syria, he is allowed to eat everything served at the host's table, for in the house nothing forbidden is used there. This corroborates what R. Jehoshua b. Levis [said](#)--viz.: An Israelite may accept one of the foregoing articles as a present from a Syrian tradesman, provided he gives it from his household stock, because in the house nothing unclean is used there. What is salcondrit salt mentioned above? R. Jehudah said in the name of Samuel: It is the salt used by all the nobles of Rome. The rabbis taught: Black salcondrit is prohibited, but not the white sort. So R. Meier; R. Jehudah said the contrary: White is forbidden and black is allowed. R. Jehudah b. Gamaliel in the name of R. Hanina b. Gamaliel said: Both the sorts are forbidden. Said Rabba b. b. 'Hana in the name of R. Johanan: He who prohibits the use of the white salt is prompted thereto by the fact that some put into it the *white* parts of the intestines of unclean fish; on the other hand, that some put into the black salt the black parts of unclean fish, is sufficient reason to him who forbids it, while these two facts justify the third party to prohibit the use of both salts. R. Abuhu said in the name of R. Hanina b. Gamaliel: There once lived an old man, a heathen, in our street, and he used to grease with pork-fat this salt which he was selling.

p. 77

"*Is forbidden.*" The word enumerated is calculated to exclude other articles; which, then, are these? According to Hiskia, preserves into which the majority are known to omit wine, is excluded even for benefit; and according to R. Johanan, also muries and cheese from Beth-Unirka. R. Meier's opinion is cited here without the mention of his name.

MISHNA VI.: The following things are allowed to eat, too: Milk milked by a heathen in the presence of an Israelite, honey and honey-cake from the beehive. Others think grapes, even when trickling, are not capable of defiling, not even as moisture; preserves into which as a rule wine and vinegar are not entering; pressed fish that is not all cut, fish-brine in which there is a fish, the leaves of Chalthith; soft olives closely packed in a barrel. R. Jose prohibits them if their kernels fall out easily. The locusts are forbidden when coming from the grocer's basket, but are allowed when they come from the pantry; the same is the case with heave-offering.

GEMARA: This Mishna bears out what the rabbis teach elsewhere--viz.: An Israelite sitting near the herd of a heathen who is milking milk, may drink it without any fear that the heathen has adulterated it. How was the case? If there is in the herd no milk-giving animal of the unclean order, it is obvious that the milk is allowed, but if there be one why should the milk be allowed now that the Israelite is unable to see which animal the heathen is milking? The rabbis intend to teach thus: The Israelite must occupy such a position that upon rising he could see the heathen milking, in which case it is allowed, for the heathen will be afraid to mix in unclean milk, as the Israelite might at any moment rise and see what he is doing. The rabbis emphasize this in order to dispel the belief that the milk is forbidden by reason of the Israelite's sitting position; the possibility, they hold, of his rising and observing the heathen's doings renders the milk allowed.

"*The honey is allowed.*" This could not possibly be forbidden, as there is not reasonable fear that the heathen will mix in it foreign stuff which would surely spoil the honey. Nor is there any reason to fear that the honey may be cooked, for even if this be the case, the honey is allowed, as the basis of the previously established rule that whatever is eatable in its raw state is allowed also when cooked by a heathen. Finally, there can be no fear that the honey having been possibly kept in forbidden vessels may have absorbed the

p. 78

vapor imbibed by the latter, since this would spoil the flavor of the honey.

"*Also grapes even when trickling,*" etc. This is apparently contradicted by the following: Shamai says, if one gathers grapes for the wine-press, they are, when trickling, subject to defilement to an extent as if water has been poured upon them. Hillel, who was at first inclined to hold the contrary, agreed at last with Shamai's opinion; hence, the moisture is defiling? This is no contradiction; when one puts the grapes into the press it is for the purpose of making wine, and if the grapes are moist, it is readily seen; while here it is a case of eating grapes when one intently looks for dry ones, and when these trickle too, no heed is taken, since they are used for eating and not for making wine.

"*Pressed not all cut,*" etc. The rabbis taught: When the head and backbone are whole, it is not all cut; "Fish-brine in which the fish is," means, when there are in the brine one or two worms called Chilbith, it is allowed. Now, if this is allowed with one Chilbith in it, why does the statement read: one or two? In a closed barrel one is sufficient, while in an open one two are required (because it may be supposed that one fell in from some other vessel). It was taught: R. Huna says it is allowed only when its head and backbone are recognizable. R. Na'hman said: Only when either of the two is recognizable. Whereupon R. Uqha b. Hama objected: We know that fish with scales and fins are allowed to eat; now, how is it possible to recognize an allowed fish by its head or backbone? Said Abayi: The fishes here in question are the Arah and Palmuda, which are of the clean order, but whose heads resemble those of the unclean. R. Jehudah said in the name of Ula: R. Huna and R. Na'hman have here in view the fish-brine, and not at all the fish, so that the one says: The fish-lac is allowed when the head of its fish is seen, while the other one maintains that the backbone, too, must be recognized. R. Seia said: I was in the habit of eating fish-brine with bread upon recognizing in it either the head or the backbone of its fish; now that I heard what R. Jehudah says in the name of Ula, I began to eat it only when I recognized both. Said R. Papa: The Halakha prevails: The said fishes are allowed only when both head and backbone are recognizable. To this an objection was raised from the following Thosephtha: Fishes cut in pieces and cooked are allowed in all their parts if the marks of the clean order were found, and be it

p. 79

only on one part of a piece or on one piece among hundreds. A heathen brought once to market a barrellful of cut fish where a piece was found with marks of the clean order on it, and R. Simeon b. Gamaliel allowed the whole barrellful, which case all but corroborates the foregoing objection. R. J'Papa gave then this interpretation: All the pieces of that barrel were equal. But if so, entire statement would appear superfluous? Lest one say it should be feared perhaps another kind of fish happened to be in there, it teaches us that it is not so. A boatful of Zahontha was

once brought to a fish-pond; R. Huna betook himself there to inspect them, and upon perceiving some scales in the boat, he allowed the whole. Rabha, finding it astounding that by reason of a few scales one should allow all the fish, regardless of the possibility that there might be among them fish void of scales, heralded that these fish are forbidden. R. Huna b. Hanina heralded the contrary. Said R. Jeremiah of Diphthi: I was told by R. Papa that R. Huna allowed only the fish-brine and not the fish itself. R. Ashi, however, said: I was told by R. Papa that R. Huna, allowed the fish, too. As to myself, I cannot prohibit the fish after hearing from R. Papa that R. Huna allows them; nor can I allow them, however, after having learned from R. Jehudah in the name of Ula that only such fish are allowable of which both head and backbone are recognized. R. Hinna Hanina b. Aida, while once at the house of R. Ada b. 'Ahhah, said: If a ship-cargo consisting of barrels with fish-brine is brought to Israelites and the Chalbith is found in one of the barrels, they all are allowed if they were open (for it is plausible to assume that there was Chalbith in the other barrels as well, but, they being open, crept out). But if the barrels were tightly covered up, only the one with the Chalbith in it is allowed. Thereupon R. Ada asked him: Whence do you know this? From three men of great erudition: Rabh, Samuel and R. Johanan.

R. Bruna said in the name of Rabh: Fish-entrails as well as fish-rye you may buy only of a specialist. Said Ula to R. Dusthai of Biri: Since Rabh speaks of entrails and rye, it is manifest that also unclean fish have rye, otherwise he would not treat of the two in the same connection. But I am able to prove the contrary from the following: The unclean fish are viviparous, while the clean ones are rye-bearing. Well, was the reply, strike the word rye from Rabh's statement. Hereupon said R. Zera: It is not necessary to strike it out, for the

p. 80

fact is that unclean fish are also rye-bearing, but so that their offspring is mature in the rye before it is ejected out of the body, while that of the clean fish is brought about by the sand. But why is it requisite that rye be bought only of a specialist now that we have signs whereby to distinguish the clean from the unclean? Have we not learned that the marks which serve to distinguish the clean from the unclean eggs of birds, are also distinctive of clean and unclean eggs of fish? But how is this possible when according to law the signs of fish are the scales and fins? The above is then to be thus understood: When the eggs are elongated, with one end pointed and the other round, it is a mark of clean ones, but if the sides are both pointed or both round, it is of the unclean order. If the yolk of the egg is on the surface and the white in the middle, it is a sign of uncleanness; the converse is a sign of cleanness. If, however, the yolk and white are intermingled, it is a sign that it comes from reptiles, and is therefore unclean. Rabha said that Rabh's view must be thus [interpreted](#): If the fish-rye is entirely squeezed so that the said signs are no longer discernible.

And if there be no specialist, what then? Said R. Jehudah: If the vendor says, I have pickled the fish and know them to be clean, he is trusted. R. Na'hman adds: He must show the sort of fish pickled by him and their entrails. R. Jehudah instructed the waiter Ada: The vendor who says, I have pickled these fish, is to be trusted.

"The leaves of Chalthith are allowed to eat." This, being, as it is, self-evident, since these leaves are not cut with a knife, is stated here in order to indicate that such a leaf is allowed even when a bit of the root is on it. If not for this specific statement, it would be plausible to think that a leaf with a piece of root on be forbidden by reason of the apparently rational supposition that the root may have come from some other vessel where it possibly was cut with a knife.

"*Very soft olives.*" Although this is likewise self-evident, its statement is none the less necessary in order to prevent the belief that, since the olives are soft, wine may have been put in them to bring about this softness.

R. Jose said: What kind of olives are these? Said R. Jose b. 'Hanina: Olives whose kernels fall out when you merely keep them in your hand, it is thus manifest that the olives were kept in wine in order to make them so soft.

"*The locusts,*" etc. The rabbis taught: Locusts, Kaprises,

p. 81

[paragraph continues] Kapluthuth brought from the store or from the locality where they are prepared, or from a boat, are allowed; but those that are sold by the small tradesmen are forbidden, for they spill wine upon them. The same is the case with apple-cider, which is allowed when coming from the store, but forbidden when bought of the small tradesmen, who mix wine in it.

The rabbis taught: Rabbi suffered once from pains in the stomach, so he asked if one could tell him whether the apple-cider of the heathen is prohibited or not; said R. Ismael b. R. Jose: My father had once suffered likewise from such pains, and having taken some apple-cider seventy years old, bought of heathens, he felt relieved. Said Rabbi: You knew this and let me suffer so long! Thereupon apple-cider was sought for and found by a heathen in the quantity of 300 pitchers seventy years old already; Rabbi drank therefrom and was cured. Whereupon he said: Praised be the Omnipotent who put his world in the hands of the guardians!

"*The same is the case with it.*" How is this to be understood? As R. Sheshith said: When a priest is suspected of selling heave-offering under the pretense that it is not terumah, one is prohibited from buying of him whatever he sells; but what he brings from the pantry, or in baskets, or from the place of production, is allowed to buy of him; for here he is afraid to falsify, lest the rabbis, on being informed thereabout, deprive him of everything.

Footnotes

[41:1](#) Voltaire makes rather an exhibit of his ignorance when he mocks the ancient Jews, saying (in his *Philos. Diction*, vol. ii., p. 102) that they were the only nation given to this offence, since otherwise the prohibition thereof would have been superfluous. This Mishna as well as the following Gemara justifies the conclusion that this offence was rather general and was practiced by non-Jews and even by non-Semites at a period much later than the time when the prohibition of the Scripture was established. The attention of the reader is called to the eye-witnesses reported in the following Gemara.

[43:1](#) The term in Hebrew is *vaysharnha*, and song in Hebrew is *shira*.

[68:1](#) Leeser translates "which he drank"; the Talmud, however, takes it literally. as the term "mishte" in Hebrew means banquet.

[69:1](#) The text here treats of the eighteen decrees mentioned in [Sabbath page 24] which we have omitted. We also call the attention of the reader to the appendix at the end of same tract.

[69:2](#) The text discusses here the three things which Josh b. Joezer testified in the cited Mishna, Idieth, which will be found there in the proper place.

[70:1](#) See Erubin.

[70:2](#) Ben-Drusai, a certain robber who used to eat meat only one-third cooked.

[75:1](#) This is explained in our "History of Amulets, Charms and Talismans." See there.

[Next: Chapter III](#)