

LANGUAGE

From when one trims [misheyefaksu] – מְשִׁיפְקִסוּ: Probably from the Greek πόςκος, pokos, meaning wool. In this context, the Gemara is likely referring to the hair that grows on various types of cucumbers and gourds. This hair either falls off by itself as the fruit ripens or it is removed manually before it is sold.

HALAKHA

The granary of cucumbers with regard to tithes – גִּרְנָן: קִישוּאִים: With regard to the separation of tithes, cucumbers and gourds reach the completion of their processing when one rubs and removes the hair-like material that covers them. This is called their granary, a term borrowed from the processing of grain. If one does not rub them, they are considered processed when he gathers them into a pile (Rambam Sefer Zera'im, Hilkhot Ma'asrot 3:8).

The granary of onions with regard to tithes – גִּרְנָן בְּצִלִּים: With regard to tithes, onions reach the completion of their processing when one removes the leaves and dry peels. If he does not remove the leaves and dry peels, the onions are considered fully processed when he gathers them into a pile (Rambam Sefer Zera'im, Hilkhot Ma'asrot 3:12).

Planned constructive labor on Shabbat – מְלָאכֶת מְחֻשְׁבֶּת: On Shabbat, the Torah prohibits only constructive labor, performed with the intention of achieving predefined goals. If one performed one of the thirty-nine labors prohibited on Shabbat accidentally, or under the impression that he was doing something else, he is exempt (Rambam Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Shabbat 1:9).

NOTES

How may one husk – בִּיצַד מוֹלֵל: The early authorities dispute the precise meaning of this question. Rashi, Tosafot, and others explain that it is referring to a Festival. Others maintain that it concerns the husking of grain on Shabbat (Rabbi Aharon HaLevi). According to their opinion, one may husk in the regular manner on a Festival. This ruling is cited by the Meiri, and the Rambam indicates likewise (see Rishon LeTziyyon).

מִתְקִיף לָהּ רַבִּי אֲבָא בַר מִמֶּל: וְרִישָׁא, לְמַעֲשֵׂר – אִין, לְשַׁבַּת לָא? וְמִי אִיכָא מִיְדֵי דְלַעֲנֵן שַׁבַּת לָא הוּי גְמַר מְלָאכָה, וְלְמַעֲשֵׂר הוּי גְמַר מְלָאכָה?

Rabbi Abba bar Memel strongly objects to this: And with regard to the first clause of the mishna, one should conclude: Yes, if one peeled a handful of barley, it is considered prepared with regard to tithes, but no, it is not considered threshing with regard to Shabbat? But is there anything that, with regard to Shabbat, is not considered the completion of the labor and may be performed; and yet, with regard to tithes, it is considered the completion of the labor? Isn't the prohibition against work on Shabbat far more stringent than tithes in all its details?

מִתְקִיף לָהּ רַב שֵׁשֶׁת בְּרִיהַ דְרַב אִידִי: וְלָא? וְהָא גְרָנָן לְמַעֲשֵׂר, דְתַנֵּן: אִיזְהוּ גְרָנָן לְמַעֲשֵׂר? הֲקִישׁוּאִין וְהַדְלֹעִין מְשִׁיפְקִסוּ, וְשִׁלָּא פְקִסוּ – מְשִׁינְעֵמִיד עֲרֻמָּה. וְתַנֵּן נַמִּי גְבִי בְצִלִּים: מְשִׁינְעֵמִיד עֲרֻמָּה. וְאֵלּוּ גְבִי שַׁבַּת – הֲעֵמַדְתָּ עֲרֻמָּה פְטוּר!

Rav Sheshet, son of Rav Idi, strongly objects to this claim: And is there no example of a halakha in which tithes are treated more stringently than Shabbat? And is there not the halakha of their granary for tithes, as we learned in a mishna (Ma'asrot 1:5): What is the equivalent of their granary, i.e., the point at which the processing of various vegetable is completed so that they become obligated in tithes? With regard to cucumbers and gourds, they become obligated from when one trims the thin hairs that cover them [misheyefaksu],<sup>l</sup> and for those he did not trim, from when he assembles them in a pile.<sup>h</sup> And we also learned in a mishna (Ma'asrot 1:6), with regard to onions, that it is from when one assembles them in a pile.<sup>h</sup> Whereas with regard to Shabbat, one who assembles produce in a pile is exempt, as this is not a prohibited labor on Shabbat.

אֵלּוּ מֵאִי אֵיִת לְךָ לְמִימַר – מְלָאכֶת מְחֻשְׁבֶּת אֶסְרָה תוֹרָה, הֲכָא נַמִּי: מְלָאכֶת מְחֻשְׁבֶּת אֶסְרָה תוֹרָה.

Rather, what have you to say? Why is one exempt if he forms a pile on Shabbat? The Torah prohibited only planned, constructive labor<sup>h</sup> on Shabbat, the type of work that involves the creation of something new, and the formation of a pile is not considered that kind of labor. Here too, with regard to peeling barley, the Torah prohibited creative work. Although collecting the peeled barley in one's hand is considered the completion of the labor in respect to tithes, it is not prohibited labor on Shabbat.

בִּיצַד מוֹלֵל? אַבְיֵי מְשַׁמֵּיָה דְרַב יוֹסֵף: אָמַר: חֲדָא אַחְדָּא, וְרַב אֲוִיָּא מְשַׁמֵּיָה דְרַב יוֹסֵף: אָמַר: חֲדָא אַתְרֵתִי. רַבָּא אָמַר: בִּיּוֹן דְמִשְׁנֵי – אֶפִּילוּ חֲדָא אֶכְוֵלְהוּ נַמִּי.

Apropos husking kernels on Shabbat, the Gemara asks: How may one husk<sup>n</sup> grain on a Festival? Abaye said in the name of Rav Yosef: One finger on another, i.e., one may place the kernels between two fingers and rub. And Rav Avya said in the name of Rav Yosef: One may even do so one on two, i.e., between the thumb and two fingers. Rava said: Since he alters the manner in which he performs the activity, he may even do so with one finger on all the rest.

בִּיצַד מְנַפֵּחַ? אָמַר רַב אֲדָא בַר אֲהָבָה: אָמַר רַב: מְנַפֵּחַ

The Gemara further asks: How may one blow on the grain, to winnow it in a permitted manner on Shabbat? Rav Adda bar Ahava said that Rav said: One blows

Perek I  
Daf 14 Amud a

NOTES

From the joints of his fingers and above – מִקְשָׁרֵי אֶצְבָּעוֹתָיו וְלְמַעְלָה: Some commentaries explain that this is not referring to the fingertips. On the contrary, one may use only the palm of the hand (Rid).

מִקְשָׁרֵי אֶצְבָּעוֹתָיו וְלְמַעְלָה.

from the joints of his fingers and above,<sup>n</sup> i.e., he does not place the kernels mixed with chaff in his palm but on his fingers, which is an unusual way to hold them.

מְחַכּוּ עָלָהּ בְּמַעְרְבָא: בִּיּוֹן דְמִשְׁנֵי – אֶפִּילוּ בְכוּלָהּ יָדָא נַמִּי. אֵלּוּ אָמַר רַבִּי אֶלְעָזָר: מְנַפֵּחַ בְּיָדוֹ אַחַת וּבְכָל כְּחוֹ.

They laughed at this explanation in the West, Eretz Yisrael, saying: Since he alters his behavior from the usual method, doing so even with his entire hand should be permitted as well. Rather, the halakha is as Rav Elazar said: One may blow while holding the grain with one hand but not two, and he may even do so with all his strength, as this is not considered similar to a prohibited labor at all.

**דיכית תבלין ביום טוב** – One may grind spices in the usual manner on a Festival. Some authorities prohibit this in the case of saffron and pepper, as they do not lose their flavor. They therefore rule that one must pound these spices in an unusual manner (*Magen Avraham*). In any case, the custom is to slightly modify one's regular method of grinding spices (*Rema*). Although some authorities are lenient in a situation where one did not know the day before that he would require the spices (*Magen Avraham*), it is proper to be stringent and perform the task by means of an adjustment of some sort (*Taz; Shulhan Arukh HaRav*). This *halakha* is in accordance with the opinion of Beit Hillel (*Shulhan Arukh, Orach Hayyim 504:1*).

BACKGROUND

**Saffron [morika]** – מוריקא – *Morika* is the saffron crocus, from which saffron is derived. In Aramaic, it is called *kur-kuma*, while the Latin name is *Crocus sativus*. This plant has been used since ancient times. It is a perennial that grows from bulbs, with white corolla leaves that surround the inside of the flower, which is a yellow-orange color. The flowers are used to make spices and perfumes as well as concentrated yellow dyes and paint. Saffron is also used medicinally. It is both cultivated and grows wild in many parts of Eretz Yisrael.



Crocus flowers and saffron threads

**מתני' בית שמאי** אומרים: תבלין נדוכין במדוך של עץ, והמלח בפך ובעץ הפרור. ובית הלל אומרים: תבלין נדוכין בדרבן במדוך של אבן, והמלח במדוך של עץ.

**MISHNA** Beit Shammai say: Spices may be pounded on a Festival in a slightly unusual manner, with a wooden pestle, and salt may be pounded only with an earthenware flask or with a wooden pot ladle,<sup>N</sup> in a manner very different from that of a weekday. And Beit Hillel say: Spices may be pounded in their usual manner, even with a stone pestle, and as for salt, although it must be pounded in an irregular manner, a slight modification such as pounding it with a wooden pestle is enough to render the act permitted.<sup>H</sup>

**גמ' דכולי עלמא** מיהת מלח בעיא שנוי, מאי טעמא? רב הונא ורב חסדא; חד אמר: כל הקדרות פולין צריכות מלח, ואין כל הקדרות צריכות תבלין.

**GEMARA** In any event, everyone, both Beit Shammai and Beit Hillel, agrees that the pounding of salt requires a change; it may not be performed in the regular weekday manner. What is the reason for this? Rav Huna and Rav Hisda disputed this issue. One of them said: Everyone knows that all dishes require salt, and therefore one should prepare salt the day before the Festival. Since he failed to do so, this task may be performed on the Festival only in an unusual manner. But not all dishes require spices, and therefore it is possible that on the day prior to the Festival, one was not aware that he would require spices on the Festival.

וחד אמר: כל התבלין מפגיין טעמן, ומלח אינה מפגייה טעמה.

And the other one said a different reason: All spices lose their flavor<sup>N</sup> and cannot be prepared ahead of time, and salt does not lose its flavor, which means one could have prepared it the day before. Since he neglected to do so, he may prepare salt on the Festival only in an unusual manner.

מאי ביניהו? איכא ביניהו דידע מאי קדרה בעי לבשולי, אי נמי במוריקא.

The Gemara asks: What is the practical difference between these two reasons? The Gemara answers: The practical difference between them is in a case where one knew beforehand which type of dish he wants to cook on the Festival. Since he knew which spices he would require, he could have prepared them the day before, and which case spices are no different from salt, and one should be required to prepare them in an unusual manner. However, if the reason is that spices lose their flavor, the fact that he knew which dishes he planned to prepare is of no relevance. Alternatively, there is a practical difference in the case of saffron,<sup>B</sup> whose flavor does not dissipate over the course of a single day. Consequently, one who knows what dish he will prepare on the Festival could have prepared the saffron the day before.

אמר רב יהודה אמר שמואל: כל הנדוכין – נדוכין בדרבן, ואפילו מלח. והא אמרת מלח בעיא שנוי. הוא דאמר בי האי תנא. דתנא, אמר רבי מאיר: לא נחלקו בית שמאי ובית הלל על הנדוכין – שנדוכין בדרבן ומלח עמהן.

Rav Yehuda said that Shmuel said: All foods that must be pounded before being eaten may be pounded in their usual manner, and this applies even to salt. The Gemara challenges this: But didn't you say that everyone agrees that salt requires a change<sup>N</sup> in its manner of preparation? The Gemara answers: He said this *halakha* in accordance with the opinion of that *tanna*, as it is taught in a *baraita* that Rabbi Meir said: Beit Shammai and Beit Hillel did not disagree in the case of foods that are regularly pounded. They both maintain that they may be pounded in their usual manner, and salt can be pounded together with them.<sup>N</sup>

NOTES

**Wooden pot ladle** – עץ הפרור – Rashi holds that this refers to a kind of large, wooden kitchen spoon. The Rambam, in his Commentary on the Mishna, says that it was specifically used for stirring while cooking. Some suggest that it refers to a piece of wood with various protrusions, used for crumbling food after cooking (Ran, citing Ramban).

**All spices lose their flavor** – כל התבלין מפגיין טעמן: In the Jerusalem Talmud, two opinions are cited in this regard: Either spices lose their flavor, or their flavor turns bitter if they are left for a while before they are added to a dish.

**Salt requires a change** – מלח בעיא שנוי: The early authorities discuss the basic question of whether salt has the status of food or if it is merely a substance used in the preparation of food. If it

is not considered food, it is like other items that merely enable food to be eaten, and therefore it may not be prepared on a Festival at all. If it is food, there is no reason that one should have to change its manner of use, as all food may be prepared in the usual fashion on a Festival. They explain that since large quantities of salt are typically pounded all at once, doing so has the appearance of a weekday activity, and therefore one must adjust his method of pounding (Ran; Rabbi Aharon HaLevi).

**Salt can be pounded together with them** – ומלח עמהן: Rashi explains that this is referring to salt pounded together with other spices in the same mortar and pestle. Alternatively, including salt means that this list of spices includes salt, which may likewise be pounded on its own.

**HALAKHA**

**Pounding salt** – דיכת מלח – One may grind salt on a Festival only by tilting the mortar and pestle on its side or by using a bowl, which represents a significant modification, The *halakha* is in accordance with the opinion of Beit Hillel, as exemplified by Rav Aḥa and Rav Sheshet (*Shulḥan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim 504:1*).

**LANGUAGE**

**Groats** [*tisanei*] – טיסני – Probably from the Greek *πτισάνη*, *ptisanè*, meaning peeled barley grains or food made from barley.

לא נחלקו אלא לדוכה בפני עצמה, שביט שמאי אומרים: מלח בפך ובעץ הפרור לצלי, אבל לא לקדרה. ובית הלל אומרים: בכל דבר. בכל דבר סלקא דעתך? אלא אימא: לכל דבר.

They disagreed only about whether it is permitted to pound salt by itself, as Beit Shammai say: Salt may be pounded with a flask and with a wooden pot ladle for roasting, i.e., in small quantities, as one does not require much salt for roasting meat, but it may not be pounded in the large quantities required to salt meat for a cooked pot.<sup>N</sup> And Beit Hillel say: It may be pounded by anything. The Gemara expresses surprise at this last statement: By anything?<sup>N</sup> Can this enter your mind? How can Beit Hillel say that one may pound salt in any manner, when it has been established that everyone agrees that this may be performed only in an unusual manner? Rather, say: Salt may be pounded for anything, whether it is a small quantity for roasting or a large quantity for salting meat.

אמר ליה רב אחא ברדלא לבריה: כי דיכת – אצלי אצלוני ודוך. רב ששת שמע קל בוכנא. אמר: האי לאו מגווייה דביטאי הוא.

Rav Aḥa Bardela said to his son: When you pound salt, tilt it a little to the side and then pound, so that it will at least be performed in a slightly different manner on a Festival.<sup>N</sup> The Gemara similarly relates: Rav Sheshet heard the sound of a pestle pounding salt on a Festival. He said to himself: This sound is not coming from inside my house, as I have instructed the members of my household not to do so.<sup>H</sup>

ודלמא אצלוני אצלי? דשמעיה דהיה צליל קליה. ודלמא תבלין הווי תבלין נבוחי מנבוח קלייהו.

The Gemara asks: But perhaps they tilted it and pounded in a permitted manner? The Gemara answers: This could not have been the case, as Rav Sheshet heard that it was a clear sound, unlike the one produced when a pestle is tilted. The Gemara asks: But perhaps they were pounding spices, which may be pounded in the regular fashion on a Festival? The Gemara answers: The sound produced by pounding spices is distinctive, like a bark, which he would have recognized.

תנו רבנן: אין עושין טיסני ואין בותשין במכתשת. תרתוי? הכי קאמר: מה טעם אין עושין טיסני – לפי שאין בותשין במכתשת.

**S** The Sages taught in a *baraita*: On a Festival one may not prepare groats [*tisanei*],<sup>L</sup> a dish comprised of grains of wheat crushed into quarters, which involves great effort, nor may one grind grain with a mortar and pestle. The Gemara expresses puzzlement: These are two<sup>N</sup> contradictory rulings. The *tanna* first stated that groats alone may not be prepared, as this involves hard work, implying that other items may be ground. He subsequently states that one may not grind with a mortar and pestle at all. The Gemara answers: This is what he said: The *baraita* should be amended to read as follows: What is the reason that one may not prepare groats? Because one may not grind with a mortar and pestle.

ולמא אין בותשין במכתשת. אי תני אין בותשין במכתשת – הוה אמינא: הני מילי במכתשת גדולה, אבל במכתשת קטנה – אימא שפיר דמי קא משמע לן.

And let the *tanna* simply say: One may not grind with a mortar and pestle, from which it can be inferred that groats may not be prepared. The Gemara explains that if he teaches only: One may not grind with a mortar and pestle, I would have said that this applies only to a large mortar and pestle, whose use has the appearance of a weekday activity; but with a small mortar and pestle, one might say it seems well, and one may prepare even groats with this mortar and pestle. The *tanna* therefore teaches us that groats may not be prepared in any manner.

**NOTES**

**For roasting...for a pot** – לצלי...לקדרה: Some commentaries explain that salt must be pounded for roasted food, as coarse salt will fall off the roast, whereas in the case of a cooked dish the salt will melt in the water (*Meiri*). Others maintain that in the case of a cooked dish, one should have known he would need salt the day before, as a cooked dish always requires salt. However, salt is not always added to roasted food, and therefore one might not have known on the eve of the Festival that he would need to salt it (see Jerusalem Talmud; *Ḥatam Sofer*).

**By anything** – בכל דבר: Others explain that this refers to pounding with a stone, an object that is considered *muktze* according to all opinions (*Ritva*).

**A change with regard to salt** – שינוי במלח – The question of why one must pound in a different manner is discussed at length by both early and later authorities. Some infer from the wording of the mishna: In their manner, which is referring to salt as well, that there is no need to make any adjustment at all, as otherwise this phrase

adds nothing (*Tziyyun LeNefesh Hayya*). Others draw the opposite inference: The fact that the mishna did not merely state that salt may be pounded in their manner, but proceeded to detail how it may be pounded, indicates that although it is permitted to pound with a wooden pestle, one must nevertheless make some sort of change from the weekday method (*Ḥatam Sofer*).

**Two** – תרתוי – Rabbeinu Ḥananel, Rashi, and *Tosafot* all state that the word two, in this context, means that there are two contradictory rulings here. Some elaborate and explain that had the *tanna* first issued the general statement: One may pound with a mortar and pestle, the second *halakha* could have been considered an example of this rule. However, since he first mentioned the special case, this indicates that the general principle deviates from or contradicts the previous case (*Kikkayon DeYona*). Some early authorities explain that this is not a contradiction at all but a needless repetition, which is an alternative meaning of the one-word question: Two, which is found in several places in the Talmud (Rabbi Aharon HaLevi).



Abaye said, also, when the *baraita* was taught – אָמַר אַבַּיֵי כִּי תִנָּא: Some commentaries note that although this is apparently a new answer, the Gemara did not introduce this response with the word rather, as it usually does in these cases. This indicates that Abaye's intention was to clarify the original meaning of the previous answer (Maharsha). Others write, following *Tosafot*, that if the first answer is not cited in the name of a particular Sage, the Gemara does not use the word rather, even if the subsequent answer provides a novel explanation (Rashash).

## NOTES

הָא לָנוּ וְהָא לְהוּ – The Meiri suggests that the wheat of Eretz Yisrael was superior in quality and could be ground properly even with a small mortar and pestle. Consequently, doing so is prohibited as the weekday manner of performing the task. He also cites an alternative version of the Gemara that inserts: A fixed mortar and pestle was taught in the mishna, i.e., it is prohibited to use a small mortar and pestle that is attached to the ground, as this constitutes the exact method of labor that is performed on a regular weekday.

אֶף מִדִּית וְשׁוּלָה – An alternative version of the text reads: One may wash and skim off, which is explained by some commentaries in an entirely different manner. They maintain that washing is a lighter form of selecting, which means that the opinion of Rabban Gamliel is in fact more stringent than that of Beit Hillel, who permit one to select in the usual manner (*Meiri*; see *Kerem Shlomo*). The Jerusalem Talmud indicates likewise.

## PERSONALITIES

מָר שְׁמוּאֵל – Mar Shmuel is also called Shmuel Mar. According a tradition of the *ge'onim*, *mar* was a title of respect bestowed mainly upon the Exilarchs and their family members. Since Mar Shmuel is not found in the list of the Exilarchs, it is unlikely that he served in this position, but he was probably a family member. This is also indicated by the Gemara's comment, later in the discussion, that Rava let Mar Shmuel speak (21b). Letting someone speak usually refers to the permission granted to a family member of the Exilarch to present a public discourse of *halakha*. Mar Shmuel lived in the fourth–fifth generation of the Babylonian *amora'im* and was Rava's contemporary. Mar Shmuel was friendly with Rava, and he even left him a large sum from his estate. Although he was on intimate terms with the greatest scholars of his age, his servants, like all those of the Exilarch, were not considered trustworthy with regard to the performance of mitzvot.

וְהִתְנִיא: אֵין בּוֹתְשִׁין בְּמִכְתָּשׁתַּת גְּדוֹלָה, אֲבָל בּוֹתְשִׁין בְּמִכְתָּשׁתַּת קְטָנָה. אָמַר אַבַּיֵי: כִּי תִנָּא נִמְי מִתְנִיתָא מִכְתָּשׁתַּת גְּדוֹלָה תִנָּא.

The Gemara challenges this: But isn't it taught explicitly in a *baraita* that one may not grind with a large mortar and pestle, but one may grind with a small mortar and pestle? Abaye said: Also, when the first *baraita* was taught,<sup>N</sup> it was taught with regard to a large mortar and pestle, not a small one. In other words, the *baraita* is stating two *halakhot*, not one, as claimed previously. The *tanna* first rules that one may not prepare groats even with a small mortar and pestle, and he subsequently states that one may not use a large mortar and pestle for any purpose.

## Perek I

## Daf 14 Amud b

רָבָא אָמַר: לָא קִשְׂיָא: הָא לָנוּ, וְהָא לְהוּ.

Rava said: This is not difficult; the *baraitot* do not contradict one another. This ruling, which permits a small mortar and pestle, is for us, the residents of Babylonia, who do not have servants, and that statement is for them,<sup>N</sup> the inhabitants of Eretz Yisrael, who have many servants. Since servants might treat the prohibition lightly, by using a large mortar and pestle and claiming they had used only a small one, they are prohibited from pounding in all cases.<sup>H</sup>

רַב פַּפִּי אֶקְלַע לְבֵי מָר שְׁמוּאֵל, אֵייתִי לִיה דִּי קִסָּא וְלֹא אָכַל. וְדִלְמָא בְּמִכְתָּשׁתַּת קְטָנָה עֲבָדוּהּ? דְּתַזְוִיָּה דְּהוּהּ דִּי קִסָּא טָפִי.

The Gemara relates: Rav Pappi happened to come on a Festival to the house of Mar Shmuel.<sup>P</sup> He brought to him porridge, made from wheat groats, but he did not eat it, out of concern that the wheat might have been pounded on the same day. The Gemara asks: And perhaps they performed the pounding with a small mortar and pestle, in a permitted manner? The Gemara answers: This cannot be the case, as he observed that it was well ground, which cannot be achieved by means of a small mortar and pestle.

וְדִלְמָא מֵאֲתָמוּל עֲבָדוּהּ? דְּתַזְוִיָּה דְּהוּהּ דִּי קִלְיָ צְהַרְיָה. וְאֵי בְּעֵית אֵימָא: שְׂאֵנִי בֵי מָר שְׁמוּאֵל, דְּאֵיכָא פְּרִיצוּתָא דְּעַבְדֵי.

The Gemara asks: And perhaps they prepared it the day before, on the Festival eve? The Gemara answers: This cannot be the case, as he observed that the husks of the groats were bright, an indication that they had been prepared recently. And if you wish, say instead that he refrained from eating for another reason, because the house of Mar Shmuel is different, as he had slaves, and slaves are lax with regard to prohibitions. Therefore, Mar Shmuel ought to have prohibited all forms of grinding in his house, to ensure that no one grind anything in an inappropriate manner.

מִתְנִי הַבּוֹרֵר קְטָנוֹת בְּיוֹם טוֹב, בֵּית שְׁמַאי אוֹמְרִים: בּוֹרֵר אוֹכֵל וְאוֹכֵל, וּבֵית הַלֵּל אוֹמְרִים: בּוֹרֵר כְּדָרְכוּ. בְּחִיקוּ בְּקַנּוֹן וּבְתַמְחוּי, אֲבָל לֹא בְּטַבְּלָא וְלֹא בְּנֶפֶחַ וְלֹא בְּכַבְרָה. רַבֵּן גַּמְלִיאֵל אוֹמַר אֶף מִדִּית וְשׁוּלָה.

**MISHNA** With regard to one who selects legumes on a Festival by separating the edible and inedible portions, Beit Shammai say: He may select food and eat it immediately, while leaving the refuse. And Beit Hillel say: He may select in his usual manner, in his lap, with a tray, or with a large vessel, but he may not do so with a tablet, nor with a winnow, nor with a sieve, as these vessels are specially designed for selecting, which gives his action the appearance of a weekday activity. Rabban Gamliel says: One may even wash the legumes in water and skim off the refuse floating on top.<sup>HN</sup>

## HALAKHA

**Preparing groats** – עֲשִׂיתָ גְּרִיסִים: It is prohibited to grind wheat into groats with a large mortar and pestle. If one did so, some authorities hold that he may not eat them, and it is proper to be stringent in this regard, as in the incident of Rav Pappi (*Magen Avraham*). It is, however, permitted to grind in an unusual manner, i.e., with a small mortar and pestle. In Eretz Yisrael, it is prohibited to do so even with a small mortar and pestle, for one of the following reasons: The wheat there is a high quality, and there is no loss in the quality of the dishes prepared with wheat ground the day before (Rambam); the large number of slaves make it more likely that the grinding will be done inappropriately (*Maggid Mishne*, citing Rashi; *Magen Avraham*, citing *Yam Shel Shlomo*); or, a small mortars and pestles are invariably used in Eretz Yisrael,

and therefore using the small mortar and pestle does not count as an unusual manner (Ra'avad) This ruling follows the statement made by Rava (*Mishna Berura*, citing *Peri Hadash*; *Shulhan Arukh*, *Orah Hayyim* 504:3).

**Selecting legumes** – בְּרִירַת קְטָנוֹת: It is permitted to select legumes in the usual manner on a Festival, into one's lap or with a funnel. However, one may not use vessels especially designed for this purpose, e.g., a winnow or a sieve, in accordance with the opinion of Beit Hillel. Some say that one must eat the food immediately after selecting (*Taz*, citing Rashba), whereas others hold it is sufficient to eat it on the same day (*Magen Avraham*; *Shulhan Arukh*, *Orah Hayyim* 510:2).

The refuse is greater than the food – פסולת מרובה על – האוכל: If a mixture contains more waste than food, one may select and remove the food and leave behind the refuse, in accordance with the opinion of Rabban Gamliel. If the removal of the refuse involves greater effort than selecting the food, one may remove the food, even if there is more food than refuse. In general, one should perform this action in the manner that requires the least effort (*Arukh HaShulhan*). If nuts or a similar food have been cracked but are still inside their shells, the shells are not considered refuse (*Rema*), although some are stringent in this regard (*Taz; Magen Avraham*). Some authorities prohibit one to eat foods that can easily lead to the transgression of selecting, *ab initio* (*Shulhan Arukh HaRav; Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim 510:2*).

What kinds of food one may send – אילו מיני אכל – משלחים: In addition to prepared food, one may send live animals and fowl as a gift, provided they are not *muktze*, as well as wine, oil, flour, and legumes. One may not send grain that requires grinding, as grinding is a labor prohibited on a Festival. The *halakha* is in accordance with the opinion of Beit Hillel and the unattributed mishna (*Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim 516:1*).

Provided that he does not do it by means of a convoy – ובלבד שלא יעשנו בשורה – Even those objects that one may bring to another on a Festival may not be sent by a convoy of three people carrying a single type of food. If they are carrying three different kinds of food, it is permitted, provided that the three people are not positioned in a straight line. The reason for this ruling is that the Gemara's question is left unresolved, and the *halakha* is lenient in cases involving uncertainty about a rabbinic prohibition (*Maggid Mishne*). Some authorities prohibit sending items via a line of people even within the same courtyard (*Magen Avraham*), while others are lenient (*Shulhan Arukh HaRav*). One may rely on this lenient opinion in a case of need (*Mishna Berura; Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim 516:2*).

גמ' תניא, אמר רבן גמליאל: במה דברים אמורים – קשה אוכל מרובה על הפסולת, אבל פסולת מרובה על האוכל – דברי הכל נוטל את האוכל ומניח את הפסולת.

פסולת מרובה על האוכל מי איכא מאן דשרי? לא צריכא, דנפיש בטרחא וזוטר בשיעורא.

רבן גמליאל אמר אף מדיח ושולה. תניא, אמר רבי אלעזר ברבי צדוק: כך היה מנהגן של בית רבן גמליאל: שהיו מביאין דלי מלא עדשים ומציפין עליו מים, ונמצא אוכל למטה ופסולת למעלה.

והתניא איכא! לא קשיא: הא בעפרא, הא בגילוי.

מתני' בית שמאי אומרים: אין משלחין ביום טוב אלא מנות, ובית הלל אומרים: משלחין בהמה חיה ועוף, בין חיין בין שחוטין. משלחין יינות, שמנים, וסלתות, וקטניות, אבל לא תבואה. ורבי שמעון מתיר בתבואה.

גמ' תני רב יחיאל: ובלבד שלא יעשנו בשורה. תנא: אין שורה פחותה משלשה בני אדם. בעי רב אשי: תלתא גברי ותלתא מיני מאי? תיקו.

**GEMARA** It is taught in a *baraita*: Rabban Gamliel said: In what case is this statement said? Under what circumstances did Beit Hillel permit the removal of the refuse in the weekday manner of selecting? In a case where the quantity of the food is greater than the quantity of the refuse. However, if the quantity of refuse is greater than the quantity of food,<sup>NH</sup> everyone agrees that one must remove the food and leave the refuse.

The Gemara asks: If the quantity of refuse is greater than the quantity of food, is there an opinion that permits it? Since the smaller amount of food is nullified by the refuse, the entire mixture is considered *muktze* and may not be moved. The Gemara answers: No, it is necessary to state this *halakha* in a case where the removal of the refuse is greater in terms of effort, and yet it is smaller in size. In other words, there is actually more food than refuse, but since greater effort is required to remove the refuse, it is preferable to remove the food.

The mishna taught that Rabban Gamliel says: One may even wash the legumes in water and skim off the refuse floating on top. It is taught (*Tosefta, Beitza 1*): Rabbi Elazar, son of Rabbi Tzadok, said: This was the custom of the house of Rabban Gamliel, that they would bring a bucket full with lentils and pour water in it, and then the food would sink down and the refuse would float up, which spared them from having to separate the lentils from the refuse manually.

The Gemara asks: But isn't the opposite taught in another *baraita*, that the food rose to the top while the refuse sunk below? The Gemara answers: It is not difficult. This *baraita*, which says the refuse sinks down, is referring to refuse in the form of earth, which sinks below the lentils; that *baraita*, where it is stated that the refuse rises, speaks of straw, which floats on water.

**MISHNA** Beit Shammai say: One may send only portions<sup>N</sup> of prepared food on a Festival, but not any other gifts. And Beit Hillel say: One may even send gifts of domesticated animals, undomesticated animals, and fowl, whether alive or slaughtered. Similarly, one may send wines, oils, and vessels of flour, and even legumes, but not grain, which is unfit for use, as one may not grind it on the Festival. And Rabbi Shimon permits sending gifts even in the case of grain,<sup>N</sup> as it can be made into porridge without being ground.<sup>H</sup>

**GEMARA** Rav Yehiel teaches: And one may send these items provided that he does not do it by means of a convoy<sup>H</sup> of people, as they would look as though they were transporting merchandise to the marketplace. It is taught in a *baraita*: A convoy consists of no less than three people;<sup>N</sup> if there are fewer than three, it is not called a convoy and is permitted. Rav Ashi raised a dilemma: In a case of three people and three different types of food, what is the *halakha*? Is this considered a convoy, or does the fact that there are three different types of food mean that each of them is considered a separate item? The Gemara answers: The dilemma shall stand unresolved, as no answer was found.

NOTES

The quantity of refuse is greater than the quantity of food, etc. – פסולת מרובה על האוכל וכו' – Rashi and other commentaries explain that if there is more refuse than food, the food is negated by the refuse; it is all considered *muktze* and one may not select it in any manner.

One may send only portions – אין משלחין... אלא מנות – The Jerusalem Talmud asks why Beit Shammai permit one to send the thigh of a cow, though it is much larger than a small goat, which they prohibit. The answer given there is that the relevant difference is between carrying a live animal and carrying a piece of meat. However, it is permitted to lead a live animal to another to present it to him as a gift for the Festival. Some maintain

that the reason Beit Shammai prohibit sending gifts is that are not prepared food, due to the prohibition against carrying out an item that serves no purpose on the Festival, from one domain to another (Rashi). The Rambam, however, explains that Beit Shammai prohibited it because it has the appearance of a weekday activity.

Rabbi Shimon permits in the case of grain – רבי שמעון מתיר – Rabbi Shimon's reasoning is apparently based on the fact that grain can be made fit for use by means of a small mortar and pestle, and therefore it may be sent on a Festival. The first *tanna*, in objecting to the sending of grain as a gift on a Festival, reasons that the principle is determined by the usual

case, where one would not use unground grain on a Festival (Ra'avan). In the Jerusalem Talmud, it is explained that Rabbi Shimon rules in accordance with the opinion of his teacher, Rabbi Akiva, who maintains that even labor required for feeding animals may be performed on a Festival. Consequently, it is permitted to send grain, as it is fit for animal fodder in its current state.

A convoy of three – שורה של שלשה – Some commentaries explain that when three people walk together it has the appearance of a weekday activity (Rambam). Others hold that if three people walk together, they can be viewed as merchants: Buyer, seller, and middleman (Rabbeinu Efrayim).

**Ludiyot** – לודיות: This is a dish prepared from cooked wheat that has not been ground. It is mixed with nuts and pomegranates and eaten as a dessert.

**Diverse kinds** – בלאים: In this context, the term diverse kinds is referring to the *halakha* of *sha'atnez*, the prohibition by Torah law to wear a mixture of wool and linen (see Leviticus 19:19 and Deuteronomy 22:11). One may not wear a garment in which these two materials have been spun, woven, or sewn together. Certain other combinations are prohibited by rabbinic decree. In addition, as noted in the Gemara, the Sages added a prohibition against lying on mattresses that contain a mixture of wool and linen. However, one may manufacture, sell, and derive benefit from these garments.

**The sacred congregation of Jerusalem** – קהלא קדישא – דבירושלים: The *Arukh* and others identify this sacred congregation of Jerusalem with the so-called Sacred Assembly. This group, as explained in the Jerusalem Talmud, refers primarily to the Sages Rabbi Yosei ben Meshulam and Rabbi Shimon ben Menasya. They were known by this name because they would divide their days into thirds: A third for prayer, a third for Torah, and a third for work. It is also possible that they received this title because they continued to reside in Jerusalem even after the destruction of the Second Temple, in a period when simply living in the ruined city constituted a sanctification of God's name (see 27b).

## HALAKHA

**One may send clothes** – משלחין בלים: One may send clothes to a friend on a Festival, whether or not they are sewn. Even clothes made of a mixture of wool and linen may be sent, if they serve a requirement of the Festival. It is, however, prohibited to send unsewn shoes or ones that have spikes (*Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Ḥayyim* 516:3).

**Using garments of diverse kinds** – שמוש בשעטנו: By Torah law, it is permitted to sit on a cloth made of a mixture of wool and linen. The Sages, however, prohibited doing so, even if only the bottom layer contains the prohibited mixture. However, the prohibition applies only to soft garments. This means that one may sit on a hard garment made of the prohibited mixture that is placed on a hard surface, but one may not do so if the garment was stuffed or placed on soft material. Some say that if the mixture is prohibited by rabbinic law, one can sit on hard cloth made of prohibited mixtures (Rema; see *Shakh*). Others are stringent even with regard to sitting on the cushions of a wagon (*Arukh HaShulhan*). It is permitted to drape oneself with a garment made of a mixture of wool and linen if he does not do so for warmth, e.g., to protect himself from the rain or sun (*Shulhan Arukh, Yoreh De'a* 301:1).

## LANGUAGE

**Thread** [*nima*] – נימא: From the Greek νῆμα, *nēma*, meaning a thread or a hair.

**Curtain** [*vilon*] – וילון: Possibly from the Latin *velum*, whose meanings include a screen or a curtain, or from the Greek βῆλος, *bēlos*, meaning a threshold.

”רבי שמעון מתיר בתבואה”. תנא: רבי שמעון מתיר בתבואה, כגון חטין – לעשות מהן לודיות, שעורים – ליתן לפני בהמתו, עדשים – לעשות מהן רסיסין.

**מתני'** משלחין בלים, בין תפורין בין שאינן תפורין, ואף על פי שיש בהן בלאים, והן לצורך המועד. אבל לא סנדל המסומר, ולא מנעל שאינו תפור. רבי יהודה אומר: אף לא מנעל לבן, מפני שצריך אומן, זה הכלל: כל שנאותן בו ביום טוב – משלחין אותו.

**גמ'** בשלמא תפורין – חזו למבויש; שאין תפורין נמי – חזו לכסויי, אלא בלאים למאי חזו?

וכי תימא: חזו למימך תותיה, והתנא: "לא יעלה עליך" – אבל אתה יכול להציעו תחתך. אבל אמרו חכמים: אסור לעשות כן, שמא תכרך לו נימא על בשרו.

וכי תימא: דמפסיק מידי ביני ביני, והאמר רבי שמעון בן פאי אמר רבי יהושע בן לוי אמר רבי יוסי בן שאול אמר רבי משום קהלא קדישא דבירושלים: אפילו עשר מצעות זו על גבי זו ובלאים תחתיהן – אסור לישן עליהם, (משום שניאמר "לא יעלה עליך").

אלא בילון. והאמר עולא: מפני מה אמרו וילון טמא – מפני שהשמש מתחמם כנגדו!

The mishna taught that Rabbi Shimon permits the sending of grain. It is taught in a *baraita*: Rabbi Shimon permits the sending of grain, for example: Wheat to prepare from it *ludiyot*,<sup>B</sup> a type of cookie; barley to place before his animal; or lentils to prepare from them *resisin*, a dish made from crushed lentils.

**MISHNA** One may send clothes,<sup>H</sup> whether they are sewn or whether they are unsewn, and even if they contain diverse kinds,<sup>B</sup> a prohibited mixture of wool and linen [*sha'atnez*].<sup>N</sup> But one may do so only if they serve the purposes of the Festival. However, one may not send a spiked sandal, which has nails fixed to it, as the Sages decreed that one may not wear a sandal of this kind on a Shabbat or Festival, nor an unsewn shoe, which is not suitable for a Festival. Rabbi Yehuda says: One may not even send a white shoe, which people do not usually wear, because it requires an artisan to paint it black. This is the general principle: Anything that one may use on a Festival, one may send it.

**GEMARA** The Gemara asks a question: Granted, it is permitted to send sewn clothes, as they are suitable for wearing. With regard to clothes that are not sewn as well, they are at least suitable for covering oneself. But in the case of clothes than contain diverse kinds, for what use are they suited? Since these clothes may not be used on the Festival, why is it permitted to send them?

And if you say that clothes of diverse kinds are suited for one to place underneath himself, but isn't it taught in a *baraita*: "Neither shall there come upon you a garment of diverse kinds" (Leviticus 19:19)? This verse teaches that one may not wear this garment, but by Torah law you may spread it beneath you. However, the Sages said: It is prohibited to do so, lest a thread [*nima*]<sup>L</sup> wind itself around his flesh. This shows that the Sages prohibited even spreading underneath oneself a cloth that contains a mixture of wool and linen.

And if you say that the allowance of cloth of diverse kinds is referring to a case where there is something separating between them, i.e., one may place a garment of diverse kinds beneath another object, but didn't Rabbi Shimon ben Pazi say that Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said that Rabbi Yosei ben Shaul said that Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi said, in the name of the sacred congregation in Jerusalem:<sup>B</sup> Even in a case of ten mattresses placed one on top of the other and a cloth of diverse kinds underneath them, it is prohibited to sleep on them, as it is stated: "Neither shall there come upon you" (Leviticus 19:19).<sup>H</sup>

Rather, the mishna is referring to a curtain [*vilon*]<sup>L</sup> of diverse kinds, which may be hung up, as it is not an item of clothing. The Gemara challenges this: But didn't Ulla say: For what reason did the Sages say that a curtain is ritually impure,<sup>N</sup> i.e., that it can contract the impurity of a vessel despite the fact that it is not directly used by people? Because the attendant warms himself with it. Since attendants use curtains as makeshift blankets when they are cold, a curtain may not be made from a mixture of wool and linen.

## NOTES

The mitzva of diverse kinds – מצוות בלאים: Most authorities agree that an article of diverse kinds designed to be worn or draped over one's body is prohibited in all cases, whereas an item made for sitting is prohibited only due to the decree lest a thread winds itself around him. Consequently, if one places a cover on it, it is permitted.

A curtain is ritually impure – וילון טמא: Some maintain that a curtain can indeed contract various forms of ritual impurity, either by touch or by treading. However, this is due to

its status as a vessel, not because it can be worn. Ulla merely added another reason that it would be capable of contracting ritual impurity: A curtain is sometimes considered a garment. Alternatively, Ulla is explaining the fundamental reason for the impurity of a curtain, i.e., why it is not considered part of the house, which is not susceptible to impurity at all: Since a curtain is occasionally used as a kind of garment, the Sages decreed that all types of curtains and screens, including the one in the Temple, can contract ritual impurity, even if they do not serve this purpose at all (Rabbi Aharon HaLevi).