

One may not consecrate, or take a valuation vow, or consecrate objects for use by the priests or the Temple, or separate *terumot* or tithes – לא מקדישין ולא מעריכין ולא מחרימין ולא מגביהין תרומות ומעשרות ומעשרות. One may not consecrate animals or objects, take a valuation vow, or separate *terumot* or tithes on Shabbat or on a Festival because these resemble commercial activities (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Shabbat* 23:14 and *Sefer Korbanot, Hilkhot Korban Pesah* 1:19; *Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim* 339:4, 524:1).

NOTES

One may cast lots – ומטילין חלשין: The rationale for this ruling is that by casting lots, the priests display affection for the mitzva of eating the sacrifices (Rambam).

והא תני רבי הושעיא: הולך אדם אצל רועה דרגיל אצלו ונותן לו טלה לפסחו ומקדישו, ויוצא בו. התם נמי, כיון דרגיל אצלו – אקדושי ליה מעיקרא, והא "מקדיש" קתני. הקדש עילו, מדרבנן.

The Gemara raises another proof to the view of Rabbi Yoḥanan: **But Rabbi Hoshaya taught: One who wants to bring a Paschal lamb and does not have his own lamb may go to a shepherd to whom he normally goes, and the shepherd may give him a lamb to be used for his Paschal lamb, and he may consecrate it and fulfill his obligation with it.** This indicates that one may consecrate an animal on Shabbat. The Gemara answers: **There, too,** it is referring to a special case. **Since he normally goes to him every year, the shepherd has already consecrated it beforehand,** prior to Shabbat. The Gemara challenges this explanation: **But it taught that one may consecrate it,** indicating that the animal is only now being consecrated. The Gemara answers: This is not an actual sanctification in the normal sense, but rather **consecration by valuation.** By consecrating their animals on their own, the owners add further sanctity to the offering. This process is merely **rabbinic,** and it may be performed on Shabbat according to all opinions.

ומי אמר רבי יוחנן הכי? והא אמר רבי יוחנן: הלכה כסתם משנה, ותנן: לא מקדישין ולא מעריכין ולא מחרימין ולא מגביהין תרומות ומעשרות, כל אלו – ביום טוב אמרו, קל וחומר בשבת. לא קשיא: כאן – בחובות שקבוע להן זמן, כאן – בחובות שאין קבוע להן זמן.

The Gemara questions the very basis of this discussion: **Did Rabbi Yoḥanan really say this? But Rabbi Yoḥanan stated as a general principle that the halakha is always in accordance with an unattributed mishna, i.e., a mishna that does not mention the name of the Sage whose ruling is quoted in the mishna. And we learned in an unattributed mishna: One may not consecrate, or take a valuation vow, or consecrate objects for use by the priests or the Temple, or separate terumot or tithes;** they said all of these prohibitions with regard to a Festival, and it is an *a fortiori* inference that these activities are prohibited on Shabbat as well. How, then, would Rabbi Yoḥanan have permitted sanctifying an animal on Shabbat or on a Festival? The Gemara answers: This is **not difficult.** Here, in the case in which Rabbi Yoḥanan deems it permitted, it is referring to **obligations that have a set time,** such that if the person does not consecrate the animal right now he will no longer be able to fulfill the mitzva. **There,** in the mishna that prohibits these activities, the prohibition is referring to **obligations that do not have a set time,** and one can therefore consecrate the animal after Shabbat.

MISHNA One may count his guests who are coming to his meal and his appetizers, as long as he does so from memory; but one may not read them from a written list, the reason for which will be explained in the Gemara. **A person may draw lots with his children and family members at the table on Shabbat, in order to determine who will receive which portion, as long as he does not intend to set a large portion against a small portion in such a lottery. Rather, the portions must be of equal size. And one may cast lots^N among the priests for sanctified foods on a Festival, but not for the specific portions.**

מתני' מונה אדם את אורחיו ואת פירותיו מפיו, אבל לא מן הכתב. מפני אדם עם בניו ועם בני ביתו על השולחן, ובלבד שלא יתכוין לעשות מנה גדולה כנגד מנה קטנה. ומטילין חלשין על הקדשים ביום טוב, אבל לא על המנות.

Perek XXIII
Daf 149 Amud a

גמ' מאי טעמא? רב ביבי אמר: גזירה שמיא ומחוק. אבני אמר: גזירה שמיא וקרא בשטרי הדיוטות.

GEMARA We learned in the mishna that one may not read the names of his guests or the appetizers served in his meal from a written list. The Gemara asks: **What is the reason** for this prohibition? **Rav Beivai said:** It is a decree lest one erase something that is written on the list if he regrets inviting a particular guest or changes his mind about a particular dish. **Abaye said:** It is a decree lest one read regular business documents.

מאי בינייהו? איכא בינייהו: דכתב אכותל, ומילי למאן דאמר שמיא ומחוק – לא חיישינן, ולמאן דאמר שמיא וקרא – חיישינן.

The Gemara asks: **What is the practical difference between them?** The Gemara answers: **There is a difference between them** in a case in which the writing is on a wall and it is raised higher than a person can reach. **According to the one who says that the decree was made lest one erase something from the list, in a case such as this we are not concerned** about erasure because one cannot even reach the writing. **But according to the one who says that the decree was made lest one read business documents, we are still concerned** in this case.

NOTES

Lest one erase...lest one read – שָׂמָא יִמְחֹק...שָׂמָא יִקְרָא: Since these two concerns are so similar to one another, and it is impossible to rule out the possibility that a person might erase or read a business document on Shabbat, we accept both concerns expressed by Rav Beivai and Abaye. Therefore, they only disagree about cases where only one concern is applicable.

Rather, we should actually explain that the writing was on a wall and was raised – אֲלָא לְעוֹלָם דְּכֵתֵב אֲבוּתָל – וּמִיִּדְלִי: The commentaries dispute the meaning of this part of the discussion. The Rif and others explain that it is a continuation of the previous discussion with regard to the distinction between the positions of Rav Beivai and Abaye. Other commentaries say that this statement introduces a new discussion, which attempts to resolve the differences between the mishna and the *baraita* with regard to reading a list on a wall.

HALAKHA

Reading lists of guests or food – קְרִיאַת רְשִׁימַת הָאוֹרָחִים – וְהַמְצַאֲכִילִים: It is prohibited to read lists of guests or food that one has prepared for a meal on Shabbat, even if they are written high up on a wall. The rationale is the concern that one might read business documents on Shabbat. Even if the list is engraved, rather than written, on a tablet or a board, it is still prohibited to read the list. However, if the list is engraved on a wall, it is permitted to read it. This ruling is in accordance with the opinion of Abaye (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Shabbat* 23:19; *Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim* 307:12).

וּלְמַאן דְּאָמַר "שָׂמָא יִמְחֹק" נִיחוּשׁ שָׂמָא יִקְרָא. וְתוֹ: לְשָׂמָא יִמְחֹק לֹא חִיְשִׁינָן? וְהִתְנַיָּא: לֹא יִקְרָא לְאוּר הַנֵּר, וְאָמַר רַבָּה: אֲפִילוּ גְבוּהַ שְׁתֵּי מְרָדְעוֹת, אֲפִילוּ עֶשְׂרֵה בֵּתַיִם זֶה עַל גְּבִי זֶה – לֹא יִקְרָא.

אֲלָא, אִיכָא בִּינְיֵיהוּ: דְּכֵתֵב אֲבוּתָל וּמִיתְתֵּן, לְמַאן דְּאָמַר שָׂמָא יִמְחֹק – חִיְשִׁינָן, לְמַאן דְּאָמַר שָׂמָא יִקְרָא – לֹא חִיְשִׁינָן, גּוּדָא בְּשַׁטְרָא לֹא מִיחְלֵף.

וּלְמַאן דְּאָמַר "שָׂמָא יִקְרָא" לִיחוּשׁ שָׂמָא יִמְחֹק. אֲלָא, אִיכָא בִּינְיֵיהוּ: דְּחִיִּיק אֲטַבְלָא וְאִפְיִנְקַס. לְמַאן דְּאָמַר שָׂמָא יִמְחֹק – לֹא חִיְשִׁינָן. לְמַאן דְּאָמַר שָׂמָא יִקְרָא – חִיְשִׁינָן.

וּלְמַאן דְּאָמַר "שָׂמָא יִמְחֹק" לִיחוּשׁ שָׂמָא יִקְרָא. וְכִי תִּימָא: טַבְלָא וּפִינְקַס בְּשַׁטְרָא לֹא מִיחְלֵף – וְהִתְנַיָּא: מוֹנֵה אָדָם כְּמַה מְבַפְנִים וְכְמַה מְבַחֵחֵץ, וְכְמַה מְנוֹת עֲתִיד לְהֵיחַ לְפָנֵיהֶם מִכְּתָב שְׁעַל גְּבִי הַכּוֹתֵל, אֲבָל לֹא מִכְּתָב שְׁעַל גְּבִי טַבְלָא וּפִינְקַס.

הִיכִי דְּמִי? אִילִימָא דְּכֵתִיב מִכְּתָב – מֵאֵי שְׁנָא הֵכָא וּמֵאֵי שְׁנָא הֵכָא? אֲלָא לֹא – דְּחִיִּיק, וְקִתְנֵי: מִכְּתָב שְׁעַל גְּבִי הַכּוֹתֵל, אֲבָל לֹא מִכְּתָב שְׁעַל גְּבִי טַבְלָא וּפִינְקַס.

אֲלָא לְעוֹלָם דְּכֵתֵב אֲבוּתָל וּמִיִּדְלִי. וְדִקָּא קְשִׁיָּא לָךְ דְּרַבָּה – דְּרַבָּה תִּנְיָא הִיא. דְּתִנְיָא: מוֹנֵה אָדָם אֶת אוֹרְחָיו וְאֶת פְּרַפְרוֹתָיו מִפִּיּו, אֲבָל לֹא מִן הַכְּתָב. רַבִּי אַחָא מִתִּיר מִכְּתָב שְׁעַל גְּבִי הַכּוֹתֵל.

הִיכִי דְּמִי? אִילִימָא דְּכֵתִיב מִתְתָּא – לִיחוּשׁ שָׂמָא יִמְחֹק. אֲלָא לֹא – דְּכֵתֵב וּמִיִּדְלִי. וְשִׁמְעַ מִינֵהּ: דְּרַבָּה תִּנְיָא הִיא, שְׁמַע מִינֵהּ.

The Gemara asks: **And according to the one who says that the decree was made lest one erase, we should also be concerned lest one read^N business documents. And furthermore, are we really not concerned lest one erase when the writing is high up? But wasn't it taught in a *baraita* that one may not read by the light of a lamp on Shabbat lest one adjust the lamp toward oneself; and Rabba said: Even even if the lamp was two statures of a person high, and even as high as two plow handles, and even if it was as high as ten houses one atop the other, one may not read by its light.** This clearly demonstrates that when we are concerned that one may violate *halakha*, we do not distinguish between situations in which such a violation is more or less likely.

Rather, there is a difference between them in a case in which the writing is on a wall and it is low down. According to the one who says that the reason for the decree is lest one erase, in a case such as this we are concerned because one can easily reach the writing and erase it. However, according to the one who says that the decree was made lest one read business documents, we are not concerned because a wall will not be confused with a document, and reading from the wall will not cause one to then read business documents.

The Gemara asks further: **And according to the one who says that the concern is lest one read, we should also be concerned lest one erase. Rather, there is a practical difference between them in a case where the writing is engraved on a tablet or on a board. According to the one who says that the concern is lest one erase, in a case such as this we are not concerned.** Since the writing is not in ink, there is no concern that he will erase it. **According to the one who says that the concern is lest one read business documents, we are concerned.** The style of writing is irrelevant in terms of the likelihood that one will end up reading business documents.

The Gemara asks further: **According to the one who says that the concern is lest one erase, we should also be concerned lest one read business documents. And if you say: A tablet or a board will not be confused with a document, but wasn't it taught explicitly in a *baraita*: One may count how many guests will sit inside, and how many guests will sit outside, and how many portions he will place before them^H from writing that is on the wall, but not from writing that is on a tablet or a board?**

The Gemara attempts to clarify this: **What are the circumstances of the case described in this statement? If you say that it was written in ink, what is the difference here, when the writing is on a wall, and what is the difference here, when the writing is on a tablet? Rather, is it not a case of a list that has been engraved, and nonetheless it teaches that one may read from writing that is on the wall but not from writing that is on a tablet or a board?**

Rather, we should actually explain that the writing was on a wall and was raised.^N And with regard to what was difficult for you, based on Rabba's statement that prohibited reading by candlelight on Shabbat regardless of the height of the candle, which presumably means that in our case, too, we should be stringent regardless of the height of the writing, that statement of Rabba is the subject of dispute between *tanna'im*, as it was taught in a *baraita*: **One may count one's guests and one's appetizers from memory, but not from a written list. Rabbi Aḥa permits reading from a written list that is on a wall.**

The Gemara attempts to clarify this: **What are the circumstances in which Rabbi Aḥa permits this? If you say that it is written below, low down on the wall, we should be concerned that perhaps one will erase it. Rather, is it not referring to a case in which it is written and the location of the writing is raised such that it is high up on the wall, and conclude from this that the statement of Rabba is the subject of dispute among the *tanna'im*?** The Gemara concludes: **Indeed, conclude from this that it is so.**

וְהַיָּמִין תִּנְאֵי כֶהֱנִי תִנְאֵי: דְתִנְאֵי: אֵין רוֹאֵין בְּמִרְאָה בְּשַׁבַּת, רַבֵּי מְאִיר מְתִיר בְּמִרְאָה הַקְּבֻעַ בְּכוּתֵל.

The Gemara comments that in this matter, these *tanna'im* are like those *tanna'im*, who also argued over the same principle, as it was taught in a *baraita*: **One may not look in a mirror on Shabbat**^{NH} lest one see a hair hanging and pluck it. **Rabbi Meir permits looking in a mirror that is fixed on a wall.**

מְאִיר שְׁנֵא הַקְּבֻעַ בְּכוּתֵל - דְּאִדְהֵי וְהֵבֵי מְדַבֵּר, שְׂאִינוּ קָבוּעַ נְמוּ - אִדְהֵי וְהֵבֵי מְדַבֵּר.

The Gemara questions Rabbi Meir's leniency: **What is different about a mirror that is fixed on a wall?** In that situation we say **that, in the meantime**, while one goes to bring scissors or another appliance to cut one's hair, **one will remember** that it is Shabbat and that it is prohibited to cut hair. If so, with regard to a mirror **that is not fixed on a wall**, we can also say that **in the meantime one will remember**.

הֲכֵא בְּמִרְאָה שֶׁל מִתְּכַת עֶסְקִינוּ, וְכֵדָרַב נְחִמְן אָמַר רַבָּה בֵּר אַבּוּה. דְּאָמַר רַב נְחִמְן אָמַר רַבָּה בֵּר אַבּוּה: מִפְּנֵי מָה אָמְרוּ "מִרְאָה שֶׁל מִתְּכַת - אַסּוּרָה" - מִפְּנֵי שְׂאִדְם עֲשׂוּי לְהַשִּׁיר בָּהּ נְמוּן הַמִּדּוּלְדֵּלִין.

Rather, **here we are dealing with a metal mirror**, and it is as **Rav Nahman** said that **Rabba bar Avuh** said, for **Rav Nahman** said that **Rabba bar Avuh** said: **For what reason did the Sages say that a metal mirror is prohibited for use on Shabbat? Because a person may remove hanging hairs with it**, meaning that one may use the sharp edge of the mirror itself to cut the hairs. If the mirror is permanently set on the wall, we are not concerned that one will do this. This is similar to the view that one may read writing that is high up on a wall because it is impractical to erase the writing.

תִּנוּ רַבְנַן: כְּתַב הַמְּהַלֵּךְ תַּחַת הַעֲצוּדָה וְתַחַת הַדְּיוֹקְנָאוֹת - אַסּוּר לְקִרְוֹתוֹ בְּשַׁבַּת. וְדִיוֹקְנָא עֲצֻמָּה - אִף בְּחוּל אַסּוּר לְהַסְתִּיל בָּהּ, מִשּׁוּם שְׁנַאָמַר "אֵל תִּפְנוּ אֶל הָאֱלִילִים". מֵאֵי תֵּלְמוּדֵי דָּא? אָמַר רַבֵּי חֲנִינּוּ: אֵל תִּפְנוּ אֶל מִדְּעֻתְכֶם.

The Sages taught in a *baraita*: **With regard to writing that is under a picture^H or under graven images [deyokenaot]^L**, it is **prohibited to read it on Shabbat** lest one end up reading business documents. **And with regard to an idolatrous image^H itself, even on a weekday it is prohibited to look at it, because it says:** "**Do not turn toward idols** [*al tifnu el ha'elilim*]^N or make yourselves molten gods, I am the Lord your God" (Leviticus 19:4). The Gemara asks for clarification: **What is the biblical derivation?** How does this verse indicate that one may not look at an idolatrous image? **Rabbi Hanin** said: **Do not push God** [*al tefannu El*] **out of your mind** by looking at these images (*Aruk*).

"מִמִּפְּיֵי אֲדָם עִם בְּנֵי וְכו'". עִם בְּנֵי וְעִם בְּנֵי בֵיתוֹ - אֵין, וְעִם אַחֵר - לֹא. מֵאֵי טַעְמָא? כְּדָרַב יְהוּדָה אָמַר שְׁמוּאֵל. דְּאָמַר רַב יְהוּדָה אָמַר שְׁמוּאֵל: בְּנֵי חֲבוּרָה הַמְּקַפְּדִין זֶה עַל זֶה - עוֹבְרִין מִשּׁוּם מִדָּה וּמִשּׁוּם מִשְׁקַל, וּמִשּׁוּם מְנוּן, וּמִשּׁוּם לְוָיָן וּפּוֹרְעִין בְּיוֹם טוֹב.

We learned in the mishna that **a person may draw lots with one's children** and family members at the table on Shabbat to see who will receive which meal portion. The Gemara infers: **With one's children and family members, yes**, it is permitted, **but with another person it is not. What is the reason for this?** The Gemara explains that it is as **Rav Yehuda** said that **Shmuel** said, for **Rav Yehuda** said that **Shmuel** said: **Members of a group** who are eating together on Shabbat or on a Festival and **who are particular with each other^H** that no one receive a larger portion than anyone else **are in violation of the prohibitions of measuring, and weighing, and counting merchandise on Shabbat or a Festival, and they are also in violation of the prohibition against lending and repaying on a Festival.**

HALAKHA

One may not look into a mirror on Shabbat – במראה – *אין רואין במראה* – *בשבת*: One may not look into a metal mirror on Shabbat, since it generally has a sharp edge that can be used to trim hairs. Even if the mirror is attached permanently to a wall, it is still prohibited to use it. However, it is permitted to look into any other type of mirror, with regard to which there is no concern that one will use it to trim one's hair. This ruling is in accordance with the *Tosefa* (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Shabbat* 22:14; *Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim* 302:13).

Writing that is under a picture – *כתב המהלך תחת העצודה*: It is prohibited to read the writing underneath pictures and graven images on Shabbat, lest one read business documents (Rashi; Rambam *Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Shabbat* 23:19; *Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim* 307:15).

An idolatrous image – *דיוקן אלילי*: It is prohibited to look at

an idolatrous image because one may derive pleasure from looking at it (*Tosafot; Shakh; Rambam Sefer HaMadda, Hilkhot Avoda Zara* 2:2; *Shulhan Arukh, Yoreh De'a* 142:15).

Members of a group who are particular with each other – *בני חבורה המקפידין זה על זה*: If members of a formal group eat together on Shabbat or a Festival, and they are particular with one another, insisting on fair compensation for each item, they are prohibited to exchange portions with one another or return a portion that one has previously borrowed from another. This constitutes a violation of conducting business on Shabbat or a Festival (Rambam *Sefer Nezikin, Hilkhot Geneiva* 7:10). The *Shulhan Arukh* and other authorities do not mention this *halakha* because, according to the interpretation of *Tosafot*, the law with regard to such a group is no different than the law with regard to any informal group of people (*Beit Yosef*).

NOTES

אין רואין במראה – *אין רואין במראה*: Rabbeinu Hananel teaches that this prohibition is not based on the possibility of accidentally removing hairs. Rather, the law pertains to the mirror itself: Perhaps one will find dirt or rust on the mirror and polish it, thus violating of the prohibition of repairing on Shabbat. Rabbeinu Zerahya HaLevi explains that, according to the Gemara's conclusion, all mirrors are prohibited due to the concern that one may use a metal one.

אל תפנו אל – אל תפנו אל [*al tifnu el ha'elilim*] – *אל תפנו אל*: Most of the commentaries understand that the word *elilim* is referring to anything that lacks true value, as well as to idols. Rashi and other commentaries do not explain the Gemara's teaching: Do not push God out of your mind [*al tefannu El mida'atkhem*], as cited above. Rather, they translate the phrase as follows: Do not turn toward your opinions [*al tifnu el da'atkhem*]. The Gemara warns people not to turn to things that human beings imagine on their own and which lack real significance.

LANGUAGE

Graven images [*deyokenaot*] – *דיוקנאות*: The origin of this word is not entirely clear. Some authorities state that it is derived from the Greek *δείκασον*, *deikanon*, which refers to a picture, especially an embroidered one. Others think that it is related to the word *εἰκών*, *eikon*, which means statue or picture, with the added Hebrew or Greek prefix *d* or *dnyu*.

HALAKHA

A person may draw lots with his children – מפּיס אָדָם – **עם בְּנָיו**: It is permitted to distribute food portions to one's family members based on a lottery, provided that the portions are of equal size. However, it is prohibited to do so with other people. If the portions are of unequal size, even family members may not draw lots for them because this violates the prohibition of gambling, as the opinion of Rav, which permits this, is rejected in tractate *Bava Metzia* (Rif; Rosh). The Rambam permits drawing lots for unequal portions with one's family members (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim*, *Hilkhot Shabbat* 23:17; *Shulhan Arukh*, *Orah Hayyim* 322:6).

Due to the prohibition against gambling with dice – משוים קוביא: It is prohibited to play dice or any other game in which the winner takes more than the loser. This is considered a form of stealing by rabbinic decree (Rambam *Sefer Nezikin*, *Hilkhot Gezeila VaAveida* 6:7; *Shulhan Arukh*, *Hoshen Mishpat* 370:2).

One may draw lots for sacrifices – ומטילין חלשין על – **הקרבנות**: The priests are permitted to draw lots for portions of the Festival sacrifices on the Festival (see Ra'avad) because it is an act that demonstrates love for the mitzva. However, it is prohibited for them to do so for non-sacred food (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim*, *Hilkhot Yom Tov* 4:20).

NOTES

Due to the prohibition against gambling with dice – משוים קוביא: Dice players, who are professional gamblers, are among the people that the Sages disqualified as witnesses. The Sages disagreed with regard to the rationale for this *halakha*. According to some, the winnings from playing dice are not acquired in a legal manner because the other players do not expect to lose when they place their bets. Therefore, one who takes money in this fashion is considered a robber by rabbinic decree. *Tosafot* offer a somewhat similar explanation. Even according to those who say that money won through gambling is not considered stolen, gambling is nonetheless considered despicable behavior.

Weekday [hol] portions – מנות דחול: In his Commentary on the Mishna, the Rambam interpreted the phrase: Portions of *hol*, to mean: Portions that are non-sacred food [*hullin*]. Therefore, the priests may not draw lots for non-sacred food.

ובדברי (בית הלל) אף משוים רבית.

אי הכי – בני ובני ביתו נמי. בני ובני ביתו היינו טעמא – בדבר יהודה אמר רב. דאמר רב יהודה אמר רב: מותר להלוות בני ובני ביתו ברבית, כדי להטעמן טעם רבית.

אי הכי – מנה גדולה כנגד מנה קטנה נמי.

אין הכי נמי, וחסורי מיחסרא והכי קתני: מפּיס אָדָם עם בְּנָיו ועם בְּנֵי ביתו על השלחן, אפילו מנה גדולה כנגד מנה קטנה. מאי טעמא – בדבר יהודה אמר רב. עם בְּנָיו ועם בְּנֵי ביתו – אין, עם אחרים – לא. מאי טעמא – בדבר יהודה אמר שמואל. מנה גדולה כנגד מנה קטנה – אף בחול לאחרים אסור. מאי טעמא – משוים קוביא.

“מטילין חלשין על וכו’.” מאי “אבל לא על המנות?” אמר רבי יעקב בריה דבית יעקב: אבל לא על המנות של חול ביום טוב. פשיטא. מהו דתימא: הואיל וכתוב “ועמד במריבי כהן” – אפילו מנות דחול נמי – קא משמע לן.

ואמר רבי יעקב בריה דבית יעקב: כל שחבירו נענש על ידו – אין מכניסין אותו במחיצתו של הקדוש ברוך הוא. מנלן. אילימא משום דכתוב “ויאמר ה’ מי יפתה את אחאב ויעל ויפול ברמות גלעד ויאמר זה בכה וזה אמר בכה ויצא הרוח ויעמוד לפני ה’ ויאמר אני אפתנו וגו’ ויאמר אצא והייתי רוח שקר בפי כל נביאיו ויאמר תפתה וגם תוכל צא ועשה כן”.

And according to Beit Hillel, they even violate the prohibition of interest. In Beit Hillel's view, it is prohibited to loan or return objects without determining their monetary value, lest the object rise in value and the borrower end up returning an item that is more expensive than the one he borrowed.

The Gemara asks: If this is so, and one violates so many prohibitions when drawing lots, it should be prohibited to do so with one's children and family members also. The Gemara answers: With regard to one's children and family members, this is the reason that it is permitted: It is like the ruling that Rav Yehuda said that Rav said, for Rav Yehuda said that Rav said: It is permitted to loan to one's children and family members with interest, in order to let them experience a taste of how difficult it is to repay a loan taken with interest. Also, in the case of family members, all the money, including the money used to repay the loan, belongs to the same person. Therefore, there is no real prohibition of interest.

The Gemara asks: If this is so, and everything in this case actually belongs to the father, and he uses a lottery system in order to educate his family, it should be permitted to cast lots for a big portion against a small portion also.

The Gemara answers: Yes, it is indeed so, and the mishna is incomplete and it teaches the following: A person may draw lots with his children^h and his family members at the table, and he may even do so with a large portion against a small portion. What is the reason for this? It is in accordance with the ruling that Rav Yehuda said that Rav said. Although with one's children and family members, yes, this is permitted, with others it is not. What is the reason for this? It is in accordance with the ruling that Rav Yehuda said that Shmuel said: Raffling a large portion against a small portion is prohibited to do for other people, even on a weekday. What is the reason? Due to the prohibition against gambling with dice,^{hn} which is prohibited by rabbinic law as a form of theft.

The mishna taught that one may draw lots for the sacrifices^h but not for the specific portions. This statement is not entirely clear, and the Gemara asks: What is the meaning of the phrase: But not for the specific portions? Rabbi Ya'akov, son of the daughter of Ya'akov, said that it means: But one may not draw lots for the weekday [hol] portionsⁿ on a Festival. The Gemara challenges: This is obvious. The Gemara answers: Lest you say that since the priests are naturally quarrelsome, which the Sages derive from that which is written: “Yet let no man strive, neither let any man reprove, for your people are like those that strive with the priest” (Hosea 4:4), and in order to maintain peace between them even lotteries for weekday portions were also permitted, therefore, the mishna teaches us that this is not the case.

Having quoted Rabbi Ya'akov, son of the daughter of Ya'akov, the Gemara brings another teaching of this *amora*. And Rabbi Ya'akov, son of the daughter of Ya'akov, said: Anyone who causes another to be punished on his account, they do not bring him within the partition of the Holy One, Blessed be He, even if he is right. The Gemara asks: From where do we know this? If you say it is because of what is written in the prophecy of Micaiah, that proof can be disputed. It is written: “And the Lord said: Who will entice Ahab to go up and fall at Ramot Gilad? And one said: In this manner, and another said: In that manner. And the spirit came out and stood before the Lord and said: I will entice him. And the Lord said to it: With what? And it said: I will go out and will be a lying spirit in the mouth of all of his prophets. And He said: You shall entice him and will prevail. Go out and do this” (1 Kings 22:20–22).

All of the kings of the nations, all of them, etc. – **כל מלכי גוים בולם וכו'** – In other words, after Nebuchadnezzar's death, all of the kings he had captured slept honorably in their own homes. While he was alive, they slept in shame in his palace (Maharsha).

נבוכדנצר וזדקיהו – The exposition about Nebuchadnezzar's homosexual activity is based on the following verse, which is not quoted in the Gemara: "Woe to one who gives his neighbor drink, who puts your venom in and also makes him drunk so that you may look upon their nakedness" (Habakkuk 2:15). This is interpreted as an allusion to Nebuchadnezzar's practice of intoxicating his male guests so he could engage in homosexual relations with them (Maharsha). This basic storyline is one that was familiar in talmudic times, due to current events. The memoirs of the early Roman emperors are replete with stories similar to these about Nebuchadnezzar.

ואמרין מאי רוח? אמר רבי יוחנן: זה רוחו של נבוא. ומאי "צא"? אמר רב: צא ממחיצתי. ודילמא התם היינו טעמא, דכתב "דובר שקרים לא יכון".

And we said: What is this spirit? Rabbi Yohanan said: This is the spirit of Naboth the Jezreelite, who asked to avenge his death at the hands of Ahab. And what is the meaning of the words: **Go out**, which God commanded him? Rav said: It means that he was given permission to entice Ahab, but God said: **Leave from within My partition**. Therefore, it seems that the spirit of Naboth was told to leave God's area because it caused Ahab to be punished. The Gemara rejects this proof: **But perhaps there, the reason is as it is written: "One who speaks lies shall not dwell before My eyes"** (Psalms 101:7), and this is the only reason that the spirit of Naboth was removed from within God's partition.

אלא מהקא "שבעת קלון מבוד שתה גם אתה והערל וגו'". "שבעת קלון מבוד" – זה נבוכדנצר, שתה גם אתה והערל" – זה צדקיהו. חדא: דכוליה קרא בנבוכדנצר כתיב, ועוד: צדקיהו צדיקא, מאי הוה ליה למיעבד ליה? דאמר רבי יהודה אמר רב: בשעה שבקש אותו רשע לעשות לאותו צדיק כך וכו'.

Rather, it is derived from here: **"You are filled with shame instead of honor. Drink, you, and be like one who is uncircumcised, the cup of the Lord's right hand will turn to you and filthiness shall be upon your glory"** (Habakkuk 2:16). The verse is expounded: **"You are filled with shame instead of honor"**; this is referring to Nebuchadnezzar. **"Drink, you, and be like one who is uncircumcised"**; this is referring to Zedekiah, who was also punished for being the cause of Nebuchadnezzar's punishment, as will be explained. The Gemara rejects this proof: **One objection to this is that the entire verse is written about Nebuchadnezzar. And furthermore, with regard to Zedekiah, the righteous one, what could he have done to him?** For Rav Yehuda said that Rav said about this matter: **When that wicked man wanted to do this to that righteous man, his foreskin was stretched, as will be explained.**

אלא מהקא "גם ענוש לצדיק לא טוב" – אין "לא טוב" אלא רע. וכתב "כי לא אל תפץ רשע אתה לא יגורך רע". צדיק אתה ה', ולא יגור במגורך רע.

Rather, the basis for this idea is from here: **"Punishment is also not good for the righteous"** (Proverbs 17:26), meaning that it is not good for a righteous person to issue punishment. **There is no meaning of not good other than evil. And it says: "For You are not a God that desires wickedness, evil will not dwell with You"** (Psalms 5:5), meaning that **You, God, are righteous and evil shall not dwell with You in Your place of dwelling**. Even a righteous person who punishes someone and is called evil and cannot dwell within God's partition.

מאי משמע דהאי חלשים לישנא דפורא הוא – דכתב "איך נפלת משמים הילל בן שחר נגדעת לארץ חולש על גוים וגו'". אמר רבה בר רב הונא: מלמד שהיה מטיל פור על גדולי מלכות, לידע איזה בן יומו של משכב וכו'. וכתב "כל מלכי גוים בולם וגו'", אמר רבי יוחנן: שפחו ממשכב וכו'.

The Gemara asks: **From where may it be inferred that this term used in the mishna, *halashim*, is a word for lots?** As it is written: **"How have you fallen from heaven, O day-star, son of the morning! How have you been cut down to the ground, casting lots [*holesh*] over the nations!"** (Isaiah 14:12), and Rabba bar Rav Huna said: **This verse teaches us that he, Nebuchadnezzar, would cast lots [*holesh*] for the royal leaders of the nations he had captured, in order to know whose day it was to service him with homosexual relations. And it is written: "All the kings of the nations, all of themⁿ sleep in glory, every one in his own house"** (Isaiah 14:18). **And Rabbi Yohanan said: The meaning of this verse is that they rested from homosexual relations.**

ואמר רבי יוחנן: כל ימיו של אותו רשע לא נמצא שחוק בפה כל בריה, שנאמר "נחה שקטה כל הארץ פצחו רנה" – מכלל דעד השתא לא הוה רנה.

And Rabbi Yohanan said: **All of the days of the life of that wicked man, laughter could not be found in the mouth of any creature, as it is stated: "The whole earth is at rest and is quiet; they break forth into singing"** (Isaiah 14:7). This proves by inference that **until now there was not any song.**

ואמר רבי יצחק אמר רבי יוחנן: אסור לעמוד בביתו של אותו רשע, שנאמר "ושעירים ירקדו שם".

And Rabbi Yitzhak said that Rabbi Yohanan said: **It is prohibited even nowadays to stand in the ruins of the house of that wicked man, Nebuchadnezzar, in Babylonia, for it is stated about that place: "And demons shall dance there"** (Isaiah 13:21). There is concern that one may be injured by the harmful forces there (Maharsha).

ואמר רב יהודה אמר רב: בשעה שביקש אותו רשע לעשות לאותו צדיק כך, נמשכה ערלתו שלש מאות אמה, והיתה מתזרת על כל המסיבה כולה, שנאמר "שבעת קלון מבוד שתה גם אתה והערל". ערל בגימטריא שלש מאות הוי.

And Rav Yehuda said that Rav said: **At the time when that wicked man, Nebuchadnezzar, wanted to do to that righteous man, Zedekiah,ⁿ this act of sodomy, his foreskin was stretched three hundred cubits, and it surrounded the entire company at Nebuchadnezzar's feast, as it is stated: "Woe to one who gives his neighbor drink, who puts your venom in and also makes him drunk so that you may look upon their nakedness. You are filled with shame instead of honor. Drink, you, and be like one who is uncircumcised [*vehe'arel*]"** (Habakkuk 2:15–16). The word *arel*, which refers here to one who is uncircumcised and also connotes the foreskin, has a numerical value of three hundred.

וְאָמַר רַב יְהוּדָה אָמַר רַב: בְּשַׁעָה שְׂרִיד אוֹתוֹ רָשָׁע לְגִיהֶנֶם רָעָשׁוּ כָּל יוֹרְדֵי גֵיהֶנֶם, אָמְרוּ: שָׂמָא לְמִשׁוֹל עֲלֵיהֶם הוּא בָּא, אוֹ לִיְחֻלּוֹת כְּמוֹתֵם הוּא בָּא? שְׁנֵאמַר "גַּם אַתָּה חוֹלִית כְּמוֹנוּ אֵלֵינוּ נִמְשַׁלְתָּ." יֵצְאָתָה בֵּת קוֹל וְאָמְרָה "מִמֵּי נַעֲמַת רְדָה וְהִשְׁכַּבְהָ אֶת עֵרְלִים."

"אֵיךְ שָׁבַת נוֹגֵשׁ שְׁבֻתָּה מִדֵּהֲבָה" אָמַר רַבִּי יְהוּדָה אָמַר רַב: שְׁבֻתָּה אוֹמֶה זֶה שְׂאֻמְרָה

And Rav Yehuda also said that Rav said: When that wicked man descended into Gehenna, everyone who had already descended to Gehenna trembled, and they said, referring to themselves in third person: Perhaps he is coming to rule over them; or is he coming to be weakened like them? As it is stated: "They all answer and say to you: Have you also become weak like us? Have you become like us [eleinu nimshalta]?" (Isaiah 14:10). The Hebrew phrase: *Eleinu nimshalta*, can mean: Have you become like us, or alternatively: Have you come to rule over us. A Divine Voice emerged and said: "Whom do you pass in beauty? Go down and be laid with the uncircumcised" (Ezekiel 32:19). This confirmed that Nebuchadnezzar has the same status in Gehenna as everyone else.

On a related note, the verse states: "And you shall take up this parable against the king of Babylonia and you shall say: How has the oppressor ceased. The exactor of gold has ceased" (Isaiah 14:4). Rav Yehuda said that Rav said: The meaning of this verse is that this nation that said:

Perek XXIII
Daf 150 Amud a

HALAKHA

A person may not hire workers on Shabbat – לֹא יִשְׁכּוֹר: It is prohibited to hire workers on Shabbat (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Shabbat* 23:12; *Shulḥan Arukh, Orah Ḥayyim* 307:2).

One may not wait for nightfall at the edge of the Shabbat boundary – אֵין מַחְשִׁיבִין עַל הַתְּחוּם וְכוּ': It is prohibited to walk to the edge of the Shabbat boundary toward the end of Shabbat in order to hire workers or perform an activity prohibited on Shabbat immediately after Shabbat ends. However, one may walk to the edge of the boundary to retrieve one's animal or to perform any activity that is permitted on Shabbat. Some authorities rule that it is only permitted to retrieve one's animal if the animal can walk on its own (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Shabbat* 24:3; *Shulḥan Arukh, Orah Ḥayyim* 306:1).

Telling a gentile on Shabbat – לְגוֹי: The Sages prohibited asking a gentile to perform a prohibited labor on Shabbat (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Shabbat* 6:1).

NOTES

Telling a gentile to do something that is prohibited for a Jew on Shabbat violates a rabbinic prohibition – אֲמִירָה לְגוֹי שְׁבוּת: Some commentaries interpret this question as a statement of surprise: If the statement is referring to another who is a gentile, one should be permitted to ask the gentile to hire workers because asking a gentile to perform a prohibited labor on Shabbat is only prohibited by rabbinic law. According to this interpretation, prohibiting to ask a gentile to hire laborers on Shabbat, which is also only prohibited by rabbinic law, involves issuing a decree to prevent violation of another decree, which is contrary to a halakhic principle adopted by the Sages (*Me'ir*).

מִדוּד וְהִבָּא. וְאִיכָא דְאָמְרִי: שְׂאֻמְרָה "מֵאֲדָּ מֵאֲדָּ הִבִּיא בְּלֹא מִדָּה".

"וְרַבּוּ יִתִּירָה הוֹסֵפֶת לִי." אָמַר רַב יְהוּדָה אָמַר רַב יִרְמְיָה בַּר אֲבָא: מִלְּמַד שְׂרֻכָב עַל אַרְי זָכָר, וְקִשְׁר תַּנִּין בְּרִאשׁוֹ, לְקַיִים מַה שְׁנֵאמַר "וְגַם אֶת חַיֵּת הַשָּׂדֶה נִתַּתִּי לוֹ לְעַבְדּוֹ".

מִתְנִי לֹא יִשְׁכּוֹר אָדָם פּוֹעֲלִים בְּשַׁבָּת, וְלֹא יֵאמַר אָדָם לְחִבְרֵי לְשָׂכוֹר לוֹ פּוֹעֲלִים. אֵין מַחְשִׁיבִין עַל הַתְּחוּם לְשָׂכוֹר לוֹ פּוֹעֲלִים וְלִהְבִּיא פִּירוֹת, אֲבָל מַחְשִׁיבֵי הוּא לְשָׂמוֹר, וּמִבִּיא פִּירוֹת בְּיָדוֹ. כֹּלל אָמַר אֲבָא שְׂאוּל: כָּל שְׂאֵנִי זְכָאִי בְּאִמְרָתוֹ – רִשְׁאִי אֲנִי לְהַחְשִׁיב עָלָיו.

גַּמְ' (פְּשִׁיטָא) מֵאִי שְׂנָא הוּא וּמֵאִי שְׂנָא תְּחִבְרוּ? אָמַר רַב פָּפָא: תְּחִבְרוּ גּוֹי. מִתְקִיף לָהּ רַב אֲשִׁי: אֲמִירָה לְגוֹי שְׁבוּת.

Measure and bring a lot of money, has ceased. And some say that the meaning of the statement is that this nation said: Bring very, very much, without measure.

The Gemara cites another verse pertaining to Nebuchadnezzar: "And surpassing greatness was added unto me" (Daniel 4:33), about which Rav Yehuda said that Rav Yirmeya bar Abba said: This teaches that Nebuchadnezzar rode atop a male lion and tied a serpent to its head, fulfilling what was said of him: "And the beasts of the field I have also given him to serve him" (Jeremiah 27:6).

MISHNA A person may not hire workers on Shabbat^H to work for him after Shabbat because even speaking about weekday matters is prohibited on Shabbat. Similarly, a person may not tell another on Shabbat to hire workers for him. One may not even wait for nightfall at the edge of the Shabbat boundary^H in order to leave the boundary immediately after Shabbat to hire workers for himself or to bring produce from his field. But he may wait for nightfall at the edge of the Shabbat boundary in order to guard his produce that is outside the Shabbat boundary, and he may then bring produce back in his hand, since he did not initially intend to wait at the edge of the boundary for this purpose. Abba Shaul stated a general principle: With regard to anything that I am permitted to discuss on Shabbat, I am permitted to wait for nightfall at the edge of the Shabbat boundary for its sake.

GEMARA The beginning of the mishna taught that one may not hire workers on Shabbat, and one may not tell another to hire workers for him. The Gemara finds this puzzling and states: This is obvious. What is the difference between him and another? Just as he is prohibited from hiring workers on Shabbat, others are also prohibited from doing so. Rav Pappa said: Another is referring to a gentile. Rav Ashi strongly objects to this: This is itself a prohibition, for telling a gentile to do something that is prohibited for a Jew on Shabbat^H violates a rabbinic prohibition.^N