Nevertheless a fountain or a cistern wherein is a gathering of water
And he made a ritual bath for them in the days of Nisan –
shall be pure” (Leviticus 11:36). That is the source for the two types
of the water of a ritual bath, which is collected from rainwater. The Sages
spring water –
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One could ask: Why is permitted:
A woman
Since rainwater only

Shulĥan Arukh, Yoreh De‘ah
Tosafot,

The Gemara notes: This is a dilemma according to the one who said
that one may employ artifice when there is a fire on Shabbat. One
is permitted to wear several layers of garments to take them out of
a burning house on Shabbat. And this is a dilemma according to
the one who said that one may not employ artifice when there is a fire
on Shabbat.

Abaye raised a dilemma: What is the halakha with regard to a case
where a woman employs artifice to circumvent the halakha and
fastens her garment on a nut in order to take the nut out in a permissible
fashion to her young child in the public domain on Shabbat?
The Gemara notes: This is a dilemma according to the one who said
that one may employ artifice when there is a fire on Shabbat, as
the cases are distinct. Perhaps there, artifice is permitted because if
you do not permit him to take the garments out of the burning house
in that manner, he will come to extinguish the fire. However, here,
if you do not permit the woman to employ artifice and take the nut
out to her child in the public domain, she will not come to take it
out.

Or perhaps, according to one who said that one may not employ artifice in the case of a fire, there is a distinction between the
cases. There, in the case of a fire, wearing garments is the typical
manner in which one takes clothing out to the public domain. How-
ever, here, utilizing a nut as a button is not the typical manner in
which one takes a nut out to the public domain. Since no Torah pro-
hibition is violated by doing so, say that she may well employ artifice
to take the nut out to her son. The Gemara concludes: Let this di-
lemma stand unresolved.

MISHNA One with an amputated leg may go out on Shabbat with his wooden leg, as it has the
legal status of a shoe; this is the statement of Rabbi Meir.

Perek VI Daf 66 Amud a

HALAKHA

One with an amputated leg may go out on Shabbat with his wooden leg...and Rabbi Yosei prohib-
its –

His supports –

Receptacle for pads (keretin) –

And Rabbi Yosei prohibits going out into the public domain with the wooden leg, since he does not consider it to have the legal status of a shoe.

And if the wooden leg has a receptacle for pads, a concave space at the top of the leg into which pads are placed to cushion the amputated
leg, it assumes the status of a wooden vessel and can become ritually impure.

And his supports, which are shoes that one who had both of his feet amputated places on his knees in order to walk on his knees, if a zav
wears them, they are subject to ritual impurity imparted by treading.
A zav is a primary source of ritual impurity. If he touches a vessel it
assumes first-degree ritual impurity status. However, vessels on which
he treads, sits, lies, or leans become primary sources of ritual impu-
rity, provided they are designated for that purpose. These supports
are vessels designated for treading. And one may go out with
them into the public domain on Shabbat since they have the legal status of
shoes. And one may enter the Temple courtyard with them. Although,
generally, wearing shoes in the Temple courtyard is prohibited,
in this regard, the supports do not have the legal status of shoes.

However, if one who is crippled to the extent that he cannot walk at
all sits on a chair that is attached to him, places supports on his hands,
and propels himself along with his hands, his chair and supports
are subject to ritual impurity imparted by treading. And one may not
go out with them on Shabbat, and one may not enter the Temple
courtyard with them.

NOTES

Artifice – шности: The difference between the artifice in-
volved in wearing extra garments and the artifice involved
in fastening a garment with a nut is that the extra gar-
ments serve no purpose and it is clear to all that wearing
them is artifice. However, the nut here serves a purpose
as a button, at least temporarily, so there is no prohibition
involved in carrying it (Rabbi Yakov Emden). There are
commentaries who said that if she fastens the garment
on one nut, it is permissible, but on more than one nut,
it is prohibited, since that artifice is conspicuous (Me‘in).

What is the halakha with regard to a case where a
woman employs artifice and fastens, etc. –

---

Notes

Receptacle for pads (keretin) – Some commentators interpreted keretin as the flesh and bone
protruding from an amputated limb. The one who fash-
ions the prosthesis leaves space for them to prevent pain
resulting from pressure on the amputated limb (gebrim; Rabeinu Hananel; Rambam’s Commentary on the
Mishna).

וכו

The Gemara notes: This is a dilemma according to the one who said
that one may employ artifice when there is a fire on Shabbat, as
the cases are distinct. Perhaps there, artifice is permitted because if
you do not permit him to take the garments out of the burning house
in that manner, he will come to extinguish the fire. However, here,
if you do not permit the woman to employ artifice and take the nut
out to her child in the public domain, she will not come to take it
out.

Or perhaps, according to one who said that one may not employ artifice in the case of a fire, there is a distinction between the
cases. There, in the case of a fire, wearing garments is the typical
manner in which one takes clothing out to the public domain. How-
ever, here, utilizing a nut as a button is not the typical manner in
which one takes a nut out to the public domain. Since no Torah pro-
hibition is violated by doing so, say that she may well employ artifice
to take the nut out to her son. The Gemara concludes: Let this di-
lemma stand unresolved.

MISHNA One with an amputated leg may go out on Shabbat with his wooden leg, as it has the
legal status of a shoe; this is the statement of Rabbi Meir.
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HALAKHA

One with an amputated leg may go out on Shabbat with his wooden leg...and Rabbi Yosei prohib-
its –

His supports –

Receptacle for pads (keretin) – Some commentators interpreted keretin as the flesh and bone
protruding from an amputated limb. The one who fash-
ions the prosthesis leaves space for them to prevent pain
resulting from pressure on the amputated limb (gebrim; Rabeinu Hananel; Rambam’s Commentary on the
Mishna).

And Rabbi Yosei prohibits going out into the public domain with the wooden leg, since he does not consider it to have the legal status of a shoe.

And if the wooden leg has a receptacle for pads, a concave space at the top of the leg into which pads are placed to cushion the amputated
leg, it assumes the status of a wooden vessel and can become ritually impure.

And his supports, which are shoes that one who had both of his feet amputated places on his knees in order to walk on his knees, if a zav
wears them, they are subject to ritual impurity imparted by treading.
A zav is a primary source of ritual impurity. If he touches a vessel it
assumes first-degree ritual impurity status. However, vessels on which
he treads, sits, lies, or leans become primary sources of ritual impu-
rity, provided they are designated for that purpose. These supports
are vessels designated for treading. And one may go out with
them into the public domain on Shabbat since they have the legal status of
shoes. And one may enter the Temple courtyard with them. Although,
generally, wearing shoes in the Temple courtyard is prohibited,
in this regard, the supports do not have the legal status of shoes.

However, if one who is crippled to the extent that he cannot walk at
all sits on a chair that is attached to him, places supports on his hands,
and propels himself along with his hands, his chair and supports
are subject to ritual impurity imparted by treading. And one may not
go out with them on Shabbat, and one may not enter the Temple
courtyard with them.

NOTES

Artifice – шnosti: The difference between the artifice in-
volved in wearing extra garments and the artifice involved
in fastening a garment with a nut is that the extra gar-
ments serve no purpose and it is clear to all that wearing
them is artifice. However, the nut here serves a purpose
as a button, at least temporarily, so there is no prohibition
involved in carrying it (Rabbi Yakov Emden). There are
commentaries who said that if she fastens the garment
on one nut, it is permissible, but on more than one nut,
it is prohibited, since that artifice is conspicuous (Me‘in).

What is the halakha with regard to a case where a
woman employs artifice and fastens, etc. –

---

Notes

Receptacle for pads (keretin) – Some commentators interpreted keretin as the flesh and bone
protruding from an amputated limb. The one who fash-
ions the prosthesis leaves space for them to prevent pain
resulting from pressure on the amputated limb (gebrim; Rabeinu Hananel; Rambam’s Commentary on the
Mishna).
It was stated: Shmuel said that the correct reading of the mishna is: An amputee may not go out, and Rabbi Yosei permits him to do so. And, likewise, Rav Huna said that the correct reading of the mishna is: An amputee may not. Rav Yosef said: Since Shmuel said that the correct reading of the mishna is: An amputee may not, and Rav Huna said: An amputee may not, we will also learn the mishna: An amputee may not.

It was stated: Shmuel said that the correct reading of the mishna is: An amputee may not go out, and Rabbi Yosei permits him to do so. And, likewise, Rav Huna said that the correct reading of the mishna is: An amputee may not. Rav Yosef said: Since Shmuel said that the correct reading of the mishna is: An amputee may not, and Rav Huna said: An amputee may not, we will also learn the mishna: An amputee may not.

Rava bar Shirah strongly objects to this: And did they not hear that Rav Hanan bar Rava taught the mishna to Hyya bar Rav before Rav in a small room [kituna] in the school of Rav: An amputee may not go out on Shabbat with his wooden leg; this is the statement of Rabbi Meir. And Rabbi Yosei permits going out with it. And Rav signalled him with a hand gesture to reverse the opinions, Rabbi Meir permits going out and Rabbi Yosei prohibits doing so. Rav Nahman bar Yitzḥak said: And the mnemonic to remember which tanna permits and which tanna prohibits is samekh samekh. The letter samekh appears both in the name Yosef and in the Hebrew word for prohibits [eser]. In that way, one remembers that Rabbi Yosei is the one who prohibits it.

The Gemara comments: And even Shmuel, who said that the correct reading of the mishna is: An amputee may not, and Rabbi Yosei permits it, reversed his opinion. As we learned in a mishna: The halitza ceremony, which frees a childless widow from the obligation to enter into levirate marriage with her brother-in-law, involves the widow removing her brother-in-law’s sandal from his foot. If she removed a sandal that is not his, or a wooden sandal, or the sandal of the left foot that was on his right foot, the halitza is valid.

And we said: Who is the tanna who holds that a wooden sandal is considered a shoe for this purpose? Shmuel said: It is Rabbi Meir, as we learned in a mishna: An amputee may go out with his wooden leg, this is the statement of Rabbi Meir, and Rabbi Yosei prohibits doing so. Ultimately, Shmuel accepted Rav’s reading of the mishna.

And Rav Huna also reversed his opinion, as it was taught in a baraita: With regard to a plasterers’ sandal worn by those who work with lime and would cover their leather shoes with a shoe woven from straw or reeds so that the leather shoes would not get ruined by the lime. If the plasterer is a zav and walks with his shoes covered, the shoe covering is subject to ritual impurity by treading, as the legal status of that sandal is that of a shoe. A woman may perform halitza with it, and one may go out with it on Shabbat; this is the statement of Rabbi Akiva. And the Rabbis did not agree with him.

Rava also reversed his opinion as it was taught in the Gemara, that they agreed with him? Rav Huna said in resolution of this apparent contradiction: Who is the Sage whose opinion is referred to in the phrase: ‘They agreed with him?’ It is Rabbi Meir. And who is the Sage whose opinion is referred to in the phrase: ‘They did not agree with him? It is Rabbi Yosei. Even Rav Huna accepted Rav’s reading of the mishna that Rabbi Yosei prohibits going out with a wooden leg.
And if the wooden leg has a receptacle—

An artificial leg that has a receptacle for pads can become ritually impure and even become a primary source of ritual impurity when used by a zav, in accordance with the mishna and the opinion of Rava. The halakha is in accordance with Rava’s opinion in disputes with Abaye (Rambam Sefer Tahara; Hilkhos Kelim 25:16).

The wagon of a small child—

A child’s wagon can become ritually impure, even with impurity imparted by the treading of a zav (Rambam Sefer Tahara; Hilkhos Kelim 25:16).

Walking stick, typically used by the elderly—

An elderly person’s cane cannot become ritually impure because it is a wooden utensil without a receptacle. In addition, because the elderly person does not lean most of his weight on it, it does not become impure with impurity imparted by the treading of a zav (Rambam Sefer Tahara; Hilkhos Kelim 25:17).

Rav Yosef said: Who is the Sage whose opinion is referred to in the phrase: They did not agree with Rabbi Akiva? It is Rabbi Yoḥanan ben Nuri. As we learned in a baraita: A receptacle made of straw and a tube made of reeds, Rabbi Akiva deems these vessels capable of becoming ritually impure, and Rabbi Yoḥanan ben Nuri deems them pure, i.e., incapable of becoming ritually impure because they are not vessels. According to Rabbi Yoḥanan ben Nuri, straw objects are not considered vessels fit for use.

It was taught in a baraita that the Master said: A plasterers’ sandal is subject to ritual impurity imparted by treading. The Gemara asks: How could that be? These sandals are not made for walking. Rav Aha bar Rav Ulla said: They are used for walking, as, at times, the plasterer walks in them until he reaches his house.

We learned in the mishna: And if the wooden leg has a receptacle for pads, it is capable of becoming ritually impure. Abaye said: It is subject to ritual impurity due to contact with ritual impurity imparted by a corpse, and it is not subject to ritual impurity imparted by treading. If a zav uses a wooden leg it merely assumes first-degree ritual impurity status, since he cannot lean all his weight on it. Rava said: The artificial foot is even subject to ritual impurity imparted by treading.

Rava said: From where do I derive to say this halakha? As we learned in a mishna: The wagon of a small child utilized to teach him to walk (Tosafot) is subject to ritual impurity imparted by treading, since its purpose is to lean on it. And Abaye said: The two cases are not comparable. There, in the case of the wagon, he leans all his weight on it; here, in the case of the wooden leg, he does not lean all his weight on it.

Abaye said: From where do I derive to say this halakha? As it was taught in a baraita: A walking stick, typically used by the elderly, is pure, i.e., incapable of becoming ritually impure from any form of ritual impurity. Apparently, an object upon which one does not lean all his weight is not subject to ritual impurity imparted by treading.

And how does Rava respond to this proof? He says that there is a distinction between the cases: There, in the case of a walking stick used by the elderly, it is made merely to align his steps and straighten his posture. He does not completely lean all his weight on it. Here, in the case of a wooden leg, it is made to lean on, and in fact he leans all his weight on it.

It was taught in the mishna that the supports of a zav and his chair are subject to ritual impurity imparted by treading, and one may not go out with them on Shabbat, and one may not enter into the Temple courtyard with them.

The tanna, who recited mishnayot before Rabbi Yoḥanan, taught the opposite halakha in the mishna: One may enter into the Temple courtyard with them.

Rabbi Yoḥanan said to him: I teach that a woman may perform halitza with this support, as it has the legal status of a shoe in every sense, and you say that one may enter the Temple courtyard? Teach the mishna in the following manner: One may not enter into the Temple courtyard with them.
We learned in the mishna that _loketamin_ are pure. The Gemara asks: What are _loketamin_? Rabbi Abbahu said: They are wooden toys in the shape of a donkey one carried on the shoulders, creating the impression that the donkey is riding him. Rava bar Pappa said: They are stills used to avoid getting dirty when walking in mud or for amusement. Rava bar Rav Huna said: They are masks (peramei).

### MISHNA

Young boys may go out on Shabbat with knots as a folk remedy and princes with bells. And any person is permitted to go out on Shabbat with those objects; however, the Sages spoke in the present, addressing situations that were prevalent.

### GEMARA

We learned in the mishna that young boys may go out on Shabbat with knots. The Gemara asks: What are these knots? Adda Mari said that Rav Nahman bar Barukh said that Rav Ashi bar Avin said that Rav Yehuda said: They are garlands of the madder plant that are tied for their medicinal qualities.

Abaye said: Mother, actually his foster mother, said to me about the healing properties of madder: ‘Three garlands maintain the illness at its present state and prevent it from worsening, five garlands heal the illness, and seven are effective even against sorcery.

Rav Aha bar Yaakov said: And that benefit provided by the madder plant is specifically in a case where one on whom the knots were tied does not look at the sun and the moon, and does not see rain, and hears neither the sound of footsteps. Rav Nahman bar Yitzhak said: If that is the case, the remedial powers of the madder fell in a pit, i.e., if so many conditions exist, for all intents and purposes it provides no benefit at all.

The Gemara asks: If these knots in the madder plant have remedial qualities, why specifically were boys mentioned in the mishna? Even girls can benefit from the cure as well. By the same token, why specifically were young boys mentioned in the mishna? Even adults can benefit from the cure as well.

Rather, what are these knots? Like that which Avin bar Huna said that Rav Hama bar Gurya said: A son who has longings for his father and has a difficult time leaving him, the father takes a strap from the right shoe and ties it on the boy’s left arm as a talisman to help the child overcome his longings. These feelings are more common in small children and especially in boys for their fathers, as fathers were more involved in raising their sons than they were in raising their daughters. Therefore, the Sages allowed specifically young boys to go out with these knots. With regard to this practice, Rav Nahman bar Yitzhak said: And your mnemonic for where to tie the strap is _phylacteries_, which are tied by the right hand on the left arm. And the opposite, tying the strap from the left shoe onto his right arm, is dangerous because it will exacerbate his longings.

### NOTES

**What are _loketamin_?** The synonyms for _loketamin_ cited in the Gemara were themselves not understood over the course of the generations and several interpretations were suggested. Some authorities explained that _hanna drakDET_ is a prothetic, wooden arm for amputees (Rabbeinu Hananel). Some commentators explain that _peramei_ is as a type of _bob_ that was hung around the neck of small children or the very elderly so that their saliva would not drip on their garments (Arukh).

**Garlands of madder** ([pua](https://www.steinsaltz-center.org/)) – _pe’ot_ [a]: One commentary translated _pua_ as a wig, a variation of the word _pe’a_, from which they pluck hairs to make garlands (_Menli_). However, the other commentaries and the Jerusalem Talmud taught that it is a plant. In the Jerusalem Talmud, other numbers of garlands that determine its medicinal efficacy were suggested: five, seven, and nine.

**A son who has longings for his father** – _ay malket_ [א]: Ostensibly, the Gemara is referring to knots tied for small children. Since small children are not obligated in the performance of mitzvot, why is the Gemara discussing this _halakha_? Some commentators taught that the father is the one who moves the clothes in his son’s shoes as a talisman (_Menli_). Other authorities maintain that it is referring to a son who has reached the age of majority, thirteen, whose father died. He performs this practice to alleviate his sorrow (Rabbeinu Hananel).

---

**BACKGROUND**

**Masks** – _peramei_:

One may not go out with _loketamin_ – _peramei_:

One may not go out on Shabbat with the image of a donkey made by clowns, with stilts, or with masks because all the suggested interpretations of the _loketamin_ in the Gemara were accepted as _halakha_ (Rambam _Sefer Zemanim_, Hilkhot _Shabbat_ 19:15; _Shulhan Arukh_, _Orah Hayyim_ 310:20).

---

**Mask of a Roman actor from the mishnaic period**

---

**LANGUAGES**

_Loptamín_ – _loketamin_. Apparently, the primary reading is _onos_ from the Greek _onos_ kat’ _omon_, meaning a donkey on the shoulder. Therefore, the interpretation of Rabbi Abbahu, who was from Eretz Yisrael and an expert in Greek, is closest to the etymology of the word.

_Masks (peramei)_ – _peramei_. According to this reading, this word may be from the Latin _forma_, meaning form or mask. However, according to the variant reading _peramei_, it is from the Middle Persian _padām_, a ritual kerchief worn by Zoroastrian priests over the mouth while officiating at a sacred fire.

---

**WWW**

[www.steinsaltz-center.org](http://www.steinsaltz-center.org)  [www.korenpub.com](http://www.korenpub.com)
Overturning a cup – אבירב: It is permitted to place a cup that had hot water emptied out of it but which remains very hot on one’s navel. Similarly, it is permitted to place the cup there in order to raise a sunken navel (Rambam Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhos Shabbos 21:3; Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim 328:43).

Oil and salt on Shabbos – שַׁבְּתָא בְּשַׁבְּתָא: One may smear a mixture of oil and salt (Elya Rabba) on his palms on Shabbos (Rambam Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhos Shabbos 21:3; Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim 328:44).

Swaddling a baby – אַבּ: It is permitted to tightly swaddle a baby to align dislocated limbs on Shabbos (Rambam Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhos Shabbos 21:31).

On the topic of the use of various forms of healing and medical practices and their permissibility on Shabbat, the Gemara cites additional statements by that Sage on these topics. Avin bar Huna said that Rav Hama bar Gurya said: With regard to overturning an empty cup4 in which there had been hot water and placing it on one’s navel5 for healing purposes on Shabbat, he may well do so.

And Avin bar Huna said that Rav Hama bar Gurya said: It is permissible to smear oil and salt on oneself on Shabbat.6

As in this case of Rav Huna, who departed from the house of Rav, and Rav, who departed from the house of Rabbi Hiyya, and Rabbi Hiyya, who departed from the house of Rabbi Ye-huda HNasi, when they were drunk, the rabbi would bring oil and salt and rub them on the palms of their hands and the soles of their feet and say: Just as this oil is clear, so let the wine of so-and-so, son of so-and-so, his mother, become clear. In other words, let them become sober. And if he could not bring oil and salt, or if they did not work, he would bring the sealing clay of a barrel and soak it in water and say: Just as this sealing clay is clear, so let the wine of so-and-so, son of so-and-so, become clear.

And Avin bar Huna said that Rav Hama bar Gurya said: With regard to tightly swaddling a baby7 born on Shabbat in order to align any limbs that may have been dislocated in birth, one may well do so.

There were different versions with regard to the halakhot of Avin bar Huna. Rav Pappa taught two halakhot with regard to children in his name and Rav Zevid taught one halakha with regard to a child in his name. The Gemara explains: Rav Pappa taught two halakhot with regard to children, and he taught both of them in the name of Avin bar Huna, i.e., the halakha with regard to knots and the halakha with regard to swaddling. Rav Zevid taught one halakha with regard to a child. The first, with regard to knots, he taught in the name of Rabba bar Hanah, as Rabba bar Hanah said: With regard to tightly swaddling a baby on Shabbat, one may well do so.

The Gemara cites additional statements said by Abaye in the name of the woman who raised him with regard to remedies. Abaye said, Mother said to me: All incantations that are repeated are intoned using the name of the mother of the one requiring the incantation, and all knots tied for the purpose of healing are tied on the left.

And Abaye said, Mother said to me: All incantations for which the number of times they must be intoned is specified, one recites them as they are specified; and those for which the number of times they must be intoned is not specified, one recites them forty-one times.

BACKGROUND

Overturning a cup on one’s navel – אבירב: According to Rashi, this refers to the realignment of a displaced vertebra in the neck. A similar treatment is still in use today. However, the gemara explain that this stranulation involves applying pressure to the veins in the neck for medicinal purposes. In various cases, such as paroxysmal tachycardia, pressure is indeed applied to the veins in the neck and to the vagus nerve.

Swaddling a baby – אַבּ: According to Rashi’s explanation, the Gemara is apparently discussing a treatment similar to cupping glasses, which was common practice until recent times. From a medical perspective, the treatment works by increasing the flow of blood to a certain area. In the Rambam’s opinion, it is speaking in this context of using cupping glasses to restore the intestines to their place by drawing the skin outward.

Notes

To strangle on Shabbat – בּ: According to the gemara, explain this method of healing is performed for an adult suffering from intestinal pain. Pressure is applied to one’s throat in a procedure that looks like strangulation, but eventually the intestinal pain passes.
The Sages taught in a baraita: One may go out with a preservation stone, which prevents miscarriages, on Shabbat. They said in the name of Rabbi Meir that one may go out even with the counterweight of a preservation stone, i.e., a stone or another object that was weighed against and found equal to the weight of the preservation stone, which is also effective. And this leniency applies not only to a woman who miscarried in the past and is concerned that she may miscarry again, but also to a woman who is pregnant; rather, it applies even if a woman suspects that she may become pregnant and miscarry. Rav Yeimar bar Shelamya said in the name of Abaye: And this applies only when he happened upon an object that was found equal to the preservation stone when he weighed it against that stone, not when one alters the object to equal the weight of the preservation stone. Abaye raised a dilemma: With regard to a counterweight to the counterweight, i.e., who finds an object and determines its weight by weighing it against the counterweight of the preservation stone, what is its legal status? May a woman go out into the public domain with it? The Gemara concludes: Let this dilemma stand unresolved.

And Abaye said, Mother said to me: To heal a fever of one day, let one take a pale, i.e., newly minted, dinar and go to the salt pools, and weigh its weight in salt against it, and let him bind the salt to the opening of the neckline of his garment with a thread made of hair.

And if this remedy is not effective, let him sit at a crossroads, and when he sees a large ant carrying something, he should take the ant and place it in a copper tube, and close it with lead, and seal it with sixty seals, and shake it, and lift it, and say to it: Your burden is upon me and my burden, my fever, is upon you. Rav Aya, son of Rav Huna, said to Rav Ashi: And perhaps a different person already found this ant and used this remedy to end his illness. In that case, by accepting the burden of the ant, he is bringing another’s illness upon himself. Rather, let him say to the ant: My burden and your burden are upon you.

And if this remedy is not effective, let him take a new jug, and go to the river, and say to it: River, river, lend me a jug of water for a guest who happened to come to me. And let him turn it around his head seven times, and pour out the water behind him, and say to it: River, river, take back the water that you gave me because the guest who happened to come to me came on its day and left on its day.

Rav Huna said:

For tertian fever, which afflicts one every three days, let one bring seven thorns from seven palm trees, and seven slivers from seven beams, and seven pegs from seven bridges, and seven types of ashes from seven ovens, and seven types of dust from seven door sockets, the hole in which the hinge of the door revolves, and seven types of tar from seven boats, and seven cumín seeds, and seven hairs from the beard of an old dog, and let him bind it to the opening of the neckline of his garment with a thread made of hair.

One may go out with a preservation stone, etc. – וּפָגָא בַּשַּׁבָּת, מִשְׁוּם אַבַּיֵּי, אָמְסַלֵּי בֵּית אָמָה – לַשָּׁתֹת אָשָׁר לֹהַיָּהוּ. אַבַּיֵּי – אָמְסַלֵּי בֵּית אָמָה. אַבַּיֵּי – אָמְסַלֵּי בֵּית אָמָה. אַבַּיֵּי – אָמְסַלֵּי בֵּית אָמָה. אַבַּיֵּי – אָמְסַלֵּי בֵּית אָמָה.

Tertian fever – תְּרוֹאָה תָּלָיוֹת: The illness is called tertian fever because the fever recurs every three days.