

THE  
BABYLONIAN  
TALMUD

*SEDER NASHIM*

YEBAMOTH

TRANSLATED INTO ENGLISH WITH NOTES AND GLOSSARY

BY

REV. DR ISRAEL W. SLOTKI, M. A., Litt. D.

UNDER THE EDITORSHIP OF  
RABBI DR I. EPSTEIN

B. A., Ph. D., D. Lit.

FOREWORD BY

DR J. H. HERTZ

*LATE CHIEF RABBI OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE*

a all agree<sup>11</sup> that ritual ablu-  
 tion without circum-  
 b cision is effective; and they differ only on circum-  
 cision without ablu-  
 R. Eliezer infers from the forefathers,<sup>1</sup> while  
 R. Joshua [maintains that] in the case of the forefathers also ritual  
 ablu-  
 tion was performed. Whence does he<sup>2</sup> deduce it?<sup>3</sup> If it be  
 suggested, 'From that which is written, *Go unto the people, and  
 sanctify them to-day and to-morrow, and let them wash their garments,*<sup>4</sup>  
 if where washing of the garments is not required<sup>5</sup> ablu-  
 tion is  
 required,<sup>6</sup> how much more should ablu-  
 tion be required where  
 washing of the garments is required',<sup>7</sup> [it may be retorted that]  
 that<sup>8</sup> might have been a mere matter of cleanliness.<sup>9</sup>—It is rather  
 from here:<sup>10</sup> *And Moses took the blood, and sprinkled it on the people,*<sup>11</sup>  
 and we have a tradition that there must be no sprinkling without  
 ritual ablu-  
 tion.<sup>12</sup>

Whence does R. Joshua infer that the mothers performed ritual  
 ablu-  
 tion?—It is a logical conclusion, for, otherwise,<sup>13</sup> whereby did  
 they enter under the wings of the *Shechinah*!<sup>14</sup>

R. Hiyya b. Abba stated in the name of R. Joḥanan: A man can  
 never become a proselyte unless he has been circumcised and has  
 also performed the prescribed ritual ablu-  
 tion.<sup>15</sup> Is not this obvious?  
 [In a dispute between] an individual and a majority the *halachah* is,  
 surely, in agreement with the majority!<sup>16</sup>—The expression 'Sages'  
 is in fact meant for<sup>17</sup> 'R. Jose'. For it was taught: If [a proselyte]  
 came and stated, 'I have been circumcised but have not performed  
 ritual ablu-  
 tion' he is permitted to perform the ablu-  
 tion<sup>18</sup> and [the  
 c proper performance of the previous circum-  
 cision] does not matter;<sup>1</sup>  
 so R. Judah.

R. Jose said: He is not to be allowed ablu-  
 tion.<sup>2</sup> Hence<sup>3</sup> it is  
 permissible for a proselyte<sup>4</sup> to perform the prescribed ablu-  
 tion  
 on the Sabbath;<sup>5</sup> so R. Judah. R. Jose, however, said: He is not  
 to be allowed to perform the ablu-  
 tion.<sup>6</sup>

The Master said, 'Hence it is permissible for a proselyte to  
 perform the prescribed ablu-  
 tion on the Sabbath; so R. Judah'.<sup>7</sup>  
 Seeing that R. Judah stated that one<sup>8</sup> suffices is it not obvious

that, if circum-  
 cision has been performed in our presence, he is per-  
 mitted to perform ablu-  
 tion!<sup>5</sup> Why then, 'Hence'<sup>9</sup>—It might have-  
 been assumed that in the opinion of R. Judah, ablu-  
 tion forms  
 the principal [part of the initiation],<sup>10</sup> and that ablu-  
 tion is not to  
 take place on the Sabbath because, thereby, a man is improved;<sup>11</sup>  
 hence we were taught<sup>12</sup> that R. Judah requires either the one or  
 the other.<sup>13</sup>

'R. Jose, however, said: He is not to be allowed to perform the  
 d ablu-  
 tion'. Is not this obvious? Since R. Jose said that both<sup>1</sup> are  
 required [ablu-  
 tion must be forbidden as] the improvement of a  
 man<sup>2</sup> may not be effected on the Sabbath!—It might have been  
 assumed that in the opinion of R. Jose circum-  
 cision forms  
 the principal [part of the initiation] and that the reason there<sup>3</sup> is be-  
 cause the circum-  
 cision had not been performed in our presence<sup>4</sup>  
 but where the circum-  
 cision had taken place in our presence<sup>5</sup> it  
 might have been assumed that a proselyte in such circumstances<sup>6</sup>  
 may perform the prescribed ablu-  
 tion even on the Sabbath, hence  
 we were taught<sup>7</sup> that R. Jose requires both.<sup>1</sup>

Rabbah stated: It happened at the court of R. Hiyya b. Rabbi—  
 (and R. Joseph taught: R. Oshaia b. R. Rabbi;<sup>8</sup> and R. Safra taught:  
 R. Oshaia b. Hiyya)<sup>9</sup>—that there came before him a proselyte who  
 had been circum-  
 cised but had not performed the ablu-  
 tion.<sup>10</sup> The  
 Rabbi told him, 'Wait here until to-morrow<sup>11</sup> when we shall arrange  
 for your ablu-  
 tion'. From this incident three rulings may be de-  
 duced. It may be inferred that the initiation of a proselyte requires  
 the presence of three men;<sup>12</sup> and it may be inferred that a man is  
 not a proper proselyte unless he had been circum-  
 cised and had also  
 performed the prescribed ablu-  
 tion; and it may also be inferred<sup>13</sup>  
 that the ablu-  
 tion of a proselyte may not take place during the night.

Let it be said that from this incident it may also be inferred that  
 qualified scholars are required!<sup>14</sup>—Their presence might have been  
 a mere coincidence.<sup>15</sup>

R. Hiyya b. Abba stated in the name of R. Joḥanan: The initi-  
 e ation of a proselyte requires the presence of three men; for *law*<sup>1</sup> has

a (11) Even R. Eliezer.  
 b (1) Who, he maintains, did not perform any ritual ablu-  
 tion when they were  
 admitted to Judaism. (2) R. Joshua. (3) That the forefathers had performed  
 ritual ablu-  
 tion. (4) Ex. XIX, 10. (5) E.g., after nocturnal pollution; *keri*, v.  
 Glos. (6) V. Lev. XV, 16. (7) As was the case when Israel received the Torah  
 and were thus admitted into Judaism. (V. Ex. XIX, 10). (8) The washing of  
 the garments. (9) And had no reference to Levitical purity. Such washing,  
 therefore, can have no bearing on the question of the ritual ablu-  
 tion of pros-  
 e-lytes. (10) Is R. Joshua's deduction made. (11) Ex. XXIV, 8. (12) Ker. 9a.  
 (13) Lit., 'for if so', if even ablu-  
 tion was not performed. (14) V. Glos. They  
 could not have been initiated without any ceremonial whatsoever. (15) Ber.  
 47b. (16) And this view is held (*supra* 46a) by the Sages who obviously form  
 a majority against the individual or joint opinions of R. Eliezer and R. Joshua.  
 (17) Lit., 'who are the Sages?' (18) And by this act alone he is admitted as a  
 proper proselyte.

c (1) Lit., 'and what is there in it'. Whether the circum-  
 cision had been valid,  
 having been performed for the specific ritual purpose of the proselyte's ini-  
 tiation into Judaism, or whether it had been invalid because it was carried out  
 as a mere surgical operation or as a non-Jewish sectarian rite, is of no conse-  
 quence, since the present performance of the ritual ablu-  
 tion is alone sufficient  
 for the initiation. (2) Because both circum-  
 cision and ablu-  
 tion are required. As the validity of the former is in doubt (v. *supra* note 1) the latter must  
 not be allowed unless some act of circum-  
 cision (causing a few drops of blood  
 to flow) had again been carried out specifically for the purpose of the initiation.  
 (3) Since according to R. Akiba one act, either ablu-  
 tion or circum-  
 cision, suffices. (4) Who had been circum-  
 cised on Sabbath Eve in the ritually pre-  
 scribed manner. (5) The ablu-  
 tion being of no consequence (v. *supra* nn. 3

and 4), the proselyte's person in no way being improved by it, it is an act  
 which is permitted on the Sabbath. (6) The ablu-  
 tion completes the initiation  
 and thus effects the proselyte's improvement, which is an act forbidden on  
 the Sabbath. Thus it has been shewn that the author of the view that both  
 ablu-  
 tion and circum-  
 cision are required, given *supra* as the opinion of 'the  
 Sages', is in fact R. Jose. (7) V. Baḥ. Cur. edd. omit the last three words.  
 (8) Either circum-  
 cision or ablu-  
 tion. (9) 'Hence etc.'. There is no need, surely,  
 to state the obvious. (10) Since circum-  
 cision he stated *supra* does not matter.  
 (11) V. *supra* note 6. (12) By the addition of 'Hence etc.'. (13) Either circum-  
 cision or ablu-  
 tion.

d (1) Circum-  
 cision and ablu-  
 tion. (2) Which is completed by the ablu-  
 tion  
 (v. *supra* p. 305, n. 6). (3) *Supra*. Where a proselyte who declared, 'I have  
 been circum-  
 cised but have not performed ritual ablu-  
 tion' is not to be allowed  
 ablu-  
 tion. (4) And may be presumed to have been invalid. (5) And is known  
 to us to have been carried out in accordance with the requirements of the law.  
 (6) Lit., 'this'. (7) By R. Jose's apparently superfluous statement. (8) Alfasi:  
 Berabbi, v. Nazir Sonc. ed. p. 64, n. 1. (9) Was also present. (10) Re-  
 questing that he be allowed to perform the prescribed ablu-  
 tion, so as to  
 complete his initiation. (11) The incident having occurred during the night.  
 (12) Since R. Safra insisted that *three* scholars (R. Hiyya and the two R. Oshaias)  
 were present at the time the proselyte's request for his initiation was dealt  
 with. (13) Since the ablu-  
 tion was postponed till the following morning.  
 (14) To witness the initiation of a proselyte, as was the case here where all  
 the three were qualified men, v. Glos. s.v. *Mumhe*. (15) And provides no  
 proof that in all other cases the presence of qualified scholars is essential.

e (1) Num. XV, 16, *One law . . . for the proselyte* 72. (E.V. 'Stranger').



From this I only know [that the law is applicable] within the Land of Israel, whence is it inferred [that it is also applicable] within the countries outside the Land?—It was specifically stated in Scripture, <sup>a</sup> *With thee*,<sup>4</sup> i.e., 'wherever he is with thee'.<sup>6</sup> If so, why was the Land of Israel specified?—In the Land of Israel<sup>7</sup> proof must be produced;<sup>8</sup> outside the Land of Israel<sup>9</sup> no such proof need be produced; these are the words of R. Judah. But the Sages said: Proof must be produced both within the Land of Israel and outside the Land.

'If he came and had witnesses with him,' what need is there for a Scriptural text?<sup>10</sup> R. Shesheth replied: Where they<sup>11</sup> state, 'We heard that he became a proselyte at a certain particular court'. As it might have been taught that we are not to believe them,<sup>12</sup> we were taught [that we do believe them].

<sup>b</sup> 'In your land,'<sup>1</sup> from this I only know [that the law is applicable] within the Land of Israel, whence is it inferred [that it is also applicable] within the countries outside the Land?—It was specifically stated in Scripture, *With thee*, i.e., wherever he is with thee'. But this,<sup>2</sup> surely, had been expounded already!<sup>3</sup>—One is derived from *With thee*<sup>4</sup> and the other from *With you*.<sup>5</sup>

But the Sages said: Proof must be produced both within the Land of Israel and outside the Land'. But, it is written, surely, *In your land!*<sup>6</sup>—That expression is required [for the deduction] that proselytes may be accepted even in the Land of Israel. As it might have been assumed that there they become proselytes only on account of the prosperity of the Land of Israel, and at the present time also, when there is no prosperity, they might still be attracted<sup>7</sup> by the Gleanings,<sup>8</sup> the Forgotten Sheaf,<sup>9</sup> the Corner<sup>10</sup> and the Poor Man's Tithe,<sup>11</sup> hence we were taught [that they may nevertheless be accepted].

R. Hiyya b. Abba stated in the name of R. Joḥanan, 'The *halachah* is that proof must be produced<sup>12</sup> both in the Land of Israel and outside the Land'. Is this not obvious? [In a dispute between] an individual and a majority the *halachah* is, of course, in agreement with the majority!<sup>13</sup>—It might have been suggested that R. Judah's view is more acceptable since he is supported by Scriptural texts,<sup>14</sup> hence we were taught [that the *halachah* is in agreement with the Sages].

Our Rabbis taught: *And judge righteously between a man and his brother, and the proselyte that is with him;*<sup>1</sup> from this text<sup>2</sup> did R. Judah deduce that a man who becomes a proselyte<sup>3</sup> in the presence of a Beth din is deemed to be a proper proselyte; but he who does so privately is no proselyte.<sup>4</sup>

It once happened that a man came before R. Judah and told him, 'I have become a proselyte privately'. 'Have you witnesses?' R. Judah asked. 'No', the man replied. 'Have you children?'—'Yes', the man replied. 'You are trusted', the Master said to him, 'as far as your own disqualification is concerned but you cannot be relied upon to disqualify your children'.<sup>5</sup>

Did R. Judah, however, state that a proselyte is not trusted in respect of his children? Surely it was taught: *He shall acknowledge*<sup>6</sup> implies, 'he shall be entitled to acknowledge him before others?'<sup>7</sup> From this did R. Judah deduce that a man is believed when he declares, 'This son of mine is firstborn'.<sup>8</sup> And as a man is believed when he declares, 'This son of mine is firstborn' so is he believed when he declares, 'This son of mine is the son of a divorced woman' or 'the son of a *haluzah*'.<sup>9</sup> But the Sages say: He<sup>10</sup> is not believed!<sup>11</sup>—R. Naḥman b. Isaac replied: It is this that he<sup>12</sup> really told him,<sup>13</sup> 'According to your own statement you are an idolater, and no idolater is eligible to tender evidence'.<sup>14</sup>

Rabina said: It is this that he<sup>2</sup> really told him,<sup>3</sup> 'Have you children?' [And when the other replied] 'Yes' [he asked] 'Have you grandchildren'. [The reply being again] 'Yes', he told him 'You are trusted so far as to disqualify your own children<sup>4</sup> but you cannot be trusted so far as to disqualify your grandchildren'.

Thus it was also taught elsewhere: R. Judah said, 'A man is trusted in respect [of the status of] his young son but not in respect of that of his grown-up son'; and R. Hiyya b. Abba explained in the name of R. Joḥanan that 'young' does not mean actually a minor and 'grown-up' does not mean one who is actually 'of age', but any young son who has children is regarded as of age while any grown-up son who has no children is deemed to be a minor. And the law is in agreement with R. Naḥman b. Isaac.<sup>5</sup> But, surely, [a Baraita] was taught in agreement with Rabina!<sup>6</sup>—That statement was made with reference to the law of ac-

<sup>a</sup> (6) Even outside the Land of Israel. This exposition is discussed *infra*. (7) Where it is an advantage to be a proselyte. (8) By the proselyte, that his circumcision was duly performed at the Beth din for the specific purpose of his initiation. Otherwise he is not to be trusted. (9) Where no material advantage is to be gained in claiming to be a proselyte. (10) To prove that the proselyte is accepted. (11) The witnesses. (12) Since they were not eye witnesses.

<sup>b</sup> (1) V. BaḤ. Cur. edd., 'in the land'. (2) The Scriptural expression, *with thee*. (3) Lit., 'thou hast brought it out', *supra*, to exclude the acceptance of a proselyte when not well known. How then could the same phrase be used for two different expositions? (4) וְיָדָעָהּ Lev. XIX, 33. (5) וְיָדָעָהּ, *ibid.* 34. V. אֲדָוָה הַגִּירָה, a.l. and *Torath Kohanim*. Cur. edd. read, וְיָדָעָהּ, 'from with thee' which occurs in Lev. XXV, 47. (6) Lev. XIX, 33. (Cf. BaḤ. Cur. edd., 'in the land') which excludes other countries. (7) Lit., 'there is'. (8) לֶקֶט, 'gleaning'; the gleanings of the harvest which must be left for the poor. V. Lev. XIX, 9, XXIII, 22, Peah IV, 10f. (9) וְשָׁחַח, 'forgetting'; any sheaf forgotten when a field is reaped belongs to the poor. V. Deut. XXIV, 19, Peah V, 7f, VI. (10) רְכָנִים, 'corner', sc. of the field, the produce of which must not be harvested by the owner, it being the portion of the poor. V. Lev. XIX, 9, XXIII, 22, Peah III. (11) וְשָׁחַח, given to the poor in the third and sixth years of the septennial cycle. (12) By a man who claims to have been properly initiated as a proselyte. (13) In the law under discussion the Sages are in the majority against R. Judah's individual opinion. (14) 'With thee' and 'In your land'. V. *supra*.

<sup>c</sup> (1) Deut. I, 16. זָר, 'proselyte' (E.V. 'stranger'). (2) Since 'proselyte' was mentioned in the same context as 'judge'. (3) I.e., who had been circumcised and performed the prescribed ablution. (4) As a judicial matter requires a Beth din so does the initiation of a proselyte. (5) [As children of a heathen father they would be disqualified, even if the mother was a Jewess, R. Judah being of the opinion that the offspring of the union of a heathen with a Jewess is *mumzer*, v. Tosaf. s.v. גִּיּוֹרִים]. (6) Sc. the *firstborn* (Deut. XXI, 17). (7) וְיָדָעָהּ, E.V., *he shall acknowledge*, being a Hif., may also be rendered as here, 'he shall make known', viz., to others. (8) Though another was hitherto reputed to be his firstborn son. (9) V. Glos. (10) If another son of his was reputed to be the firstborn. (11) *Kid.* 74a, 78b, B.B. 127b. Thus it has been shewn that, according to R. Judah, a father's word is accepted in respect of the status of his children. How, then, could it be stated here that the word of a proselyte was not to be relied upon as far as the eligibility of his children is concerned? (12) R. Judah. (13) The proselyte.

<sup>d</sup> (1) As his children have hitherto been reputed to be legitimate, his ineligible evidence cannot disqualify them. (2) R. Judah. (3) The proselyte. (4) In accordance with the deduction from 'He shall acknowledge' in the Baraita cited from *Kid.* and B.B. *supra*. (5) Who regarded the proselyte, on the strength of his own testimony, as an idolater whose evidence is inadmissible even in the case of his own children. (6) That a father is to be trusted in respect of a son of his who has no children. The assumption at the moment is that this referred to the case of a proselyte.



either too much prosperity, or too much suffering'. He is not, however, to be persuaded or dissuaded too much.<sup>7</sup> If he accepted,<sup>8</sup> he is circumcised forthwith. Should any shreds<sup>9</sup> which render the circumcision invalid remain, he is to be circumcised a second time. As soon as he is healed arrangements are made for his immediate ablution, when two learned men must stand by his side and acquaint him with some of the minor commandments and with some of the major ones.<sup>10</sup> When he comes up after his ablution he is deemed to be an Israelite in all respects.

In the case of a woman proselyte, women make her sit in the water up to her neck, while two learned men stand outside and give her instruction in some of the minor commandments and some of the major ones.

b The same law<sup>1</sup> applies to a proselyte and to an emancipated slave; and only where a menstruant may perform her ablution<sup>2</sup> may a proselyte and an emancipated slave perform this ablution;<sup>3</sup> and whatever is deemed an interception in ritual bathing<sup>4</sup> is also deemed to be an interception in the ablutions of a proselyte, an emancipated slave and a menstruant.<sup>5</sup>

The Master said, 'If a man desires to become a proselyte . . . he is to be addressed as follows: "What reason have you for desiring to become a proselyte . . ." and he is made acquainted with some of the minor, and with some of the major commandments'. What is the reason?—In order that if he desire to withdraw let him do so;<sup>6</sup> for R. Helbo said: Proselytes are as hard for Israel [to endure] as a sore,<sup>7</sup> because it is written in Scripture, *And the proselyte<sup>8</sup> shall join himself with them, and they shall cleave<sup>9</sup> to the house of Jacob.*<sup>10</sup>

'He is informed of the sin [of the neglect of the commandment of] Gleanings, the Forgotten Sheaf, the Corner and the Poor Man's Tithe'. What is the reason?—R. Hiyya b. Abba replied in the name of R. Johanan: Because a Noahide<sup>11</sup> would rather be killed than spend so much as a *perutah*<sup>12</sup> which is not returnable.<sup>13</sup>

c 'He<sup>1</sup> is not, however, to be persuaded, or dissuaded too much'. R. Eleazar said: What is the Scriptural proof?—It is written, *And when she saw that she was steadfastly minded to go with her, she left off speaking unto her.*<sup>2</sup> 'We are forbidden', she<sup>3</sup> told her,<sup>4</sup> '[to move

on the Sabbath beyond the] Sabbath boundaries'<sup>5</sup>—'Whither thou goest' [the other replied] 'I will go'.<sup>6</sup>

'We are forbidden private meeting between man and woman'<sup>7</sup>—'Where thou lodgest, I will lodge'.<sup>8</sup>

'We have been commanded six hundred and thirteen commandments'!—'Thy people shall be my people'.<sup>9</sup>

'We are forbidden idolatry'!—'And thy God my God'.<sup>10</sup>

'Four modes of death<sup>8</sup> were entrusted to Beth din'<sup>9</sup>—'Where thou diest, will I die'.<sup>10</sup>

'Two graveyards<sup>11</sup> were placed at the disposal of the Beth din'!—'And there will I be buried'.<sup>10</sup> Presently *she saw that she was steadfastly minded* etc.<sup>2</sup>

'If he accepted, he is circumcised forthwith'. What is the reason?—The performance of a commandment must not in any way be delayed.

'Should any shreds which render the circumcision invalid remain etc.', as we learned: These are the shreds which render the circumcision invalid: Flesh which covers the greater part of the corona,<sup>12</sup> [a priest having been so circumcised] is not permitted to eat *terumah*; and R. Jeremiah b. Abba explained in the name of Rab: Flesh which covers the greater part of the height of the corona.<sup>13</sup>

'As soon as he is healed arrangements are made for his immediate ablution'. Only after he is healed but not before!<sup>1</sup> What is the reason?—Because the water might irritate the wound.

'When two learned men must stand by his side'. Did not R. Hiyya, however, state in the name of R. Johanan that the initiation of a proselyte requires the presence of three?—But, surely, R. Johanan told the tanna:<sup>2</sup> Read, 'three'.

'When he comes up after his ablution he is deemed to be an Israelite in all respects'. In respect of what practical issue?—In that if he retracted and then betrothed the daughter of an Israelite he is regarded as a non-conforming Israelite and his betrothal is valid.<sup>3</sup>

'The same law applies to a proselyte and to an emancipated slave'. Assuming this<sup>4</sup> to apply to the acceptance of the yoke of the commandments,<sup>5</sup> the following contradiction may be pointed out: This<sup>6</sup> applies only to a proselyte, but an emancipated slave need not accept!<sup>7</sup>—R. Shesheth replied: This is no contradiction.

a (7) Lit., 'and they do not increase upon him nor do they enter with him in details'. (8) All the restrictions and disabilities pointed out to him. (9) Round the corona of the membrum virile. (10) With the ablution the proselyte completes his ritual initiation. Hence it is necessary that at that moment he shall submit to the 'yoke of the commandments'.

b (1) This is explained *infra*. (2) I.e., a ritual bath containing no less than forty *se'ah* of water. (3) Though the ablutions of the latter are not in connection with levitical uncleanness. (4) The water must come in direct contact with the bather. Should any foreign matter intervene between his body and the water the ablution is thereby rendered invalid. (5) Although the purpose of these ablutions is not, like that of the usual ablutions, to qualify for the eating, or the handling of, levitically clean things. The ablutions of the proselyte and the slave are only a part of their initiation ceremonial, while that of the menstruant has for its object the woman's permissibility to her husband. (6) Lit., 'that if he separates let him separate'. (7) *שִׁפְרָתוֹ*, cf. Lev. XIII, 2. (8) *זָרָה*, (E.V., 'stranger'). (9) *וְנִסְפָּרְתִּי*, of the same rt. as *סִפְרָתָהּ* (v. *supra* note 7), 'they will be like a sore'. (10) Isa. XIV, 1. Cf. *Kid. 70b*, *Nid. 13a*, *infra 109b*. An influx of proselytes tends to lower the moral standards of Judaism. (11) A descendant of Noah, i.e., all idolaters. (12) The smallest coin. (13) Hence he is informed of the laws of the yearly gifts to the poor. On learning of the Israelite's financial obligations to the causes of charity he would either resign himself to the inevitable or withdraw altogether from his intended conversion.

For another interpretation of this dictum, v. 'A.Z. Sonc. ed. p. 343:

c (1) V. Rashal a.l. Cur. edd. contain in parentheses: 'And he is informed of the sin of the Forgotten Sheaf and the Corner'. (2) Ruth I, 18. (3) Naomi. (4) Ruth. (5) *וְהָיָה שִׁפְרָתָהּ*, a distance of two thousand cubits in every direction from one's town, abode or resting place, within which alone one is permitted to move on the Sabbath. (6) Ruth I, 16. (7) *וְהִתְוַדַּע*, lit., 'uniting'. Unless married, man and woman may not remain in privacy with one another for any length of time. (8) Penalties for various offences. (9) V. *Sanh. 49b*. (10) Ruth I, 17. (11) One for the gravest offenders who suffered the death penalties of stoning or burning, and another for such as were executed by decapitation or strangulation. (12) Of the membrum virile. (13) I.e., even if only on a minor portion of the circumference.

d (1) Lit., 'he was healed, yes; he was not healed, no'. (2) Who recited before him the Baraita under discussion. (3) Separation cannot be effected except by means of a letter of divorce. The betrothal of an idolater is of no validity at all and no divorce is required. (4) The comparison between the proselyte and the slave. (5) As the proselyte who must at the time of his ablution accept the yoke of the commandments is made acquainted with some of them so must an emancipated slave when he performs ablution on the occasion of his emancipation. (6) That at the ablution a declaration of acceptance must be made. (7) His duty to observe the commandments having commenced at the moment he had performed his first ablution on the occasion of his initiation as the

For continuation of English translation see page 49b

