

The "Shahak affair" — called a "modern blood libel" by Rabbi Jakobovits in TRADITION's Summer 1966 issue — led to a responsum by Chief Rabbi Unterman of Israel stating that the Sabbath must be violated if necessary to save the lives of non-Jews as well as Jews. In this article, Rabbi Nachum Rabinovitch analyzes the basic legal concepts implicit in this responsum. Rabbi Rabinovitch's most recent contribution to these pages was his essay on "Chametz and Matzah" in our Spring 1966 issue.

A HALAKHIC VIEW OF THE NON-JEW

Purpose determines style. Thus the manner of presentation and the organization of the arguments in a responsum are radically different from the approach used in a purely expository discussion. It is not only a matter of traditional practice but often essential to the validity of the conclusions, that the style of a *Teshuvah* is usually what we might call inverted. One treats at length all the arguments that might be advanced against the conclusion to be established; the most far-fetched negative argument is eliminated first and one proceeds until all are rejected. The intended decision then remains as the only possibility, and the arguments for it are often dismissed in just a few words.

The purpose of a responsum is not primarily to explain why the law holds in a particular case. It is rather to prove that no matter how we look at a particular issue, the decision could not be otherwise. Thus one accepts for the sake of argument hypotheses which are not really justified in order to show that even if they *were*, the validity of the decision would be not affected. Naturally, when it comes to explaining the real motivations for the decision, the responsum may be downright misleading because the positive reasons for the law may not be adequately stressed.

TRADITION: *A Journal of Orthodox Thought*

By way of illustration, we might refer to the infamous Shahak affair which has been in the news in recent months. Figuring prominently in the discussion evoked by this modern libel is a responsum by the Ashkenazi Chief Rabbi I. J. Unterman which has been widely quoted and just as widely misconstrued.

In view of the prevalent ignorance of Jewish Law with respect to this sensitive area, it might be advisable to present an outline of the main halakhic issues involved.

To sum up the Biblical attitude to man, the Mishnah¹ quotes R. Akiva: "Beloved is man for he was created in the image of God. Out of special love it was made known to him that he was created in the Divine image." Rabbi Akiva goes on to describe the uniqueness of Israel in choosing to acknowledge its Father in Heaven, thereby meriting the status of "children of the Lord your God" (Deut. 14:1), and qualifying for the precious gift of Torah.

Rashi comments: "Beloved is man . . . therefore it is his duty to do his Maker's will." For Israel, our Maker's will is expressed in the six hundred and thirteen commandments. What about the rest of mankind? Basing itself on Biblical references and historical tradition, the Talmud² lists "seven commandments of the sons of Noah." These apply equally to all mankind since Noah was the progenitor of all. Of these, six are prohibitions and one is mandatory. The one positive commandment is to set up an administration of justice to enforce the other six commandments as well as such other just and equitable laws as may be enacted by suitable authority.³

Forbidden are: 1) murder, 2) incest, 3) robbery, 4) eating the flesh of animals which are still alive, 5) idolatry and 6) blasphemy.⁴

Jews are subject to many more commandments including those which set forth their obligations to their fellow-men in general and fellow-Jews in particular. Clearly, every human being is equally stamped with the image of God. Nonetheless, it is clear that my obligations to a man living half way across the world and whom I will never see ought not to be the same as those to my immediate neighbor. If they are set forth as

A Halakhic View of the Non-Jew

the same then they certainly cannot amount to very much! Clearly, too, my responsibilities to my fellow man ought to vary according to his circumstances as well as mine. One who is undernourished because he is rich and stingy cannot claim the same assistance as one who is starving because of poverty. If I happen to be a doctor, it is my obligation to care for the sick; but if I know nothing about medicine, treating certain diseases is not only not my duty — it is in fact forbidden, since in my ignorance, I am likely to do more harm than good.⁵

Furthermore, a community, like an individual, undertakes certain special obligations to one who is invited as a guest. Yet not everybody can lay claim to the right to be invited lest the multitude of guests eat their host out of home and hearth.

Recognizing these distinctions, the Halakhah divides mankind into three broad categories⁶ according to the commandments they are subject to and the obligations Jews have towards them.

1. Son of Noah, subject to the seven commandments.

2. *Ger Toshav* (resident alien) — a Son of Noah who has been granted residence rights in the Jewish State. While any fugitive slave who accepts the seven commandments must be admitted to residence in the Holy Land (Deut. 23:16, 17) others are admitted only on condition that they are accepted by a tribunal of three before whom they declare their willingness to abide by the seven commandments.⁷

“Why is he called Toshav (resident)? Because it is permitted for us to settle him among us in the Land of Israel.”⁸ The *Ger Toshav*, like the fugitive slave, is entitled to more than just admission to the country. To both⁹ applies the mandate of the Torah: “He shall dwell with you, in the midst of you, in the place which he shall choose within one of your gates, as it pleases him; you shall not vex him” (Deut. *loc. cit.*). This commandment is especially relevant.

The Rabbis explain¹⁰ “‘in the place which he shall choose’ — where his livelihood is to be found; ‘in one of your gates’ — he is not to be set wandering from place to place.” The residents of the town may not complain that he is competing with them, in order to force him to move on. On the contrary, they are obligated to sustain him.¹¹ Thus, the immigrant is entitled to the

TRADITION: *A Journal of Orthodox Thought*

assistance of the Jewish community to establish himself and his family.

This law applies only under the ideal conditions of Jewish independent statehood. "A *Ger Toshav* is accepted only when the Jubilee is in operation."¹² However, at any time "any one who keeps the seven commandments may not be excluded from dwelling in the land, although the court does not have jurisdiction to accept him."¹³

3. The third category consists of Jews, who are completely responsible for one another.¹⁴

Except for granting of immigrants' privileges, our obligations to a Son of Noah in our midst are the same as those to a *Ger Toshav*¹⁵ and are applicable to the Disapora. Especially important is the Biblical injunction (Lev. 25:35): "If your brother falls low and cannot maintain himself with you, you shall uphold him; though be he a stranger (*Ger*) or a resident (*Toshav*) he shall live with you." The *Sifra* understands *Ger* as a proselyte or complete convert to Judaism and *Toshav* as a resident alien.

What is implied in "He shall live with you?"

Nachmanides in his Bible commentary explains:

It is a mandatory commandment to sustain him. This is the source of the positive commandment to save a life. Based on this [the Rabbis] said:¹⁶ "Your brother shall live with you" (*ibid.* 36). Ben Petura explained this verse: If two are travelling in the desert and [only] one of them has a jug of water so that if he drinks he will be able to reach an inhabited place, but if both drink, both will die (since the water supply is inadequate), said Ben Petura, "Better that they both drink and die and let neither one see the other die." Rabbi Akiva, however, taught: "Your brother shall live with you — your life takes precedence over your fellow's life." The repetition of "your brother shall live with you" (Verse 36) emphasizes the command.

Although Maimonides does not consider this verse (35 alone or both 35 and 36) as the source of the commandment to save life, he does not disagree with the interpretation of the intent of this passage, for he rules that "since we are commanded to sustain a *Ger Toshav*, he must be given medical treatment without charge."¹⁷

A Halakhic View of the Non-Jew

Is there any difference between our obligation to save the life of a Jew and a *Ger Toshav*? The *Sifra*, to which Nachmanides refers, is explicit. There are two passages enjoining us to sustain life: one refers to a *Ger Toshav*, the other, to "your brother," namely, a Jew. The interpretation that the word "with" (in "he shall live with you" and "your brother shall live with you") implies that in extremity your life takes precedence over his, is expressly stated in *Sifra* in both instances.¹⁸ Thus, were it not for the limitation inherent in the word "with," one would suppose that you must be ready to give your life for a *Ger Toshav* no less than for a full Jew. Now that the Torah gives your life precedence, it precedes the life of your fellow-Jew no less than that of a *Ger Toshav*.¹⁹ In other words, our obligation to save a life is exactly the same for a *Ger Toshav* as for a Jew and requires that we do everything short of sacrificing our own life to save him.²⁰

What if there is a conflict of duties? If saving a life involves a major transgression, which duty takes precedence in such a case?

For a son of Noah, the question is irrelevant. With the exception of murder,²¹ "A son of Noah who is compelled to transgress one of his commandments is permitted to do so; even if he is compelled to worship idols he may do so, because he is not commanded to sanctify God's name,"²² nor even to worship Him.

A Jew, however, is subject to the command, "You shall not profane my holy Name, but I will be sanctified among the people of Israel" (Lev. 22:32). The Talmud²³ establishes that idolatry, incest, and murder may not be committed even to save one's life. A Jew is required to sanctify the name of God by martyrdom rather than transgress these commandments. Even with respect to other commandments, martyrdom is required under certain circumstances.

Generally, however, a commandment may be transgressed in order to save human life. What is the source of this rule? In *Yoma* 85a we read of a discussion on this point between Rabbi Ishmael, Rabbi Akiva, Rabbi Elazar ben Azariah and others. Their primary concern was with the Sabbath, since the Sabbath

TRADITION: *A Journal of Orthodox Thought*

is a keystone of Torah, included in the Tablets of the Covenant, and, in some respects, desecrating the Sabbath is equivalent to idolatry.²⁴

The scriptural source of this law is the verse (Lev. 18:5): "You shall therefore keep my statutes and my ordinances, which if a man do he shall live by them and not die by them."

Now, who is the subject of this clause, *which if a man do he shall live*? Does *man* refer to a Jew or to any man? The Talmud several times quotes Rabbi Meir: "How do we know that even a non-Jew who occupies himself with the Torah is like the High Priest? For it is written 'which if a man do he shall live' — not Priests, Levites, or Israelites but MAN. Thus you learn that even a non-Jew who engages in the Torah is like a High Priest." The Talmud concludes that this refers to the seven commandments, since a non-Jew is not obligated for the rest.²⁵ Thus, it is clear that the verse which authorizes desecrating the Sabbath in order that a man may live refers to any son of Noah, not just to Jews.²⁶

Nachmanides²⁷ formulates the laws in the following manner:

We are commanded to sustain a *Ger Toshav*, to save him from harm, e.g., if he be drowning in a river or if a ruin fell on him, we must try with all our power to save him. If he be sick, we must treat him. For one of our brothers, an Israelite or a proselyte (*Ger Tzedek*), we are certainly obligated to him in all these things. This is for *them* "saving a life which suspends the Sabbath." This is what the Almighty says: "If your brother falls low and cannot maintain himself with you, you shall uphold him; though he be a stranger or a resident he shall live with you," and in the Talmud they said: "You are commanded to sustain a *Ger*" . . . and this commandment was counted by the author of *Halakhot* as "Sustain thy brother," but the master (Maimonides) includes it with charity, commandment number 195 . . . but in fact they are two separate commandments.²⁸

A considerable literature deals with the conditions under which medical treatment is permissible on the Sabbath. Before proceeding to discuss particulars, Maimonides states the general rule²⁹ . . .

As regards a dangerously ill person, the Sabbath is like a weekday for all things that he requires. It is forbidden to delay breaking the

A Halakhic View of the Non-Jew

Sabbath for one dangerously ill, as it is written "which if a man do, he shall live — not die." Thus you learn that the laws of the Torah are not for vengeance against the world, but for compassion, loving-kindness and peace in the world. As for those heretics (the Karaites) who say it is a desecration of the Sabbath and forbidden — about them scripture says: "Moreover I gave them statutes that were not good and ordinances by which they could not have life" (Ezekiel 20:25).

What about childbirth? On the one hand, delivering a baby involves no Biblically prohibited form of work.³⁰ On the other hand, childbirth is a natural function of a healthy mother. There is nothing pathological or dangerous in ordinary cases.³¹

But for the mother's peace of mind and comfort it may be necessary to perform activities that entail a violation of the Sabbath. They too are permitted, but with the proviso that, if at all possible, they be done differently from the usual method so that technically they will no longer be in the category of Biblically prohibited forms of work. Thus, even for a blind woman, it is permitted to kindle a light, so that she will feel reassured that those attending her can see clearly and look after her needs.³²

Accordingly, Maimonides maintains that for a woman in child-birth "whatever is possible to do differently must be done so."³³ But in the case of a dangerously sick person he writes "the Sabbath is like a weekday for all things that he requires,"³⁴ and one need not modify the normal manner of performing the activity.

Although the obligation to treat a *Ger Toshav* is expressly stated, when Maimonides speaks of suspending the Sabbath to save a life neither Jew nor *Toshav* are mentioned. In his discussion of childbirth a distinction is made between a Jew and a *Toshav*.

"We deliver a woman *Ger Toshav*, since we are commanded 'to sustain him,' but one must not violate the Sabbath for her."³⁵ Obviously, since for a woman in childbirth, a change from the usual procedure is required, for a non-Jew the indicated change is to have a non-Jew assist if necessary, and *he* will be able to do his work in the normal manner. However, there is no ques-

TRADITION: *A Journal of Orthodox Thought*

tion that insofar as the actual delivery is concerned, this duty is implicit in the commandment "to sustain him" and a Jew should not relinquish the opportunity to perform this *Mitzvah*. In fact, if no non-Jew is available even the other services may be done by a Jew with a suitable change of procedure, since technically there will then be no Biblically prohibited Sabbath work.

The Jew accepts gratefully the responsibilities imposed upon him to respect the Divine image in man and make every sacrifice barring only life itself to save the life of another. However, does this obligation extend to criminals who rebelliously cast off the Divine image? Although we are not ordinarily permitted to take the law into our own hands to attack wrongdoers³⁶ (except to save a victim³⁷ or other special cases³⁸) "if harm comes to habitual criminals of itself, we are not commanded to save them."³⁹

In the long and troubled history of the Jewish people, it has been our lot at different times to be exposed to savage and wicked peoples whose religion was violence and whose law was murder, rapine and plunder. In speaking of some of the Roman occupation officials, the Mishnah warns against seeing one of them unescorted, and certainly putting oneself in their hands for medical treatment, because one would never come out of the encounter alive.⁴⁰ And in our own twentieth century, brutes like Mengele and his battalions of German doctors devised fiendish ways of utilizing modern medical techniques to sterilize, maim and slaughter helpless Jews.

Yet even in dealing with such abominable creatures, the Rabbis felt that to refrain from helping them in their time of need could not be justified. They were concerned about the danger of fanning the flames of hatred⁴¹ to an even higher pitch and, more importantly, their innate optimism about man's better self led them to hope that by our pursuit of "the ways of peace"⁴² even wild beasts might be tamed.⁴³ To this end, even desecration of the Sabbath was permitted when necessary.⁴⁴ This is to be done with the awareness that the name of God will be glorified in this function and in the hope that in the hearts of all his creatures there will be awakened the desire to serve Him.⁴⁵

A Halakhic View of the Non-Jew

Yet, such is the ethical sensitivity of the Halakhah, that even in the presence of the danger which might ensue from aggravated hatred, the Talmud is concerned about the rightness of helping bring into the world an innocent baby when it is known that he will be raised as a brute and will be brought up to disregard the most elementary attributes of humanity.⁴⁶ Today, we are concerned about the moral rectitude of opposing birth control when children are born fated to starve. Is there not at least an equal basis for anxiety when children are brought into the world to serve as cannon fodder or as the spiritually blind shock troops of a mad emperor?

If proof were needed that the vast majority of non-Jews should be accorded the treatment of a *Ger Toshav*, it might be appropriate to cite the views of some of the classical and modern halakhic authorities.

In his Talmud commentary, Meiri writes:⁴⁸

All who hold to the seven commandments are treated equally in the law with us and there is no favoritism for us. It goes without saying that this is so for the nations who are disciplined in the ways of religions and civilization.

Why does it go without saying? Simply because the great religions demand even more than just the seven commandments.

Meiri continues:

The Almighty will not deprive any one of reward who engages in Torah for its own sake. It has been expressly said: "Even a non-Jew who engages in Torah, even only in his seven commandments, and even if his nation as a whole transgresses them, since, however, he fulfills them as the Creator's command, he is like the High Priest." Moreover, with regard to other commandments, the Almighty will not deprive of reward those who fulfill them — even for a becoming expression, even for hurrying to perform a *Mitzvah* though it be not such as needs to be done immediately. It is a great principle for all His commandments: According to a man's works, so shall he be rewarded.

In a monograph⁴⁹ which appeared in 1840, Rabbi Zvi Chayes discusses at length Jewish-Gentile relations. We quote here only one paragraph:⁵⁰

TRADITION: *A Journal of Orthodox Thought*

The seven commandments are the natural laws which both Christians and Mohammedans apply in their courts, and both see that they are fulfilled . . . and every one who keeps the seven commandments, because they were given in God's Torah by the hand of Moses, is a *Ger Toshav*. Also, Maimonides (Laws of Kings 12) and the *Kuzari* (4:34) write that these religions are a prelude and a preparation for the hoped-for Messiah, who is the principal fruit. Then they will all become his fruit when they acknowledge Him and the tree will become whole and they will hold dear the root which they despised at first.

A leading *Posek* (halakhic authority) of our day, Rabbi Joseph Eliyahu Henkin writes:⁵¹

"Beloved is man for he was created in the image of God." This applies even to idolaters (See *Tiferet Israel* on *Avot*). Certainly the people of the world in our time are not idol worshippers, and with the passage of the generations, idolatry has been progressively uprooted from their hearts . . . and even if there are some who worship idols, in my opinion, the overwhelming majority are in the category of *Ger Toshav*.

As for the rule in the Talmud (*Yevamot* 46, *Avodah Zarah* 64) that a *Ger Toshav* must accept the seven commandments before a tribunal of three as a decree from God through Moses, this is only with respect to our obligation to provide him with a livelihood and the privilege to reside in the Land of Israel. But, insofar as being removed from the class of idolaters is concerned, anyone who denies idolatry and acknowledges that the seven commandments are obligatory, is a *Ger Toshav*.

When a Rabbi in Israel writes a responsum to a question dealing with our responsibilities to a non-Jew, all of the background material we have discussed is taken for granted. Without it, one cannot begin to understand what the responsum is all about.

For centuries we were besieged and beleaguered, hounded and persecuted. Every diabolical stratagem was applied to destroy the spirit and the body of those who remained loyal. And yet we survived not, as might be expected, embittered and hardened beyond the capacity for humane feeling and compassion. Not so! Our fathers who suffered in the ghettos of the middle ages and the pale of Russia, and our brothers, who in

A Halakhic View of the Non-Jew

our own day felt the satanic fury of accursed Nazidom, were not brutalized by the enormity of their suffering.

The more they suffered, the deeper did Jews penetrate to the meaning of the Halakhah about man and the more truly did their day-to-day practice reflect the highest response to God's imperative. Compassion and mercy for all men are the mark of the Jew, just as they are of God. As Rabbi Akiva said, "Beloved is man for he was created in the image of God. . . . Beloved is Israel for they are called 'children of God,'"

NOTES

1. *Avot* 3:14.
2. *Sanhedrin* 56a.
3. See Maimonides' Code *Hilkhot Melakhim*, 9:14 and the commentators: Nachmanides' Commentary on Gen. 34:13; Rabbi J. E. Henkin, *Lev Ivra*, New York 5717, p. 125 and *Hadarom* (10), 5719, p. 8, footnote.
4. For details see Maimonides' *Hilkhot Melakhim* 9 and 10.
5. Cf., e.g., *Yoreh Deah* 336:1.
6. *Ritva* on *Makot* 9.
7. *Hilkhot Melakhim* 8:10.
8. *Hilkhot Isurei Biah* 14:7.
9. C. Sifri, *Deut.* 23:16.
10. *Sifri loc. cit.*
11. *Malbim* to *Sifri*.
12. *Hilkhot Isurei Biah* 14:8.
13. *Keseiph Mishneh*, *Hilkhot Avodah Zarah* 10:6.
14. *Shevuot* 39a.
15. *Hilkhot Melakhim* 10:10.
16. *Sifra*; also *Bava Metzia* 62a.
17. *Hilkhot Avodah Zarah* 10:2. He only treats this as an aspect of another commandment, viz. number 195, not a separate one. See our quotation below from Nachmanides' Supplement to the Mandatory Commandments 16 and *Megilat Esther*.
18. The Gaon of Vilna suggests an emendation to the text. However, this emendation is opposed by the evidence not only of all our printed editions, as well as the standard commentators *Malbim* and *Korban Aharon*, but by the commentary of Rabbenu Hillel, one of the early Rishonim. (published from

TRADITION: A Journal of Orthodox Thought

four ancient manuscripts, Jerusalem 5721). See also *Kovetz Hearot* to Rabbenu Hillel (vol. 2 p. 77) who establishes that Maimonides must have had a similar reading to that of Rabbenu Hillel.

19. For a discussion on the law where there is only a risk not a certainty, of losing one's own life in the process of saving another, see e.g. Rabbi Meir Dan Plotsky, *Chemdat Yisrael*, Pietrokov 5687, p. 28 ff. and Addenda p. 7, footnote.

20. *Ibid.*, p. 204.

21. That one may not commit murder in order to save one's life does not require a special commandment. It follows rather from reason: "Do you suppose your blood is redder than his?" (*Pesachim* 25b).

22. *Hilkhhot Melakhim* 10:2.

23. *Sanhedrin* 74a.

24. Cf. *Chullin* 5a.

25. *Sanhedrin* 59a.

26. See *Chemdat Yisrael*, *Kuntres Sheva Mitzvot Benei Noach*, 7.

In a recent work, Rabbi Abraham A. Price disagrees with this interpretation. He argues that the verse "by doing which a man shall live" releases only the victim who is in danger from the duty to keep the Sabbath. In the case of a non-Jew, of course, no such permission is required. In order to establish that another may break the Sabbath on behalf of the victim, he argues, we must refer to *he shall live with you* which makes it obligatory for me to do everything to save someone else that I would do for myself. Since if my own life is endangered I may transgress the Sabbath law, the same may be done on behalf of anybody else. In any case, the conclusion is identical that for a *Ger Toshav* just as for a full Jew, the duty to save life is paramount. See *Mishnat Avraham*, Toronto 5710, p. 3.

For obvious reasons, we preferred the more usual interpretation in the text, where we are only concerned with the broad aspects of the law.

27. Rabbi Mosheh ben Nachman (circa 1195-1270) known as Nachmanides, the acknowledged leader of Spanish Jewry, was in his seventies when he was exiled from his native Aragon at the instigation of the Dominicans. Although, together with all other Jews, he suffered harsh indignities, in his medical practice he treated Jews and non-Jews alike. In fact, it is recorded that he even tried to treat infertility in certain non-Jewish patients who apparently were among the Jew-baiters, for which he was upbraided: "You are multiplying the seed of Amalek." Yet he persisted in the hope that the "ways of peace" would overcome evil. (*Bet Joseph-Yoreh Deah* 154).

28. Supplement to the Mandatory Commandments 16. Cf. also Meiri *Yoma* 84b.

29. *Hilkhhot Shabbat* 2:2-3.

30. Cf. *Tosafot Avodah Zarah* 26a.

31. Meiri, *Commentary to Shabbat* 128b; *Magid Mishneh*, *H. Shabbat*, 2:11.

32. *Shabbat* 128b.

33. *Hilkhhot Shabbat* 2:11.

34. *Ibid.* 2.

A Halakhic View of the Non-Jew

35. *Ibid.* 12. It is not usual for Maimonides to state a law which is not found explicitly in the Rabbinic Sources. However, none of the standard commentators cite a specific source for this statement. The only possible one I have been able to find is the *Tosefta Avodah Zarah* 3:1: a Jewish woman delivers and nurses the child of a Cuthite. It may be that the term Cuthite is due to a censor's change. However, it does not seem likely in this case. Perhaps, because it is a common occurrence about which guidance is often sought, Maimonides felt it necessary to specify this rule even though this particular instance of it had not appeared in the earlier literature.

36. *Hilkhot Rotzeach*, 1:5.

37. *Ibid.* 6.

38. *Avodah Zarah* 10:1.

39. Meiri, Commentary to *Avodah Zarah* 26a.

40. *Avodah Zarah* 27a.

41. *Ibid.* 26a.

42. *Gittin* 61a: Maimonides, *Hilkhot Melakhim* 10:12 — for the ways of peace, as it is written, *The Lord is good to all and His mercies are over all his works* (Psalms 145:9) and it is written, *Its [the Torah's] ways are ways of pleasantness and all its paths are peace* (Proverbs 3:17).

43. Cf. Tosafot *Gittin* 70a *s.v. Rav*; Rabbi J. E. Henkin *loc. cit.*; *Tanchumah, Chukat*, 51.

It is written: *Depart from evil and do good; seek peace, and pursue it* (Psalms 34:15). The Torah did not order us to pursue the commandments, e.g., *if you chance upon a bird's nest* (Deut. 22:6) *if you meet your enemy's ox* (Ex. 23:3) . . . if the opportunity presents itself you are duty-bound to do them but not to run after them. But as for peace, *seek peace in your place, and pursue it elsewhere*.

44. Cf. *She'elot u'Teshuvot Divrei Chayim* II, 25; *She'elot u'Teshuvot Chatam Sopher*, Yoreh Deah 131; *Choshen Mishpat* 194.

45. Cf. Rabbi Eliezer J. Waldinberg, *Tzitz Eliezer*, Jerusalem 5725, 15-6.

46. *Avodah Zarah* 26a. See above Note 27.

47. Rabbi Menachem ben Shlomo Meiri (1249-1306), distinguished for his extremely lucid Bible and Talmud commentaries, lived in Perpignan (France).

48. *Bava Kama* 37b.

49. *Ateret Zvi Tiferet Yisrael*.

50. *Kol Sifrei Maharitz Chayot* I, Jerusalem 5718, p. 490.

51. *Hadarom, loc. cit.*