

Women and Shechita

The mishnah on Zevachim 32a clearly permits women to perform ritual slaughter even *ab initio* (lechatchila). And yet, this practice is rare if not impossible to find today. What happened, and can it be reversed? In this shiur, we will examine debates about this issue.

Questions? Comments? Email dinanddaf@gmail.com

1. משנה זבחים ג:א

כָּל הַפְּסוּלִין שֶׁשְּׁחָטוּ, שֶׁחִטְתָּן כְּשֶׁרָה. שֶׁהִשְׁחִיטָה כְּשֶׁרָה בְּזָרִים, בְּנָשִׁים, וּבַעֲבָדִים, וּבְטַמְאִים, אֶפְלוּ בְּקֹדֶשִׁי קֳדָשִׁים, וּבְלֹבֶד שֶׁלֹּא יְהִיוּ טַמְאִים נוֹגְעִים בְּבֶשֶׂר...
...and by ritually impure individuals. And this is the *halakha* even with regard to offerings of the most sacred order, provided that the ritually impure will not touch the flesh of the slaughtered animal, thereby rendering it impure...

With regard to all those who are unfit for Temple service who slaughtered an offering, their slaughter is valid, as the slaughter of an offering is valid *ab initio* when performed even by non-priests, by women, by Canaanite slaves, and by ritually impure individuals. And this is the *halakha* even with regard to offerings of the most sacred order, provided that the ritually impure will not touch the flesh of the slaughtered animal, thereby rendering it impure...

2. זבחים לב.

גַּמִּי "שֶׁחָטוּ" – דִּיעֲבַד אֵין, לְכַתְּחִלָּה לֹא.

The Gemara infers from the use of the past tense in the mishna: With regard to all those who are unfit for Temple service who slaughtered, that after the fact, yes, the slaughter is valid. But *ab initio*, no, those who are unfit may not slaughter an offering.

וּרְמִינָהּ: "וְשָׁחֹט" – שֶׁחִטְתָּה בְּזָר, שֶׁהִשְׁחִיטָה כְּשֶׁרָה בְּזָרִים וּבְנָשִׁים וּבַעֲבָדִים וּבְטַמְאִים. וְאֶפְלוּ בְּקֹדֶשִׁי קֳדָשִׁים. אוֹ אֵינוֹ אֵלָּא בְּכַהֲנִים?

And the Gemara raises a contradiction from what was taught in the halakhic midrash *Torat Kohanim*: The verse states with regard to a burnt offering: "And he shall slaughter the bull before the Lord" (Leviticus 1:5). The fact that the verse does not stipulate that a priest must slaughter the offering teaches that slaughter is valid if performed by a non-priest, as stated in the mishna: As the sacrificial rite of slaughter is valid when performed by non-priests, by women, by Canaanite slaves, and by ritually impure individuals, and even with regard to offerings of the most sacred order. Or perhaps the term "and he shall slaughter" in the verse is referring only to slaughter by priests?

אֲמַרְתָּ: וְכִי מֵאֵין בָּאתָ – מִכָּלֵל שֶׁנֶּאֱמַר: "וְאַתָּה וּבְנֶיךָ אֶתְּךָ תִּשְׁמְרוּ אֶת כְּהֹנֶתְכֶם לְכָל דְּבַר הַמִּצְוָה";

You can say in response: From where did you come to the idea that the verse is referring only to a priest? It is from the fact that it is stated to Aaron: "And you and your sons with you shall keep your priesthood in everything that pertains to the altar" (Numbers 18:7).

יָכוֹל אֵף בְּשִׁחִיטָה? תִּלְמֹד לומר: "וְשָׁחֹט אֶת בֶּן הַבָּקָר לִפְנֵי ה' וְהִקְרִיבוּ וְגו'" – מִקְבֵּלָה וְאֵילָּה מִצּוֹת כְּהוֹנָה; לִיָּמֶד עַל הִשְׁחִיטָה שֶׁכְּשֶׁרָה בְּכָל אָדָם.

One might have thought that this is the *halakha* even with regard to slaughter, that only priests are fit to slaughter an offering. Therefore, the verse states: "And he shall slaughter the bull before the Lord, and Aaron's sons, the priests, shall present [*vehikrivu*] the blood" (Leviticus 1:5), from which it is inferred that specifically from the collection of the blood and onward it is a mitzva exclusively of the priesthood. This teaches about the rite of slaughter that it is valid *ab initio* if performed by any person.

הוא הדין דאפילו לכתחילה נמי; ומשום דקא בעי למיתנא טמאים – דלכתחילה לא, גזירה שמה יגעו בבשר; תנא: "ששחטו".

The same is true that even *ab initio* as well it is permitted for those unfit for Temple service to slaughter an offering, but because the mishna wants to teach with regard to the ritually impure that they may not slaughter an offering *ab initio* due to a rabbinic decree lest they touch the flesh and render it ritually impure, therefore the mishna taught this *halakha* with the expression in the past tense: Who slaughtered, i.e., after the fact.

3. משנה חולין א:א

הכל שוחטין ושחיתטין קשרה, חוץ מחרש, שוטה, וקטן, שמה יקלקלו בשחיתטין...

Everyone slaughters an animal, i.e., can perform halakhically valid slaughter, and their slaughter is valid, except for a deaf-mute, one who is *non compos mentis*, and a minor, lest they ruin their slaughter because they lack competence...

4. משנה נדה ח:ב

ותולה בכל דבר שהיא יכולה לתלות. שחטה בהמה, חיה ועוף, נתעסקה בכתמים או שישבה בצד העסוקים בהן, הרגה מאכלת, הרי זו תולה בה...:

And a woman who discovers a blood stain on her body or her garment may attribute its existence to any matter to which she can attribute it: If she slaughtered a domesticated animal, a wild animal, or a bird; or if she was occupied with the removal of blood stains from the garments of other women or from her own garment, from any source, such as blood that originated from a wound elsewhere on her body or even her own menstrual blood from a prior menstrual cycle; or if she sat alongside others who were occupied with removing blood stains; or if she killed a louse; in all of these cases, that woman may attribute the blood stain to it...

5. רמב"ם משנה תורה הל' שחיטה ד:ד (R. Moshe ben Maimon, 12th c. Spain, Morocco) (Egypt)

היודע הלכות שחיטה ושחט בפני חכם עד שנעשה רגיל הוא הנקרא ממחה. וכל הממחין שוחטין לכתחלה בין לבין עצמן. ואפלו נשים ועבדים אם היו ממחין הרי אלו שוחטין לכתחלה:

When one knows the laws of ritual slaughter and slaughters in the presence of a wise man until he becomes familiar with ritual slaughter, he is called an expert. Any expert may slaughter in private as an initial and preferred option. Even women and servants may slaughter as an initial and preferred option.

6. רשב"א תורת הבית הארוך, בית א', שער א' (R. Shlomo ibn Adret, 13th c. Spain)

ואשה ועבד בודקין סכין לעצמן ושוחטין לכתחילה בפני עצמן כאנשים. ובכלל הכל שוחטין דמתניתין איתנהו אפילו בשאין אחרים רואין אותן מדקתני חוץ מחרש שוטה וקטן ולא תני נשים ועבדים בהדייהו.

And a woman or indentured servant check the knife on their own and may slaughter *ab initio* themselves like men. And within the "all may slaughter" in the mishnah, there are included in those who are not watched over by others, based on the qualification of "except for a deaf-mute, a non compos mentis and a minor," without mentioning women or indentured servants among those exceptions.

7. תוספות זבחים לא: ד"ה ששחיטה

שהשחיטה כשרה בנשים - בגמרא מוכח דנשים שוחטות אפי' לכתחילה הא דתנן ששחטו דיעבד משום דבעי למיתני טמאים דלכתחילה לא ולא קאמר משום דבעי למיתני נשים דקתני ברישא מיכן תשובה למה שכתבו בהלכות א"י דנשים לא ישחטו מפני שדעתן קלה ועוד כתוב בהן שחט ולא בירך וערום ששחט שחיטה פסולה ונראה שהם חומרות בעלמא שהיה אומר אותו החכם שכתב הלכות ארץ ישראל:

For slaughter is kosher when performed by women - In the Gemara it is proven that women may slaughter even *ab initio*. The mishnah only used past tense of "who slaughtered" which is after the fact, because it includes ritually impure people who do not slaughter *ab initio* - and it does not say because it is to teach women which was taught at the outset. This is a response to that which was written in "Hilkhot Eretz Yisrael" that women should not slaughter because their minds are light. And moreover, it is written in that compilation "one who slaughters and did not recite the blessing, a naked person who slaughtered, the slaughter is invalid," and it seems that those are just strictures that the sage who wrote Hilkhot Eretz Yisrael would say.

8. תוספות עירובין נט. ד"ה ותחומין

...דמעשה בכל יום שמאמינן לנשים בשחיטה וניקור ולתרום חלה היינו משום דהוי בידה קודם שנעשית השחיטה הוי בידה לשחוט...

...It is an everyday occurrence that we believe women regarding slaughter, the removal of the hindquarters and the separation of the *hallah* dough position - this is because she has the ability to these things before they are done - e.g., before the slaughter is done, she can slaughter...

9. מרדכי חולין ריש פרק א' ד, א' עמוד א' (Mordechai ben Hillel HaCohen, 13th c. Germany)

כתב רבינו ברוך: ראיתי כתוב בהלכות שחיטה שהביא רבי אלדד בן מחלי הבא מעשרת השבטים (9th century, Babylonia, Karoian, Spain). אמר יהושע מפי משה מפי הגבורה... ואם ישחט בלא ברכה פיגול הוא, ואם ישחט ערום פיגול, ואם שיכור פיגול, ואם שחט ולא היה עליו סודר (=על ראשו) פיגול, ואם לא הורחץ משכבת זרע ושחט פיגול. אבל אסור לשחוט בימי אבלו, מיד אשה, מיד סריס, מיד זקן לאחר שעברו עליו פ' שנה, ומנער עד שימלא י"ח שנה.

Rabbenu Baruch wrote: I saw written in the laws of slaughter that R. Eldad ben Machli of the ten lost tribes brought: Joshua said from Moshe, who said from God... And if one slaughters without reciting a benediction, it is invalid, and if one slaughters naked, it is invalid, if drunk, it is invalid, if without a headcovering, it is invalid, if one was not washed of their seminal emission and forgot and slaughtered, it is invalid, a mourner may not slaughter during their mourning period, from a women, from a eunuch, from someone over 80, from a child who has not yet filled 18 years (all are invalid).

וחומר בעלמא הוא כל אלה הדברים ולא נהגין כוותיה.

(Mordechai comments:) And all of these things are mere stricture, and we do not follow him in our practice.

10. שולחן ערוך יורה דעה א:א (16th c.)

הכל שוחטין לכתחלה אפילו נשים: הגה יש אומרים שאין להניח נשים לשחוט. שכבר נהגו שלא לשחוט וכן המנהג שאין הנשים שוחטות: (ב"י בשם האגור)

All may slaughter (shecht), at the outset, even women. Rema: {There are those that say that women should not be permitted to shecht, as we have already established a custom that (women) are not to shecht, and thus the tradition (holds) that women do not shecht.}

11. ר' יעקב ברוך לנדא, ספר האגור - ריש הלכות שחיטה סימן אלף סעיף ב' (15th c Germany; moved to Italy towards the end of his life)

מילתא דפשיטא היא דאשה כשרה לשחוט אפילו לכתחילה...אף כי התוספות כתבו בביאור שנשים שוחטות אפילו לכתחילה, המנהג בכל גלות ישראל שלא ישחטו ומעולם לא ראיתי נוהג לשחוט ולכן אין להניחם לשחוט. כי המנהג מבטל הלכה ומנהג אבותינו תורה היא.

It is clear that a women may slaughter even *ab initio*...And even though Tosafot even wrote clearly that women slaughter even *ab initio*, the practice in all of the Jewish diaspora is that women do/should not slaughter. And I have never seen the practice of women slaughtering, and therefore, one should not let them slaughter. For the custom overrides the strict law, and our parents' custom is Torah.

12. ר' יוסף קארו, בית יוסף יורה דעה א:ג (16th c. Spain, Portugal, Morocco, Turkey, Israel)

...והאגור כתב שאף על פי שדעת הפוסקים כן המנהג בכל גלות ישראל שלא ישחטו ולעולם לא ראיתי נוהג לשחוט ולכן אין להניחן לשחוט כי המנהג מבטל הלכה מנהג אבותינו תורה היא - עד כאן לשונו. ואני אומר שאם היה אומר שהיו רוצות לשחוט ולא הניחום היה אפשר לומר שהיא ראייה, אך ראיית לא ראינו אינה ראייה. ...And the Agur wrote that even though all the decisions are such (that women may slaughter), the custom in all of the Jewish diaspora is that they do/should not. And I have never seen the practice of women slaughtering, and therefore, one should not let them slaughter. For the custom overrides the strict law, and our parents' custom is Torah - end quote. **(R. Yosef Karo:)** And I say that if he would have said that they wanted to slaughter and they did not allow them, he could have cited that as a proof, but a proof of "We have never seen" is not a proof.

וכתב הכל בו ה"ר יצחק כתב שהנשים שוחטות לעצמן משמע שאין שוחטות לאחרים עכ"ל ודבר תימה הוא מה חילוק יש בין שוחט לעצמו לשוחט לאחרים דכ"כ הכשר צריך לזה כמו לזה ומ"ש ר"י לעצמן היינו לומר שהן לבדן שוחטות וא"צ שיעמוד אחר על גבן:

And the Kol Bo wrote that R. Yitzchak ("halavan" ben Yaakov, Bohemia, 12th c.) wrote that women slaughter לעצמן (either by or for themselves) sounds like they don't slaughter for others - end quote. And this is surprising - what is the difference between slaughtering for oneself and for others - for anything that needs to be kosher has to be kosher for each person. And what R. Yitzchak wrote "for themselves" means that they can slaughter on their own and no one needs to supervise them.

13. שפתי כהן, שו"ע יורה דעה א:א (- R. Shabtai ben Meir HaCohen 17th c. Ashkenaz)
(various countries)

וכן המנהג: כ"כ האגור והב"י השיג עליו דלא ראינו אינה ראייה לפי עניות דעתי נראה דדעת האגור כמ"ש מהרי"ק בשרש קע"ב דבמנהג וכהאי גוונא הוי לא ראינו ראייה וכמ"ש הרב בח"מ ס"ס ל"ז.

And such is the custom: So wrote the Agur. And the Beit Yosef challenged him that "we have not seen" is not a proof. In my humble opinion, it seems that the Agur held like the Maharik in shresh 172 that regarding customs and such "we haven't seen" does constitute proof - and as the rabbi wrote in Choshen Mishpat the end of chapter 37.

14. משנה זבחים יב:ד (See also Mishnah Eduyyot 2:2)

כָּל הַקֹּדָשִׁים שְׁאֵרַע בָּהֶם פָּסוּל קֹדֶם לְהַפְשִׁטוֹ, אֵין עוֹרוֹתֵיהֶם לִכְהֻנָּה. לְאַחַר הַפְשִׁטוֹ, עוֹרוֹתֵיהֶם לִכְהֻנָּה. אָמַר רַבִּי חֲנִינָא סֵגֵן הַכֹּהֲנִים, מִיָּמַי לֹא רָאִיתִי עוֹר יוֹצֵא לְבֵית הַשְּׂרָפָה. אָמַר רַבִּי עֲקִיבָא, מְדַבְּרִיו לְמַדְנִי, שֶׁהַמִּפְשִׁיט אֶת הַבְּכוֹר וְנִמְצָא טְרָפָה, שְׂאִיתוֹ הַכֹּהֲנִים בְּעוֹרוֹ. וְחֻכְמִים אֹמְרִים, אֵין לֹא רָאִינוּ רָאִיָּה, אֶלָּא יוֹצֵא לְבֵית הַשְּׂרָפָה:

If any offerings of the most sacred order were disqualified prior to their flaying, their hides do not go to the priests; rather, they are burned together with the flesh in the place of burning. If they were disqualified after their flaying, their hides go to the priests. Rabbi Ḥanina, the deputy High Priest, said: In all my days, I never saw a hide going out to the place of burning. Rabbi Akiva said: From the statement of Rabbi Ḥanina, the deputy High Priest, we learned that in a case where one flays the firstborn offering, and the animal is later discovered to have a wound that would have caused it to die within twelve months [*tereifa*], the *halakha* is that the priests may derive benefit [*sheye'otu*] from its hide. And the Rabbis say: The claim: We did not see, is no proof; rather, if after flaying it is discovered that the animal was unfit before it was flayed, the hide goes out to the place of burning.

15. ר' יעקב עמדין, שאלת יעבץ חלק ב' סימן קנז (18th c. Germany)

...ועדיין צריך לבאר שהב"י הביא מ"ש האגור בשם ר"י הלבן. שהנשים שוחטות לעצמן משמע שאין שוחטות לאחרים. וכתב עליו ודבר תימה הוא. ונדחק לפרש לשון לעצמן לבדן. ומשמעות הלשון אינו כן אף שיש דוגמתו בלשון משנה. אינו רגיל על לשון הפוסקים. אבל נראה שהוא כמשמעו והבנתו הפשוטה שרשאות לשחוט לצורך עצמן בלבד. אבל לא לצורך אחרים. וכ"ש שאין עושין אותה ממונה על השחיטה והבדיקה לרבים. וכמש"ל שאין מוסרין בידן דבר של טורח. אפילו בשל דבריהם. לפי שדעתן קלה. אבל בדבר שאינו של טורח כל כך ודאי נאמנת. כמו שנאמנת על כל האיסורין. ואפילו באיסורי כרת כדם וחלב. לכן אם למדה אשה הלכות שחיטה. כשרה היא לשחוט תרנגולת או שאר עוף לצרכה בלבד. או אם בדק סכין ונתן לה ועמד ע"ג יכולה לשחוט גם לצורך אחרים. אבל אין ממנין אותה לשחוט לרבים כלל...

...And it is still necessary to explain that the Beit Yosef brought that which the Agur had written in the name of **R"l halavan** - that women may slaughter for themselves - which means that they may not slaughter for others. And he wrote about it that it is a surprising position. And he had to explain the word "for themselves" as "by themselves." And the language does not sound that way, even though there is an example of that usage in the language of the mishnah. But it is not

regular among the language of the decisions. But it seems that it is according to its plain meaning that they may slaughter for their own needs only, but not for the needs of others. And all the more so, we do not make her one who is appointed for slaughter and checking for the masses. And as we learned that we do not give them (=women) things that require toil - even for rabbinic ? because their minds are light. But about things that are not such toil, she is credible, as she is credible regarding all prohibitions - even regarding prohibitions that incur *karet* (excision), such as blood and fat. Therefore, if a woman learned the laws of slaughter, she is valid to slaughter a chicken or some other fowl for her own needs only. Or if a man checked the knife and gave it to her and stood there, she may slaughter for others' needs as well. But we do not appoint her to slaughter for the masses at all...

Documented Italian Tradition of Women Ritual Slaughterers

1439 – Ariel Toaff quotes the regulations concerning *Shehitah* issued by the Italian rulers of Perugia in 1439, which begin as follows: “No Jew or Jewess living in the city of Perugia may in any way slaughter any beast... except in the said slaughterhouses of the Jews”.

1556 – Two *Reshuyot* [permissions] of Rabbi Yitzhak ben Immanuel de Lattes, one for a young woman and one for a married woman. In the first it says: “And allow every Jew to eat from her *Shehitah*” on condition that she slaughter two-three times before an expert to see if she faints, and that she review over the course of an entire year the booklet of laws which she had learned with him (see his Responsa, ed. Friedlander, Vienna, 1860, No. 139, pp. 139-140; a facsimile is found in Ashkenazi, *Dor Dor Uminhagav*, pp. 255-256).

1576 – “I saw a *Reshut* [permission] on parchment from 5336 (1576) from the Rabbi of Mantua Rabbi Avraham Shimshon Basila to a certain young woman” (testimony from the Hid”a, R. Hayyim Yosef David Azulay, d. 1806, *Shiyurei Berakhah* to YD 1:1).

1581 – A *Kabbalah* or permission to perform *Shehitah* for Mrs. Malkah the wife of the Rabbi Hananiah Elyakim Rieti, Mantua, 1581. The examining rabbi was R. Shlomo b. Shimshon Basilea, and he wrote to her: “I hereby permit her to slaughter *beina l'vein atzma*, by herself (see above in paragraph I), and her *Shehitah* will be permissible to the entire Jewish people”. (It was published by Mortara in 1886 and from there quoted by Roth and Simonsohn. After that, the *Kabbalah* somehow ended up at the JTS library in New York where Haberman saw it; the quotation is from the latter.)

1614 – A *Harsha'ah* [permission] for *Shehitah* for the maiden Isota daughter of R. Elhanan Yael of Fano from the Mantua municipal *Shohet* Elya ben Yehosef of Forli and she even slaughtered fowl in his presence many times. She therefore received “absolute permission to slaughter *beina l'vein atzma*, by herself, like the other *bekiot* [proficient ones, in the plural feminine form!] among our people, and whoever is called a Jew may eat from her *Shehitah*” (quoted briefly by Marx; Assaf; Ashkenazi; Tzurieli, p. 172; the entire document was published by Duschinsky, p. 105)

1624 – After her marriage, Isota received a *Harsha'ah* for *Nikkur* “to purge hindquarters and loins... that she is *bekiah* [proficient] in the skill of the *Nikkur* of meat in all its details... and I hereby allow her completely to do *Nikkur bifnei atzma*, by herself as she sees fit, both loins and thighs and kidneys...” from Refael Vigura the *Menaker* [Purger] of the *Kehillah* of Mantua with the agreement of the *Bet Din* of Mantua (*ibid.*). It should be stressed that only the most proficient *Shohatim* were allowed to do *Nikkur*.

Before 1679 – “The Rabbi *Peri Hadash* testified that he saw women slaughtering”. *Peri Hadash* to *Yoreh Deah* was written by R. Hizkiyah de Silva, who made Aliyah from Livorno to Jerusalem in 1679. I assume that he saw women slaughtering in Livorno. (quoted by the Hid”a, *Birkei Yosef* to YD 1:4).

1684 – A *Harsha'ah* of R. David Cittoni to Bella Donna Galicci in the city of Sienna (Document A, Tzurieli, p. 173).

Before 1697 – “And so he wrote in *Sefer Gur Aryeh* (by Rabbi David Gur Aryeh Halevi who lived in Mantua, Glosses to *YD* 1:2, Mantua, 1721-1723) in his Glosses as follows: ‘And in these regions I saw women slaughtering with permission and no one protests...’ ” (quoted by the *Hid”a*, *ibid.*; Sperber, Part 4, pp. 10-11; and *Pahad Yitzhak*, Part 8, fol. 142b).

Before 1749 – Testimony of R. Yitzhak Lampronti who lived in Ferrara: “And I saw some women who obtained permission to slaughter from elderly Sages and slaughtered before the fact, and one of them is still alive... and she is Mrs. Susana the second wife of the *Haver* R. Yehudah Cohen Firano the Scribe of the Ferrara Yeshivah. And now she does not slaughter because she has reached the age of 60 or even 70” (*Pahad Yitzhak*, *ibid.*).

1870 – A *Reshut* from Yonatan Camirini to Elvira Finzi in the city of Cento “to slaughter every pure type of fowl, both for her and for the members of her household”. He apparently adopted the limitation of “*l’atzman*” [for her own use] that we have seen above (Document 2, Tzurieli, p. 173).

1909 – A *Reshut* from R. Guido Sonino in Italian to Mrs. Gina Fano in the city of Sorenio “for slaughtering fowl... for the use of her and her family” (Document 3, Tzurieli, p. 174).

1931 – Testimony from Prof. Dessau of Perugia about very religious women who received a *Reshut* to slaughter fowl for their own private use (Duschinsky, p. 102).

1933 – A *Reshut* from R. Gustavo Castel Bolognesi in Italian to Mrs. Amelia Morpurgo (d. 1963) in Padua for slaughtering fowl (Document 4, Tzurieli, p. 174; there is a photograph of the document in Asulin’s article).

1938 – Testimony by Dr. Kalman Freidman, formerly the Rabbi of Florence, who knew two women who were taught to slaughter fowl for their households (Berman quoted by Tzurieli, p. 175).

After 1930 – Testimony about two teachers who served as *Shohatot*; one from Florence received permission from Rabbi Prof. Artom and the second from Ferrara received permission from Rabbi Margalio (Tzurieli, p. 175).

Ca. 1930 – Permission from Rabbi Prof. Artom to Mrs. Sinigalia; she died in Israel and the document is in the possession of her son Jacob in Ramat Gan (Tzurieli, *ibid.*).

1983 – Testimony from Prof. Alexander Rofe in Jerusalem about an elderly woman in Jerusalem who served as a *Shohetet* in Italy (Gruber).

1984 – Testimony from Prof. Reuven Bonfil that there are still women *Shohatot* in Italy today (Bonfil, 1984, p. 73).