

Laws of Shabbat Chapter (Auto Translated)

English

Auto Translated

Shiur Overview

Summary of the Learning Session — Rambam Hilchos Shabbos, Chapters 10–14

Chapter 10 — Laws of Kosher and Matir

Halacha 1 — HaKosher: Fundamentals of the Melacha of Kosher

The Rambam's words: "HaKosher keshel shel kayama v'hi maaseh uman, chayav." Examples: **keshel hagamalim, keshel sapanim, kishrei retzu'os minaal v'sandal shekoshrim haretzanim b'sha'as asiyan.**

Explanation: One is liable for kosher only when both conditions are present: (1) keshel shel kayama – a knot made to remain, and (2) maaseh uman – a professional knot that an ordinary person doesn't know how to make.

Chidushim and Hisborus:

- **Two conditions or one?** One can learn the Rambam in two ways: (a) There are two separate conditions – keshel shel kayama **and** maaseh uman; (b) keshel shel kayama **is** maaseh uman, i.e., this is one condition. The Rambam later states that when only one condition is present (shel kayama without uman, or uman without shel kayama) one is patur but it's forbidden – which proves that there are indeed **two separate conditions**.

- **What does "keshel shel kayama" mean?** Shel kayama is **not** a type of knot (not a quality of how strong the knot is), rather it speaks of **the intention and practice** – whether one made it with the plan that it should remain. Even a strong knot, if one plans to open it, is not shel kayama. A knot that one makes every day and opens back up is called she'eino shel kayama.

- **What does "maaseh uman" mean?** It is debated whether "maaseh uman" means (a) a type of knot that only a professional knows how to make – a special technique, or (b) a knot that one makes as part of a craft (e.g., sailors, camel drivers, shoemakers). The conclusion is that "maaseh uman" speaks of **the type/quality of the knot** – a professional knot that a layman cannot make, while "shel kayama" speaks of **the intention/purpose** – whether one wants it to remain.

- **Examples of liability:** Keshel hagamalim – a knot in the camel's nose to be able to lead it; keshel sapanim – a rope on a ship to be able to tie to the shore; kishrei retzu'os minaal v'sandal – when the shoemaker ties the straps **while making the shoes**. All are both shel kayama (made to remain) and maaseh uman (professional knots).

Patur But Forbidden: One Condition Without the Other

The Rambam's words: "Nifsekas lo retzu'a u'keshara... o shenifsekas chevel u'keshara... o shekashar chevel b'deli... o shekashar retzu'a... harei zeh patur hoil v'eino maaseh uman. V'chen kol

kayotza ba'elu hakesharim she'hen maaseh hedyot." Also: "V'chol keshel she'eino shel kayama ela shehu keshel uman, harei zeh asur."

Explanation: A keshel shel kayama that is maaseh hedyot (not uman) – patur but forbidden. A keshel uman that is not shel kayama – also forbidden. Only when **both** conditions are lacking (not shel kayama **and** not maaseh uman) is it permitted lechatchila.

Chidushim and Hisborus:

- "**Shenifsekas lo**" – **the key:** The difference between chiyuv (shoemaker makes a knot while making a shoe) and patur (a strap tore and one fixes it) is that when fixing, any person can do it – it's maaseh hedyot. But it's still shel kayama because one wants it to remain.

Permitted Lechatchila: Knots That Are Allowed

The Rambam's words: "Kosheres isha maftechi hachaluk af al pi sheyesh lo shnei ptachim; chutei sevecha af al pi shehi refuya..." Also: **retzu'os minaal v'sandal shekoshran b'sha'as malbush, nodos yayin v'shemen, kederos shel basar, keshiras deli b'meshicha, keshira lifnei behema – kol elu maaseh hedyot hen v'eino shel kayama, u'lfichach koshrim u'matirin.**

Explanation: The Rambam brings a long list of knots that one may make on Shabbos, because they have two leniencies: (1) maaseh hedyot, and (2) eino shel kayama.

Chidushim and Hisborus:

- **Shnei ptachim – why not shel kayama?** One might think that when the garment has two openings, one can put it on through one and leave the second tied – which would make that knot a shel kayama. The Rambam says no, because the normal practice is that one opens both every day, so it's not shel kayama.

- **Sevecha refuya – why permitted?** Even if without the knot the sevecha would fall off, it's not shel kayama because one can remove it and put it on without opening the knot – the normal practice is to open it.

- **Retzu'os minaal v'sandal shekoshran b'sha'as malbush:** These are not the same straps that the Rambam spoke of earlier (shekoshran b'eis asiyan – which remain on the shoe). Here we speak of straps that one ties each time when putting on the shoe.

- **Nodos yayin v'shemen:** Even if it has two tails (shnei znavos) – and one side can remain closed – it's not keshel shel kayama.

- **Kederos shel basar:** One ties the lid to the pot – even though it's impossible to remove the meat without untying the knot, it's permitted.

- **Deli b'meshicha:** One may tie a bucket with a strap (meshicha), **but not with a chevel** – a rope is forbidden. The

difference: a chevel is more of a keshel shel kayama, or it's more maaseh uman.

- **Keshira lifnei behema:** One may tie a door or the legs of an animal – even if there are twenty knots (yesh ba shnei esros). Even when one might think that one side is keshel shel kayama, it's not.

- **Raavad's question:** If the Rambam gives two reasons (maaseh hedyot + einu shel kayama), why doesn't one also include a chevel (rope) in the list of permitted things? It's also not maaseh uman, and one won't leave it there either!

Chevel Shekeshura B'para / Ba'avus

The Rambam's words: "Chevel shehi keshura b'para koshera ba'avus, haysa keshura ba'avus koshera b'para. Aval lo yavi chevel mitoch beiso v'yikshor b'para o ba'avus."

Explanation: If a rope is already tied to the cow or to the feeding trough, one may tie the other end. But one may not bring a new rope from home and tie it.

Chidushim and Hisborus:

- **Why may one not bring a chevel mitoch beiso?** Because it's **mevatel kli meheichano** – he can leave it there. When the rope is already tied on one side, we know he'll open it (because he uses it regularly). But a new rope from home – he doesn't need to take it back, and it can become a keshel shel kayama.

Chevel Gurdi

The Rambam's words: "V'im haya chevel gurdi shemuttar letalelo, harei zeh ma'avir v'kosher b'para b'avos."

Explanation: A rope of weavers (gurdiyim = orgim) that one may move – one may indeed tie it to the cow.

Chidushim and Hisborus:

- **Why may one?** Because a rope that one will later use for merchandise (weaving), one won't leave as a keshel shel kayama – one knows one will open it.

- **Important principle:** One sees from here that **keshel shel kayama has nothing to do with the quality of the knot**, but with the **fact that one will open it**. This is a key principle: it's not how strong the knot is, but whether one will leave it there.

Choslos Shel Temarim V'shel Gerogeros – Matir

The Rambam's words: "Choslos shel temarim v'shel gerogeros – matir u'mafkia v'chosech."

Explanation: Baskets/bags that one places under trees to catch dates and figs – one may open them on Shabbos.

Chidushim: The Rambam suddenly brings in "matir" even though he's in the middle of discussing kosher. The Hagahos Maimoniyos explains that matir is the same halacha – a knot that one may tie, one may also be matir.

Gemi La'achach – Ra'uy L'maachal Behema

The Rambam's words: "Kol shera'uy l'maachal behema... lfichach im nifsekas retzu'as sandalo

b'charmlis, notel gemi la'achach hara'uy l'maachal behema v'chorech alav v'kosher."

Explanation: If a strap of a sandal tore, one may use a piece of grass (ra'uy l'maachal behema) to bind it, even in a place where it's normally a keshel shel kayama.

Chidushim and Hisborus:

- **Why may one with gemi la'achach?** Several explanations: (1) It won't hold – a piece of grass on a shoe will soon deteriorate. (2) He'll give it to his animal – it's more important as animal food than as a rope. (3) It can't be a true keshel shel kayama because the material isn't made for that.

- **Difference between straps:** The Rambam speaks here of the place where the strap is connected to the shoe (b'sha'as asiyan) – which is normally a keshel shel kayama. Therefore one may not use a proper thread, but gemi la'achach yes.

Muttar L'hachazir Retzu'os Limkoman

The Rambam's words: "Retzu'as minaal o sandal she'eina metrupas baregel – muttar l'hachazir haretzu'os limkoman, aval lo likshor."

Explanation: If the strap slipped out of its place but didn't tear – one may put it back in the holes, but not make a new knot.

Chidushim: The difference is: putting back in the holes where it belongs – yes. But tying a new knot – no, because that would be a keshel shel kayama.

Aniva

The Rambam's words: "Aniva muteres, l'fi she'eina mischalefes bikshira. Lfichach chevel shenifsakk, mekabetz shnei ketzosav v'chorech aleihen meshicha v'onev aniva."

Explanation: A bow (aniva) is permitted because no one will confuse it with a real knot. Therefore, a rope that tore – one takes the two ends, wraps around a strap, and makes an aniva.

Chidushim:

- **Why does one need a meshicha?** One cannot just make an aniva from the chevel itself, because when one pulls (for example a bucket), the aniva itself will open. Therefore one inserts another piece (meshicha) that strengthens the aniva so it won't come undone.

- **Rema – keshel shel uman bizman hazeh:** The Rema brings that in our times we don't know exactly what is a keshel shel uman. Therefore, a double knot (twice) one doesn't make on Shabbos. But an aniva (a bow/loop) is permitted – even an aniva on a keshel (like with a belt – one knot with a bow on top) is permitted.

Keshel She'eino Shel Kayama Maaseh Uman – Lidvar Mitzva

The Rambam's words: "Muttar likshor keshel she'eino shel kayama... afilu maaseh uman lidvar mitzva, kegon sheyikshor limdod ba shi'ur mishiurei haTorah."

Explanation: A knot that is maaseh uman but not shel kayama – which is normally forbidden miderabanan – is

permitted for the sake of a mitzva. For example, tying a rope in order to measure a shiur from the Torah.

Chidushim:

- The rule: maaseh uman + einol shel kayama = forbidden miderabanan. But for the sake of a mitzva = permitted.

- **In the Mikdash:** Strings of musical instruments that broke – one may tie them in the Mikdash, also the same principle. In the Mikdash there is no shevus, so a knot that is maaseh uman but einol shel kayama one may. But lechatchila one doesn't make even in the Mikdash – only when it's needed for the harps (where it will be a keshel shel kayama) did they permit, because the Mikdash can only permit shevus, not d'oraisa.

Hilchos Matir

The Rambam's words: "Kol keshel shechayavin al keshiraso kach chayavin al hasaraso."

Explanation: Matir is the mirror image of kosher – every category (chayav, patur but forbidden, permitted) by kosher corresponds to the same by matir.

Chidushim:

- **Question about mekalkel by matir:** By kosher one needs tying "for a purpose" (a tikun), but by matir such a condition isn't stated. Why not? By keria there is indeed a din of mekalkel – but being matir is not keria. Matir is "al menas likshor" – he opens it in order to use it again, similar to keria al menas litfor. If he has benefit from it, he's chayav; if not, it's just mekalkel.

Toldos Kosher – HaPosel Chavalim (Shezira)

The Rambam's words: "HaPosel chavalim min hachitzin u'min hachilaf o mechutei tzemer o mechutei pishtan o mechutei se'ar v'chayotza bahen – toldas kosher v'chayav."

Explanation: One who twists together various materials (grasses, wool, linen, hair) to make a rope – this is a tolda of kosher.

Chidushim:

- **Difference between shezira and oreg/tove:** By tove/oreg one makes merchandise (fabric), and kli'a is a tolda of oreg. Here however he doesn't make any merchandise, he makes a rope – this is a preparation for tying, therefore it's toldas kosher.

- **Shiur:** The shiur is – kedei sheya'amod hachevel bifsolto belo keshira. That is, if the rope is long enough that it holds itself without a knot, that's the shiur. By a short rope one needs a knot to hold it together, but when it's long enough that the shezira itself replaces the tying – that's the shiur chiyuv.

Toldas Matir – Mafrid

Chidush: A mafrid (one who separates a twisted rope) is toldas matir. But here there is an issue of mekalkel – because when he opens the rope nothing remains. Only if he has benefit (for example he'll remake it), he's chayav. The shiur is the same as by posel – as much as when it was whole it held without tying.

Hilchos Tofer

Tofer – Av Melacha

The Rambam's words: "HaTofer shtei tefiros v'kashar roshei hachut mikan u'mikan – chayav."

Explanation: Sewing is putting together two pieces of fabric with a thread. He's liable for two stitches when he ties the ends of the thread so it will hold.

Chidushim:

- **Difference between tefira and kli'a/ariga:** Kli'a/ariga is to make the fabric itself; tefira is to connect two already-existing pieces of fabric.

- **Keshiras roshei hachut:** By only two stitches one needs to tie the ends, because without it the sewing won't hold – and kol ha'oseh melacha v'ein melachto miskayemes b'Shabbos patur. But by more than two stitches (three etc.) it holds itself, so even if he didn't tie he's chayav.

- **HaMotzi chut shel tefira:** One who pulls out a sewing thread (rips it out) – is chayav mishum tzorchei hatefira. It's asked: Is this a tolda of tefira? What does "tzorchei hatefira" mean – whether it means mein hamelacha or a tolda? The Rambam doesn't explain. It's compared to "tzorchei bishul" – which means parts/components of the cooking process.

Toldos Tofer – Madbik

The Rambam's words: "HaMadbik neyaros o yeri'os b'kulan shel sofrim v'chayotza bo – harei zeh toldas tofer v'chayav."

Explanation: Gluing papers or parchments with scribes' glue and the like is toldas tofer, because it's similar to sewing – he connects two pieces in a manner of keshel shel kayama.

Chidush: It's more similar to fabric than to a building. **V'chen hamefareik** – separating two glued papers (not to destroy) is toldas kore'a.

Hilchos Kore'a

Kore'a – Av Melacha

The Rambam's words: "HaKore'a kedei litfor shtei tefiros – chayav. Kore'a l'hafsada – patur mishum mekalkel."

Explanation: Kore'a is the opposite of tofer. One must tear as much as two stitches, and it must be al menas litfor (to sew again).

Chidushim:

- **Kore'a b'chamaso / al hames:** The Rambam says that kore'a b'chamaso or keria for a deceased is chayav, because l'fi shemeyashev es da'ato v'yani'ach yitzro – it's a tikun. "Meyashev es da'ato" refers to the deceased, and "yani'ach yitzro" refers to kore'a b'chamaso.

- **Question about Raavad:** Seemingly the Raavad (who argued earlier by choveil that it's not mesaken) should also argue here by kore'a b'chamaso. But the Raavad doesn't argue here. It's explained that kore'a b'chamaso can be in ways where it's permitted to be angry (for example for a matter of Torah or against sins, one who disgraces a talmid chacham) – so it's different from choveil b'chaveiro.

- **Pose'ach beis hatzavar:** One who cuts open the neck-opening of a shirt (that was sewn closed) is chayav mishum kore'a, even though it's not al menas litfor – because it's al

menas letaken. "Al menas litfor" actually means – l'hafik mikalkel (to exit from mekalkel). That is, "al menas litfor" is not specifically to sew, but any tikun that makes the kore'a not just mekalkel.

Hilchos Boneh

Av Melacha of Boneh

The Rambam's words: "HaBoneh kol shehu chayav."

Explanation: Boneh is different from all melachos because the shiur is kol shehu. Every building is a davar chashuv, there's no minimum shiur.

Chidush: This is similar to choresh and zore'a which also have kol shehu – because all are a tikun in the ground.

HaMeshaveh Pnei HaKarka B'bayis

The Rambam's words: "HaMeshaveh pnei hakarka b'bayis, kegon shehishpil tel o mile gai, harei zeh boneh v'chayav."

Explanation: Whoever levels the floor in a house – lowering a mound or filling a pit – is chayav mishum boneh.

Chidush: Why isn't this choresh? In fields such an action is choresh, because it serves the purpose of plowing/planting. But in a house, where one won't plant, it's a tolda of boneh – because he improves the building.

Nosen Even V'nosen Tit

The Rambam's words: "HaNosen es hatit chayav" – when building a wall, where one person places stones and a second places cement (tit), the nosen hatit is chayav, and the nosen ha'even is only a mesaye'a.

Chidush and question: Why is this different from mevashel, where everyone who does a need of cooking (adds spices, lights fire, etc.) is chayav? Why don't we say that every thing from tzorchei habinyan is also chayav?

An answer is attempted: By boneh, simply placing stones without cement is not any building – it must be connected. By cooking however one can cook without spices, each part stands on its own. But the answer is not accepted as definitive – "we don't know, we believe the holy sages." The Rambam didn't give a reason.

Boneh Al Gabei Elyon

The Rambam's words: Whoever places the top stone on the tit that's already there from below, even if he doesn't place tit from above (because no more is coming), is chayav – sheharei hinicho al tit acher.

Chidush: Usually when one places a stone in the middle of a wall on existing tit, one is not chayav, because the tit from above that will hold the stone is still missing. But by the top stone, where one doesn't need any more from above, this is already gemar melacha.

Boneh Al Gabei Keilim Patur

The Rambam's words: "Boneh al gabei keilim patur" – building means in the ground, not on vessels.

Chidush (Aruch HaShulchan): The Aruch HaShulchan asks: In the Mishkan they didn't build on the ground, but on adanim! He answers: The adanim are part of the building itself. Similar to a tent – we don't say that the bottom part is a "vessel." "Al gabei keilim" means for example building something on a table – that's a weaker building.

Toldos Boneh

1) Oseh ohel kavu'a – toldas boneh v'chayav. Normal boneh is with stones, an ohel is with fabrics or similar. This was in the Mishkan.

2) Ha'oseh kli adama (potter) – making a vessel from clay is toldas boneh. The shiur is burning (in an oven), but the burning itself is toldas mevashel. The actual shaping of the vessel, even before burning, is already chayav mishum toldas boneh.

Chidush and question: Why is building on a vessel patur, but making a vessel itself is chayav? It's not resolved.

3) Magben es hagevina – toldas boneh. Gathering pieces of cheese into one is boneh. But here there is indeed a shiur – kigrogeres – because by food there must always be a shiur of importance.

Chidush and question: Gathering cheese is called boneh, but gathering bricks on a table is not called boneh (boneh al gabei keilim patur). Why? "It doesn't go into my head."

4) Hachnasas yad hakordom betoch ha'ayin shelo – inserting the hammer-head into the wooden handle is toldas boneh v'chayav. **V'chen kol kayotza bazeh.**

5) Toke'a etz b'etz – no difference whether with a nail or wood in wood (one wood in a hole of the other) – toldas boneh v'chayav.

6) Ha'oseh nekev kol shehu b'lul shel tarnegolim – making a hole in a chicken coop to let in air or light, chayav mishum boneh, because thereby he makes the lul usable.

7) HaMachazir deles shel bor, shel si'ach, shel me'ara – returning a door to a pit, even if it's not on a hinge but one just places it on, is chayav mishum boneh.

Hilchos Soser

Soser – Av Melacha

The Rambam's words: "Soser kol shehu chayav, u'vilvad sheyehei soser al menas livnos. Aval hasoser derech hashchasa patur – because he's a mekalkel."

Toldos Soser

Soser ohel kavu'a, shepeirek etz taku'a – the opposite of the toldos boneh: taking apart an ohel kavu'a, or removing a wood that's inserted – is toldas soser v'chayav, **u'vilvad sheyiskavin letaken** – but not necessarily in the same place, he wants to be mesaken something else. This is soser al menas letaken.

Hilchos Makeh B'patish

Av Melacha

The Rambam's words: "HaMakeh b'patish maka achas chayav."

Chidush: The Rambam doesn't say what the av melacha is explicitly – he goes straight to the tolda. The av is simply the last blow that finishes a melacha.

Toldas Makeh B'patish

The Rambam's words: "Kol ha'oseh davar shehu gemar melacha, harei zeh toldas makeh b'patish v'chayav."

Examples:

- **HaMenape'ach bichli zechuchis** – blowing into a glass vessel to finish it.

- **HaTzar kli tzura / HaTzorev kli cheres** – shaping a vessel or firing pottery vessels even just a part.

- **HaGored / HaMegared kol shehu** – scraping/sanding kol shehu from a vessel – one finishes the vessel by removing excess pieces.

- **Ha'oseh nekev kol shehu** – making a hole in something that needs a hole (in wood, building, vessels).

Pesach She'eino Asuy L'hachniss U'l'hotzi

The Rambam's words: "V'chol pesach she'eino asuy l'hachniss u'l'hotzi, ein chayavin alav."

Explanation: An opening that's not made either to bring in or to take out, one is not chayav on it mishum makeh b'patish.

Chidushim:

- The Rambam brings the example of nekev shel lul which is made l'hachniss ha'or u'l'hotzi haluft. The main point is that an opening must have a way in **and** a way out.

- A hole that's made only to insert a nail – there something goes in but nothing comes out, so that's not makeh b'patish. It can be boneh, but not makeh b'patish.

HaMefis Mursa / Shechin

The Rambam's words: "HaMefis shechin b'Shabbos kedei l'harchiv pi hamaka – chayav mishum makeh b'patish, shezo hi melaches harofei. Aval im ein mefis ela l'hotzi mimenu licha – harei zeh muttar."

Explanation: One who opens a shechin (blister/abscess) in order to widen the opening – for healing purposes – is chayav mishum makeh b'patish because this is melaches harofei. But only squeezing out licha (without intention to make an opening) is permitted.

Chidushim:

- "Shezo hi melaches harofei" – this is the reason why it's makeh b'patish: because it's a **tikun**. Makeh b'patish means a small tikun that finishes something. Melaches harofei is one of the things that falls under makeh b'patish, even though the doctor also does other melachos.

- The difference: when he makes a "door" in the shechin (l'harchiv pi hamaka) – that's makeh b'patish; when he only wants to remove licha without making an opening – that's completely permitted because it's not any melacha at all.

HaMesartet Al Even / HaMetzaded Es Ha'even

The Rambam's words: "HaMesartet al even kol shehu – chayav mishum makeh b'patish. V'hametzaded es

ha'even b'yesod habinyan v'sikna b'yado v'hoshiva binkoma hara'uy la – chayav mishum makeh b'patish."

Explanation: Making a small line/mark on a stone (so it will be straight for building) is makeh b'patish. Also, one who pushes a stone at the foundation of a building so it will be straight – is chayav mishum makeh b'patish.

Chidush by metzaded es ha'even: The stone is already lying there, he doesn't place it initially. He just gives it a small push so it will be straight. But through that small push the entire building becomes straight – **this is makeh b'patish** because it's the gemar tikun.

HaLoket Yavlos Me'al Begadim

The Rambam's words: "HaLoket yavlos me'al begadim b'yad – chayav mishum makeh b'patish. Aval mesiran derech esek – patur."

Explanation: One who removes small knots/hairs (lint) from woolen garments with care – is chayav mishum makeh b'patish because this is gemar melacha of the garment. But simply blowing off/removing derech esek (without care) – is patur.

**Ch

Chidushim:

- It speaks of a woolen vessel that has natural yavlos/knots, and removing them is part of the gemar melacha of the garment – not just cleaning.

- The difference between **makpid** (he wants it to be clean) – **chayav**, and **derech esek** (simply removed without special intention) – **patur but forbidden**.

HaMena'er Talis Chadasha Shechora

The Rambam's words: "HaMena'er talis chadasha shechora kedei l'hasir hatzahov v'halavan sheba kedei shetera'eh na'eh – chayav chatas."

Explanation: A new black talis (garment) has yellow or white hairs from the fabric. When one shakes it out so it will be shiny and beautifully black – he is chayav chatas mishum makeh b'patish d'oraisa, because this is gemar melacha of the garment.

Chidushim:

- This is a chiyuv chatas (d'oraisa) because by a **new** talis this shaking out is part of how one makes the garment – this is the gemar melacha, the "beauty" of the garment.

- But one who is not makpid at all – is permitted.

- The difference between the previous halacha (yavlos – patur by derech esek) and here (chayav chatas): By yavlos we speak of old garments where one removes dust, by talis chadasha shechora we speak of gemar melacha of a new garment.

- [Note:] From here stems the custom of people who don't fold their new garments on Shabbos.

Hilchos Tzida (Chapter 14)

Foundation of Tzida

The Rambam's words: "HaTzad davar shedarko letzudo – chayav. V'hi sheyotzi'enu mimkom she'eino

mishmar limkom shehu mishmar."

Explanation: One is liable for tzida only by something that it's customary to hunt. And the definition of tzida is: bringing from a place that is not mishmar (not guarded/trapped) to a place that is mishmar – where one doesn't need to catch it again.

Examples of Chiyuv

The Rambam's words: "Kegon sheradaf achar tzvi ad shehichniso l'bayis o l'gina u'l'chatzer v'na'al, o shehifri'ach of v'hichniso l'migdal, o shehichnis dagim min hayam l'toch sefel shel mayim – chayav."

Explanation: Chasing a deer until it's in a house/garden/courtyard and locking; pushing a bird into a cage (migdal); placing fish from the sea into a bowl of water – all chayav.

Chidush: "Migdal" in the Gemara means a cage (not a tower), because a bird in a courtyard is worth nothing – it can escape.

Examples of Patur But Forbidden

The Rambam's words: "Hifri'ach tzipor l'bayis, o shehifri'ach dag v'akrav min hayam livreicha shel mayim, o shehichnis chaya l'taraklin rachav – patur, she'ein tzida gemura, shema yitztarech lirdof achareiha."

Explanation: A bird in a house, a fish in a large pool, an animal in a wide palace – is patur but forbidden, because he will still need to chase after it, it's still mechusar tzida.

Tzvi V'ari – Special Laws

The Rambam's words: "Davka tzvi v'ari... chayav ad sheyachnisena l'kipash."

Explanation: A deer or a lion, which even in a small space is still hard to catch, one must place literally in a small cage (kipash). Each animal according to its nature – a bird needs a small box, a lion needs something where it can't escape in one run.

General Rule: What Is Called "Eino Mechusar Tzida" / Shiur "Makom Katan"

The Rambam's words: "Kol makom she'im yirtze l'hagi'a l'chaya b'sechiya achas... kiros kerovim zeh lazeh..."

Explanation: The rule is: if one can reach the animal with one grab/run – that's a makom mishmar. Also when the walls are close to each other so there's no empty space to escape.

Chidushim:

- "Sechiya achas" is interpreted not as swimming, but as **one grab/run** – with one movement one can reach it.

- The shiur of 12 by 12 is connected to how high the walls are – if there are high walls, the space can be larger and still be called "makom katan" (because the shadow reaches). But it's not clear what the exact shiur is.

- "**Makom shegadol mizeh – harei hi petura**" – in a larger space one is patur because it's still "mechusar tzida." The Rambam doesn't say it's permitted – only patur (but forbidden).

- An interesting observation: By other melachos (like sewing) the melacha must be finished in order to be chayav. Here by tzida he's also patur if it's mechusar tzida – the same principle.

Which Animals Are "Minan Nitzod"

The Rambam's words: "Echad mishmonas sheratzim ha'amurim baTorah... v'echad mish'ar shekatzim u'remasim sheyesh lahem minan tzida."

Explanation: One is liable for tzida by things that one customarily hunts.

Tzad Lesachek Bo

The Rambam's words: "HaTzad echad mehem, bein l'tzorech bein shelo l'tzorech, ela lesachek bo – chayav, hoil v'niskaven l'etzem hatzida."

Explanation: Even when one catches an animal only for play – one is chayav, because one intended the essence of tzida.

Chidushim:

- **What does "lesachek bo" mean?** It's not that he plays with the animal afterward, but he plays the "game" of catching itself – he catches it and releases it immediately (like "catch and release" by fishing). This is "tzad lesachek."

- **Why isn't this melacha she'eina tzricha l'gufa?** Because he intended the essence of tzida, this is the body of the melacha. According to the Rambam's approach (that melacha she'eina tzricha l'gufa is chayav) it's simple. But even according to other approaches – here he intended the act of tzida itself.

- **The Rema brings** that such a "sport" of hunting with dogs one may not do even during the week, because it's "moshav leitzim."

Yashen, Suma – A Sleeping or Blind Deer

Chidush: Even a sleeping or blind deer is still mechusar tzida, because it can wake up when one catches it, and the species is generally one that is mechusar tzida.

Tolda of Tzida – Meshale'ach Kelavim

The Rambam's words: "HaMeshale'ach kelavim kedei latzud tzeva'im v'arnavim v'chadome... harei zeh tzad v'chayav."

Explanation: When one sends dogs to catch a deer, and the person works together with the dog (the dog runs after, the person catches, or vice versa), he is chayav mishum tzida.

Chidushim:

- This is a chidush that tzida one doesn't need to do alone – one can do it together with one's animal or a tool.

- **The Rema (on Shabbos)** says that hunting with dogs is "moshav leitzim" and one may not do it even during the week. A normal Jew hunts in order to eat, but hunting with dogs is a "sport" for pleasure.

- There was a discussion whether "hunting for fun" is permitted at all, and whether it's a danger.

Shnayim She'asuha By Tzida

The Rambam's words: "Tzvi shenichnas l'bayis v'na'al echad b'fanav – chayav. Na'alu shnayim – peturin."

Explanation: If a deer runs into a house and one person locks the door – he is chayav. Two people together – patur (shnayim she'asuha).

Chidushim:

- **"Yashav echad al hapesach v'lo milo"** – one person sits by the door but doesn't fill the entire opening. He is patur because there's still an open door, the deer can still escape – he didn't do any act of tzida.

- **When the second comes and fills the rest** – the second is chayav (he completed the tzida). The first is patur.

- **When the first filled the opening, and the second sits on the side, and the first leaves** – the first is chayav (he did the act of tzida), the second may sit there until motzaei Shabbos and take the deer.

No'el Beiso L'shamro / Nichnas Lo Tzipor Tachas Kenafav

Chidush: When a person locks his door simply (not knowing that a deer is there), he doesn't transgress. Similarly, when a bird goes under his garments ("kenafav") – he may sit and guard until motzaei Shabbos. **The principle:** Only the action of tzida is forbidden. Simply being there where an animal cannot escape – that's not any act of tzida. And once a tzida has already happened, we don't say that the entire time it happens again and again.

Zaken, Chiger, Choleh, Katan

A deer that is old, limping, sick, or young – patur, because it can't run well, it's not a real tzida.

HaTzad Chaya V'of Shebireshuso

The Rambam's words: "HaTzad chaya v'of shebireshuso, kegon avazin v'sarnegolin v'yonei aliya – patur."

Explanation: Things that already belong to him, even if they fly around, they come home every day – they're called "nitzudim" and it's not a real tzida.

Chidushim:

- The Rambam says "patur" – this means it's forbidden miderabanan, not permitted lechatchila.

- **The Mishna Berura says:** A chicken (which doesn't escape at all from its owner) is not at all subject to tzida – then it's completely permitted.

HaTzad Devarim She'ein B'minan Tzida

The Rambam's words: "HaTzad devarim she'ein b'minan tzida, kegon chagavim, chazizim, tzir'in, zevuvim, yetushim, par'oshim v'chayotza bahen – patur."

Explanation: Things that no one customarily hunts – patur but forbidden miderabanan.

Tzad Mazikin – Nechashim V'akrabim

The Rambam's words: "HaMosran l'mazikin, kegon nechashim v'akrabim v'chayotza bahen, v'af al pi she'einan memitim... muttar latzud osam b'Shabbos, v'hu sheyiskaven l'hinatzel minizkan."

Explanation: Harmful creatures that can cause damage (even not kill) one may catch on Shabbos, if one intends only to be saved from their harm.

Chidushim:

- This is not melacha she'eina tzricha l'gufa – because he wants to be saved, this is the "body" of his intention.

- By things that are "ein b'minan tzida" it's patur but forbidden miderabanan. But when it's mazikin, the Sages permitted even lechatchila – because one needs to be saved from harm.

Keitzad Ya'aseh – Kofeh Kli Aleihen

The Rambam's words: "Keitzad ya'aseh? Kofeh kli aleihen, o otet aleihen beged v'chadome, u'vilvad shelo yaziku."

Explanation: One may place a vessel over mazikin (like snakes/scorpions) or wrap them with a piece of cloth, so they won't cause harm, but one may not kill them.

Chidushim and Hisborus:

1. **The foundation of the halacha – not tzida at all:** The entire matter here is not a question of tzida at all. The person has no intention to catch the animals – he only wants to be saved from them, to protect himself. This is not melacha she'eina tzricha l'gufa (where one does indeed do the act of melacha but not for that purpose), but it's not any act of tzida at all.

2. **A question on the Rambam – why is there even an issur derabanan?** If the person has no intention of tzida at all, but only wants to be saved – why should there even be an issur derabanan? The Rambam holds that melacha she'eina tzricha l'gufa is patur (but forbidden miderabanan). But here it's even less than melacha she'eina tzricha l'gufa – it's not any act of tzida at all! The question remains not fully resolved.

3. **Gemara vs. Rambam:** In the Gemara it's implied that the matter has a din of melacha she'eina tzricha l'gufa, but the Rambam rules differently – he presents it as a special halacha where one may cover mazikin, not as a patur from melacha she'eina tzricha l'gufa.

4. **Difference between sakanah and regular mazik:** Here we don't speak of species that are a danger to life (where one may kill them), but of regular mazikin – and even by regular mazikin one may restrict them (kofeh kli), but not hunt in the full sense.

Conclusion: This completes the summary of Hilchos Shabbos, Chapters 10–14, which deals with the melachos of kosher, matir, tofer, kore'a, boneh, soser, makeh b'patish, and tzida.

Rambam Hilchot Shabbat Chapter 10 – The Melacha of Tying

Introduction – Review of the Melachot Until Now

Speaker 1:

Let's learn Rambam, Sefer Zemanim, Hilchot Shabbat, Chapter 10.

We've already learned the first twenty of the thirty-nine melachot, we're in the middle of the melachot that have to do with making merchandise, making a garment.

This is an interesting point, also in the... the melacha of kosher (tying).

Speaker 2:

Yes, also in the previous series, as it were, the Rambam stopped in the middle, made a break at the beginning of Chapter 9. Also here...

Speaker 1:

Much more remains, kosher matir (tying and untying).

Speaker 2:

Yes, the Rambam, it's finally the categories as important, with the 39, it turns out that it's not too long a chapter, he didn't recognize in the matter that this is flax and this is garments. There goes the main point, all the melachot of Shabbat.

Speaker 1:

Yes.

Speaker 2:

Okay.

Halacha 1 – Hakosher: Fundamentals of the Melacha of Tying

The Rambam's Words

Speaker 1:

Hakosher (one who ties), the Rambam says as follows: "**Hakosher keshel shel kayama**" (one who ties a permanent knot), if someone makes a knot that holds, a knot that holds, "**vehi ma'aseh uman, chayav**" (and it is the work of a craftsman, is liable).

Two Conditions or One?

So you have here two things: one, it must be a keshel shel kayama (permanent knot). One could learn differently, one could learn that a keshel shel kayama is a ma'aseh uman (craftsman's work), what does keshel shel kayama mean? Something that a craftsman does, someone who knows how to make the proper knot, or this could be, there are two conditions, a keshel shel kayama and a ma'aseh uman, these are in the Rambam, later, later he explains that if it has only one condition it's not...

Speaker 2:

Yes, yes.

Speaker 1:

You also think, something we see here a case where one needs a craftsman, yes? We also had, something requires a craftsman, from choresh (plowing).

Speaker 2:

Already, one needs a craftsman.

Speaker 1:

It almost means to say that it's something that is a per- "ma'aseh uman" (craftsman's work).

Speaker 2:

Okay.

Examples of Knots That Are Chayav

Speaker 1:

There are many types of knots, a knot that fulfills the two conditions, so it's a craftsman's knot and also it's a keshel shel kayama it remains... is chayav (liable). Then he is chayav. And he gives the Gemara... he brings in the Gemara's examples. "**Kegon**" (such as), what are the Gemara's examples of knots that are shel kayama and ma'aseh uman? "**Keshel hagamolim**" (camel drivers' knot), a knot with which one ties... "**hagamolim**" he says. What the person doesn't... it says that in the nose of the camel one puts in something, a knot. And to this one connects a piece of merchandise so that the one who drives the camel, the driver, should be able to lead the camel. Or **keshel sapanim** (sailors' knot), in a ship one puts in a rope with which to tie to the dry land, should make the knot.

Vekishrei retzu'ot minaal vesandal (and knots of shoe and sandal straps), or the knots with which one ties the shoe and sandal straps, **shekoshrim haratzanim** (that the shoemakers tie) that the cobblers tie to the shoes **bish'at hityavtzrutan** (at the time of their formation) when one makes the shoes, **vechaha'i gavna** (and the like) are knots that one wants for the long term. One doesn't want, not every time one goes out with the camel does one make a new knot, rather it seems that one puts it in once and it's a permanence for a longer time. And the same thing the other things, it's a ma'aseh uman (craft work), it's a knot that one makes for a craft, as a part, yes? The word is because a craftsman makes it, or because it's a matter of craft. One drives a camel, a horse, a ship, these are things that one does in work.

Speaker 2:

Right, the Gemaras that show you that there is a type of knot that is a special professional knot. It's not an everyday thing that one makes in the kitchen, it's a type of thing that one makes once in a while. The sailor makes it every time. I don't know if he ties it to the ship, does he do this once, and then he ties it each time to the rope on the dry land. Perhaps that doesn't actually mean keshel shel kayama. No, no, soon we'll see what shel kayama means.

Patur Aval Asur (Exempt But Forbidden)

Speaker 1:

But a **keshel she'eino shel kayama ve'eino ma'aseh uman is patur** (a knot that is not permanent and not craftsman's work is exempt). Exempt, but it's forbidden from the Torah. And when is it permitted entirely, not forbidden? When it doesn't have both conditions. A keshel she'eino shel kayama (knot that is not permanent), it doesn't hold, ve'eino ma'aseh uman (and is not craftsman's work), it's not any craft work, mutar (permitted), one may entirely lechatchila (from the outset).

He begins to bring the Gemaras.

Discussion: What Does Ma'aseh Uman and Keshel Shel Kayama Mean?

Speaker 2:

What's the opposite? A knot that is ma'aseh umanut (craft work) and not keshel shel kayama? Perhaps ma'aseh umanut must always be lasting things, because ma'aseh umanut is not relevant, it's not Shabbat things. Anything that one does with a ship, even if there's no journey, is not Shabbat-like. It's a camel, all these things with animals. What comes in here Shabbat? Perhaps all ma'aseh uman, any ma'aseh uman apparently one may not do. But ma'aseh uman always means something that one does as a part of dealing with a ship or with a camel. Ma'aseh uman is a type of knot. It's actually true that the sailors have their type of knot and so on. Ma'aseh uman means such a type of knot.

One can make for a ship, perhaps I need to make a knot that is not ma'aseh uman, I don't know.

Speaker 1:

No, I think that the quality of the knot lies in the word keshel shel kayama. Ma'aseh uman means why does one make the knot, for what thing does one make the knot. There is such a thing keshel shel kayama for a ma'aseh uman, it's the same thing. One can make a keshel shel kayama... it's not the same thing. Keshel shel kayama speaks about the quality of the knot, and the ma'aseh uman speaks about for what thing one makes the knot.

Speaker 2:

No, no, no, let's learn the Gemaras. This is a type of knots. He's going to give the Gemaras of things that are, how is it called, that are keshel shel kayama but it's not ma'aseh uman, that are also something to fix an animal and the like, but it's not a thing that the craftsmen know precisely how to make the type of knot that holds well. A simple person doesn't know, he can tie his camel, but it won't be so good. It will be shel kayama. Shel kayama means that it doesn't hold when untying, it's made to remain. Shel kayama means literally. Shel kayama is actually not any type of knot. Shel kayama is actually, there is a knot that one makes because one will open it tomorrow, shel kayama means that you won't open it tomorrow, it's made to remain. Besides this one can make a good knot that the craftsman knows how to make, each one in his craft has his own, and there is a simple knot that a simple person can make.

Halacha 2 – Examples of Keshel Shel Kayama She'eino Ma'aseh Uman

The Rambam's Words

Speaker 1:

Let's learn the Gemaras and we'll try to see to understand. In short, the Rambam says, he explains as follows: **nifseka lo retzu'a** (if a strap broke for him), once a strap was cut, from the sandal, or, as was said earlier, what one puts by the shoe and sandal, **vekashar** (and he tied), he tied it. Or **shenipseka chevel** (if a rope tore), the rope of something tore, of a vessel, **vekashar** (and he tied), he tied it. **O shekashar chevel bedli** (or that he tied a rope to a bucket), he tied to the bucket with which one draws out water, he tied a rope so one should be able to grab it. **O shekashar retzu'a** (or that he tied a strap), he tied the strap, the muzzle, the thing that one has, the bridle of the animal. All these things, **harei zeh patur, ho'il ve'eino ma'aseh uman** (behold this is exempt, since it is not craftsman's work).

Vechen kol kayotza ba'elu hakesharim shehen ma'aseh hedyot (and so all similar to these knots that are layman's work). That is, I think that the word is "shenipseka

lo" (that it broke for him). That is, when one sews a shoe and makes a good knot, it's a ma'aseh uman. But it tore, everyone fixes a bit as much as he can. So also shenipseka chevel (if a rope tore), or chevel bedli (rope to a bucket), is something that everyone can make. One comes to a well and one needs to tie there a chevel bedli (rope to a bucket), everyone can do it. This is not ma'aseh uman, ma'aseh hedyot (layman's work). But it's lekiyum (for permanence).

Kol adam kosher lekiyum (every person ties for permanence), one who ties his shoe wants that it should be there for a longer time. That is, a keshel shel kayama that is not ma'aseh uman is forbidden lechatchila (from the outset), it's patur aval asur (exempt but forbidden). **Vechol keshel she'eino shel kayama, ela shehu keshel uman, harei zeh asur** (and any knot that is not permanent, but it is a craftsman's knot, behold this is forbidden). That is, both ways it's forbidden. It's only permitted if it's not kayama and not ma'aseh uman. It can be ma'aseh uman that is not kayama, and it can be ma'aseh hedyot that is keshel shel kayama, both of these will be forbidden, patur aval asur (exempt but forbidden).

Discussion: What Does Retzu'ot Minaal Vesandal Mean?

Speaker 2:

The shoes don't mean that one ties the shoes like us who tie the shoes, that's certainly not any keshel shel kayama, it's not made to remain. No, one speaks of tying the strap to the shoe. Afterwards one ties the strap, but first one ties the strap to the shoe. Right, it means like a sandal where it's not made to remove the... I still don't understand precisely. Why does one need a craftsman? If it's not keshel shel kayama. Keshel shel kayama means that it's not any strong knot that it won't hold, it will open. Why aren't the two the same thing?

Speaker 1:

Ah, a craftsman knows how to make a keshel shel kayama and not a craftsman. Keshel shel kayama means that one will hold it. It has nothing to do with how good the knot is. You can make a good knot that you make it, one will after a certain time open it. It's not any type of knot at all. It's not that it will open by itself, but even if one makes a strong knot, but since one made it with an intention that one will open it, it's a keshel she'eino shel kayama (knot that is not permanent).

Speaker 2:

Yes, it's made, you planned to take it out. Such a type of knot that every day one makes it and opens it back, is called keshel she'eino shel kayama. If that's the custom, it's implied that a person can decide himself, that's still a question. If a thing where it's the custom that one makes it every day, doesn't mean any keshel shel kayama. Keshel shel kayama is a thing that one made that it should remain. And uman (craftsman) is a type of knot that one calls... it means uman, one needs a craftsman. One calls the craftsman, I can't, just a person doesn't know how one makes it. One calls Rabbi Uman, you make it.

Halacha 3 – Knots That Are Permitted Lechatchila

The Rambam's Words

Speaker 1:

Now he's going to enumerate things that are permitted, that one may do, that it seems that it's not uman and not kayama. He says as follows: **kosheret isha miftechei hachaluk** (a woman may tie the openings of the robe), a woman may tie the

opening of her garment, **af al pi sheyesh la shnei ptachim** (even though it has two openings), even if it has two... it means, on top, today there are buttons, but there was, it had a string, and it has... what does shnei ptachim mean? It means, it's a regular garment, where on each side there is one strap, and one ties them together. He says, even sheyesh la shnei ptachim (though it has two openings), therefore one can put it on and take it off by opening only one of them, perhaps one could think that the second will be called a keshel shel kayama? He says, no, the second is also not called keshel shel kayama, because the normal order is that one opens both every day.

Chitei sevachah (threads of a hairnet), threads that one puts on the head covering on the head, **af al pi shehi refuyah** (even though it is loose), even if without the knot the head covering will be too weak and fall off the head. But still doesn't it mean keshel shel kayama? Not too weak. That is, one can, one doesn't have to open it, because one can take it off and put it on without opening the knot. But going, the normal way of putting on the hat, that one opens it, **uretzu'ot mina'al vesandal shekoshran ragil bish'at malbish** (and shoe and sandal straps that one ties regularly when wearing), ah, not good.

Hilchot Shabbat – Tying and Untying: Knots That Are Not Permanent

Permitted Knots – Specific Examples

Garment with Straps

It's a regular garment where on each side there is one strap and one ties them together. He says, even if it's only one knot, granted one can put it on and take it off by opening only one of them, perhaps one could think that the second has a law of a keshel shel kayama? He says no, the second also doesn't have any keshel shel kayama, because the normal order is that one opens both every day.

Chitei Sevachah

Chitei sevachah (threads of a hairnet), threads that one puts on the head covering on the head, even yirpu (if they loosen), even if without the knot the head covering will be too weak and fall off the head, but still doesn't it mean keshel shel kayama. Not too weak, it means one doesn't have to open it, because one can take it off and put it down without opening the knot, but usually, the normal way of putting on the hat, one opens it and makes it back.

Retzu'ot Mina'al Vesandal Shekoshran Bish'at Malbush

Retzu'ot mina'al vesandal shekoshran al raglo bish'at malbush (shoe and sandal straps that one ties on his foot when wearing). Ah, not the straps that were spoken of earlier that the Rambam said his language that remain on the shoe, **shekoshran be'et asiyatan** (that one ties at the time of their making). Now one speaks of the straps that one puts on each time.

Nodot Yayin Veshemen

Venodot yayin veshemen (and bottles of wine and oil), bottles, merchandise in the bottles of wine and oil, **aflu yesh lahem shnei zenavot** (even if they have two tails), even if it has two bands, and the same thing, one side can remain closed.

Kederot Shel Basar

Vekederot shel basar (and pots of meat), that one ties from above the lid to the pot, **aflu she'i efsar lehotzi habasar**

belo hatarat hakesher (even if it's impossible to remove the meat without untying the knot).

Keshel Deli

Vehakosher deli bemeshicha be'avnei dekiyutza (and one who ties a bucket with a band of stones and the like), that one may tie a pail, a vessel to draw out water, with a band, **aval lo bechevel** (but not with a rope), but not with a rope, because a rope is already yes a keshel shel kayama. What's the difference? Or it's already yes more of a ma'aseh uman.

Tying Before an Animal

Vehakosher lifnei behemah beraglah (and one who ties before an animal at its leg), that one may tie in front of the animal, it means to tie the door, or to tie on the legs of the animal **shelo tetze vetazik** (that it should not go out and cause damage), that it should not go out, **aflu yesh bah shnei esrot** (even if it has two knots), even if it has two knots, and he also thought that one of the sides is a keshel shel kayama. So all these things he says, even if there is a place for not, because perhaps it is yes a keshel shel kayama, all these things but in practice it doesn't mean enough keshel shel kayama, so it is yes permitted.

Chevel Shekeshurah Beparah O Ba'avus

Vechevel shehi keshurah beparah (and a rope that is tied to a cow), if on the cow there is already a rope, already one has already put a knot on the cow, one may tie the rope to the avus (feeding trough), to the bowl with which one gives food to the cow. **O hayetah keshurah ba'avus** (or it was tied to the avus), the avus has tied to it a rope, **kosherah beparah** (one ties it to the cow), one may tie it down to the cow. Both things one may do. **Aval** (but) what one may not do, **aval one may not bring a chevel mitoch beito and tie it to the cow or to the avus**. Why? What's the problem here? I tie here, I tie here.

The chevel mitoch beito (rope from his house)? Yes. So mevatel keli mehechano (nullifying a vessel from its readiness), so then he can leave it. If the rope that is already connected, he will open it. When he covered it connected to the avus, so he puts it up and puts it down. But if he brings a chevel mitoch beito (rope from his house), he doesn't need to have with the rope to drag the cow. It could be that the rope he will leave there. And the other things that were said that one may, even if it's a yes a bit keshel shel kayama, but perhaps it's not so different. I don't know. Something in the reality is different. Perhaps when he brings a new one, it's as if... when there is a rope... no, again, it's very simple. It's already tied from one side, and from the other side he ties it to the avus, and he will take it off when the cow finishes eating. But when he needs to tie it from one side, the first side we don't, we never establish that one may not. The cow comes with a rope. When one brings it to the second side. Right?

Chevel Gurdi

Ve'im hayah chevel gurdi (and if it was a Gordian rope), if it's a rope that Gordians means, Gordians, yes, it's written even in the Gemara, Gordians said, a Gordi means people who sew, weavers, **shemutar letalteloh** (that it's permitted to move it), what means rope? A chevel gurdi that one may not, because it's muktzeh. If there is a chevel gurdi that is yes mutar letalteloh (permitted to move it) for some reason, yes, that's what he says, **harei zeh ma'avir vekosher beparah ba'avot** (behold this one transfers and ties to the cow with

ropes), one may yes. Why? Because a rope that one will afterwards want to use for merchandise, one won't leave it as a keshel shel kayama.

Principle: Keshel Shel Kayama Is a Fact, Not a Quality

What's the explanation? One sees that it has nothing to do with the quality of the knot, because you know that you will open it. Yes, that's what he says, keshel shel kayama has nothing with the quality of the keshel shel kayama is a fact, because one will open it. No, why are all these things permitted? **Shekol elu ein koshrim ma'aseh hedyot hen, ve'eino shel kayama** (for all these are layman's knots, and it is not permanent). Two reasons he has, one may lechatchila (from the outset), because it's ma'aseh hedyot (layman's work), one doesn't need for this any craftsman, and it's not shel kayama (permanent), the knot won't remain there, **ulefichach koshrim umatirin, ufeirush mutar likshoran lechatchila** (and therefore one ties and unties, and the explanation is it's permitted to tie them from the outset).

Question of the Ra'avad

Right. The Ra'avad doesn't understand, if so why don't they include a rope in the list? It's also not a professional craft (ma'aseh uman), and also one doesn't leave it there. So he argues, okay.

Baskets for Dates and Dried Figs – Untying is Permitted

Baskets for dates and dried figs, one places bags or things underneath to catch the dates and dried figs that are already falling down from the trees. One ties up the baskets with rope, it seems. **One may untie, remove, and cut** on Shabbos. Why does he suddenly mention untying here? He's in the middle of discussing knots, what does he want to say here with this...

Selim, he's going to say soon the Hagahos Maimoniyos that untying is the same law, a knot that one may tie one may also untie. So, apparently the word here is... one should open it, actually regarding this the proper order would be to open it.

Okay, what does he say at length by untying, I mean. Okay.

Grass Rope – Fit for Animal Food

He says at length by untying, **anything that is fit for animal food**, here he's talking about the material with which one makes the knot. He says that if one uses grass, I don't know, a piece of straw as a string to make with it a permanent knot, one may, because what is fit for animal food, it's obvious that it won't remain closed forever, one will perhaps use it on Shabbos. **Therefore if the strap of his sandal broke in a karmelis**, the strap of his sandal tore, we're talking about a case where one may not, there where it's connected to the shoe, where one actually makes a permanent knot, one may not do it again because it's a permanent knot. What can one do? **One takes grass rope that is fit for animal food and wraps it around and ties the grass**, with this one may indeed tie to the shoe, because since we know it's animal food, it's obvious apparently that it will become moldy or whatever, it's not something that can be a true permanent knot.

Discussion: Why is Something Fit for Animal Food Permitted?

A shoe or sandal strap that is not worn on the foot, so again, a person was walking on Shabbos, he's stuck, his shoe strap tore. He may not tie a proper string, but a string that is

fit for animal food he may, which would have been a permanent knot, as we said earlier, to tie to the shoe, because that's what we're talking about here, the shoe. **His sandal strap broke**, from the shoe, it opened, it tore off from the shoe. He now wants to sew a piece of string to the shoe, he may not put another string, but grass rope he may, because it's not called a... because what is fit for animal food, why may one use something fit for animal food? What is the reason?

You said well, because he's going to give it to his animal later. It's not something that will last. It's something that he's going to give to his animal, and he needs it more urgently on his shoe. It's not something, imagine a piece of grass, how long will it last on the feet? It's not a knot to any... because you don't want a knot. Something that can be eaten. Something that can be eaten. True, by the way, we don't hold that one needs to be hungry for things, by the way.

Returning Straps to Their Place is Permitted

Not with the straps of shoes and sandals, not with the straps of shoes and sandals. The shoes and sandals no longer hold the feet. **One may return the straps to their place**, to put back, if one doesn't need to make a new hole one may. **But not to tie**. This is apparently the distinction. Not that the hole opened and you tie it back. Rather to put back in the holes where it belongs to what. Yes, something like that.

Tying a Bow

Yes. Another thing the Rambam says, all these things we discussed one may not, it's a proper knot. But a bow (aniva), a bow, which is a double knot like this, but which opens much more easily, **is permitted, because it is not confused with tying**, no one will think it's a knot. It's a different type of thing than a knot, a different type of knot. **Therefore a rope that broke**, a rope that tore, **one gathers its two ends**, there's a way how one can fix it, one can take the two ends of the rope, **and wraps a thread around them, and ties a bow**. What is wrapping a thread around them? Can one make a bow with the rope itself, no? What does he want? No, one can't, because it will open. Think yourself. A rope, here we're talking about a rope that one needs for the bucket, yes? You need to have the rope so you can pull. Aha, if one can put on it something as a bow that will strengthen the rope, hold the rope. No, you can make a bow from the rope, but you insert, you see it, you insert another piece so it won't open the bow. Understand? Because otherwise it can open itself the moment you pull on it.

A Non-Permanent Knot for a Mitzvah Purpose

Already, **one may tie a non-permanent knot**. We discussed a non-permanent knot, if it's a professional craft one may not, but if it's not a professional craft one may. But even if it's a professional craft, yes, what he says here apparently, one may however for a mitzvah purpose. **Such as tying to measure with it a measurement from the Torah measurements**, he wants to tie a rope in order to be able to measure something, even a professional craft, which rabbinically one may not even a professional craft that is not a permanent vessel, but for a mitzvah purpose one may.

The same thing **if a harp string broke**, one may tie it in the Temple, also the same thing.

Laws of Tying and Untying, Sewing and Tearing

Knots for Mitzvah Purposes and in the Temple

Speaker 1:

Such as tying to measure with it a measurement from the Torah measurements. He wants to tie a rope in order to be able to measure something, measure the measurement of a... I don't know what. Even a professional craft. What about rabbinically? One may not make even a professional craft that is not a permanent knot, but for a mitzvah purpose one may.

The same thing, **if a harp string broke, one may tie it in the Temple**. Also the same thing, in the Temple there is no rabbinic prohibition (shevus), therefore even a knot that is a professional craft, but if it's not permanent one may, but not in the country. And however, **one should not tie it initially even in the Temple**. Initially one doesn't do it even in the Temple. The only time they permitted in the Temple is only when it's lacking for the harps to be able to... because then it will be a permanent knot. Initially, when you make it temporarily, it will tomorrow, a better one will come in, you don't fix it. So then it will be biblical. The Temple can only permit rabbinic prohibitions, right? Yes, very good.

Laws of Untying

So this is the laws of tying. Now one can learn the laws of untying. Yes yes, learn a little, yes. So the law of untying, yes, how tying can be untying. It's the same law as tying. It's the opposite, it's the mirror image, the reverse of it. **Any knot for which one is liable for tying it, so one is liable for untying it**.

Discussion: Is There by Untying a Requirement of "For the Purpose of Tying"?

It's interesting, isn't there by untying the law that it must be for the purpose of tying or something like that? Or any untying is something like a repair (tikun)? We haven't come to this? Do you hear my question? There isn't such a law like by tearing there is no destructive act (mekalkel). Untying is not tearing.

No, one opens it so one can then use it again and so forth. In other words, it's perhaps a permanent knot, tearing in order to sew. It's untying in order to tie.

Right. Simply a business matter. In short, if it's a permanent knot and it's a professional craft, then one is liable also for untying. And the same thing, **any knot for which one who ties it is exempt, so one who unties it is exempt**. That means, if it's either a professional craft and it's not a permanent knot, or a permanent knot and it's not a professional craft, then that's exempt on both. And **any knot that is permitted to tie, so it is permitted to untie**. It's not a permanent knot, it's permanent. I don't know Hebrew.

Derivatives of Tying and Untying — Twisting Ropes

Nu, until here we learned the primary categories (avos) of tying and untying which were together. Now we're going to learn that there are derivatives (toledos) of tying and untying. What is the derivative? **One who twists ropes from flax fibers or from grass**. What is grass? Grass? Coarse grass. **Or from wool threads, or from linen threads, or from hair threads, and similar things**, he makes a rope.

Distinction Between Twisting and Weaving

We learned earlier that there's something of weaving. Ah, it's actually right. We learned that there's something of spinning, weaving, yes, where one makes material. Or there's a weaver who is a derivative of weaving. Here he's not a weaver, he's not making any material. He's making a rope. He's making a rope,

and he twists together a bit of things, different grasses or whatever. That means, since you see it's like a preparation for making a rope that one will tie, this is a derivative of tying and one is liable. That's how I understand it.

Measurement of Twisting

And its measurement, what is the measurement? How much rope twisting must one do in order to transgress this derivative of tying? **Enough that the rope will stand by its twist without tying, so that his work is maintained**. That means, a short rope you can take together different pieces of wool, linen, whatever it is, but you need to give it a bind so it will hold at all. If you twist, yes, it must be a rope, but at the end one needs to give it a bind. Because it opened. But you've made enough, it's long enough that it holds enough already, that's the measurement that you've already transgressed the... Ah, before that it's a derivative of tying, because the normal way is to tie. As he says here, he ties the pieces of material or whatever, threads, in order to make a rope. But if he makes twisting, that instead of tying, as if then the work is completed, then that's the measurement. Even without tying, with tying, that's tying.

But certainly it's understood, it's a derivative of tying, because it's a type of tying, only if it replaces the tying. If it doesn't replace the tying, you've done nothing.

Derivative of Untying — Separating

Ahh, Chaim, separating is the opposite. Separating twisted rope is a derivative of untying and one is liable. But here there is indeed a concept of destructive act, because here when he opens the twisted rope nothing will remain. So it's like one doesn't intend to destroy alone, if he has benefit from it, right, he's going to remake it or something like that, because if not it's simply destructive.

The measurement of untying a twisted rope is the same measurement, he broke apart as much as when it was whole it could have held without tying. That's until here the laws of tying and untying, yes? Right?

Rama — Professional Knots in Our Times

By the way, he brings, the Rama says that in our times we don't know properly what is a professional knot. So therefore, anything that is two, a double knot, one is concerned that one doesn't make Shabbos. Anything two, gone twice, yes, it's a double knot, one doesn't make on Shabbos. But a bow one may actually, yes. Not only that, even a bow that is on top of a knot, like one makes a belt, yes, one makes one small knot, and then a bow, a loop, a... how do you call it? A bow? In short, such a... how do you call it, the... a bow, yes. A bow is permitted.

Laws of Sewing

Okay. Uhm... we're going to learn the craft of sewing, sewing. Ah, what is sewing? Sewing is not to make, but sewing is one puts together two pieces of material with something, right? Through a sewing. It's very similar to weaving and that, but as I say, weaving is to make the material. Here is sewing, you put together two pieces of material, you connect them with a thread or something like that.

Measurement of Sewing

The law is thus: **One who sews two stitches is liable**. One who sewed two stitches is liable. How? **When he ties the ends of the thread on both sides**. If after sewing he tied it so the sewing won't come undone, so it will be a sewing that holds. He has already repaired the sewing so it won't slip. This

is similar to what we learned earlier by tying or by twisting, right? A craft that... **Anyone who does a craft and his craft is not maintained on Shabbos is exempt.** This is a rule.

And this is when he made only two stitches, it's lacking to tie the ends of the thread. **But if he sewed more than two stitches, even if he didn't tie,** it will indeed hold, he is liable, because he repaired a sewing, the sewing holds. Because the next one holds it.

One Who Removes a Sewing Thread

One who removes a sewing thread on Shabbos, one pulls out a sewing thread on Shabbos, which he only needed when he was sewing, he pulls it out, he's already finished. Ah, he says that he's no longer sewing, but he clips it a bit to make it tighter. He is liable **because of the needs of sewing.**

Is this like a derivative of sewing? I didn't know what to write here. We've seen by all primary categories of work, I don't know what the needs of sewing means. Whether it means similar to the craft or it's a derivative of sewing, he doesn't explain. A new category, what does the needs of sewing mean. We saw the same thing by the needs of cooking, yes? All these things are the needs of cooking. What are they? Parts of the cooking. What would I have meant?

Okay. Yes.

Laws of Tearing

After sewing comes tearing. This is the opposite of sewing, to separate the two pieces, the two threads. Tearing, **one who tears,** he tears **in order to sew two stitches,** and he does it... no, "in order to" means that much, yes? How much does he tear? As large as two stitches, and he does it **in order to sew two stitches,** so one can sew again the two stitches, he is liable.

Tearing Destructively – Destructive Act

But one who tears destructively, one who tears because he wants to tear the garment, he is exempt, **because of destructive act.** So the Rambam says again such a thing, destructive act is only when he's actually destructive, but if he has a benefit from it, it's so, **one who tears in his anger,** one tears because he's angry, **or a mourner,** or he tears mourning for a dead person, is indeed liable, because the tearing is not a destruction. Why? **Because he settles his mind with this thing, and calms his inclination,** he calms himself with this. He's talking here about for a dead person or in his anger, so calms his inclination, or his anger subsides with this thing, so this helps him to calm down, **behold this is repairing and he is liable.**

So one can say thus, settling his mind is by a dead person, and calming his inclination is by one who tears in his anger.

Discussion: Why Doesn't the Raavad Argue Here?

Here apparently the Raavad should also argue and say that one who wounds another person is not repairing. No? I don't see that the Raavad argues here, which apparently is the same dispute as he goes earlier regarding wounding.

No, because tearing in anger can be with permission in a case, for example when one may get angry for a Torah matter. Or transgressions. For example, I don't know, one who disgraces a Torah scholar, ah, okay. **Behold this is repairing and he is liable.**

Opening the Neck Opening

One who opens the neck opening on Shabbos, one, when one makes a shirt, but the hole where one needs to insert the neck is sewn, and to finish the shirt one needs to cut open and open that thing, he is liable **because of tearing.** Although there it's not in order to sew, but it's in order to repair.

Yes, but he's not liable because it's repair, he's liable because it's tearing. No, he's not liable because it's tearing in order to sew. So in order to sew always means to remove a defect. Right, there isn't here any process that Tosafos says the repair of this, he now needs to open. It's also repairing, yes. Makes sense.

Derivatives of Sewing and Tearing

What is the derivative? Yes, he's going to say derivatives of sewing and tearing.

Gluings – Derivative of Sewing

One who glues papers or parchments, one glues together papers or parchment, **with scribes' glue,** with glue that scribes use, **and similar things, behold this is a derivative of sewing and he is liable,** because it's similar to sewing that he glues together in a permanent manner.

The Craft of Building, Demolishing, and the Final Hammer Blow

The Craft of Building

Introduction: Building Versus Sewing

But in a unique way, it's not building, not taking together pieces of ground that become one, rather it's similar to material, a paper is more similar to material than to a building.

And so one who separates, or the opposite, there are two papers glued, two notes are glued together, and he separated them, but he doesn't do it destructively, he separates them because he wants them to be separated, behold this is a derivative of tearing.

Ay good.

Primary Category of Building

Now we're going to learn the craft of building. What does the Rambam say by building? What is the primary category of building?

The Rambam says, **one who builds any amount,** that means that building is different from all the crafts we've had until now, the measurement is any amount. Every building is an important thing, there is no measurement in this.

We learned by plowing and sowing, so far as I remember there are two more crafts that had any amount. Also there it's similar to building, it's similar to building, it's a repair in the ground. Yes.

One Who Levels the Ground in a House

Laws of Makeh B'patish and Tzeidah

Toladot Makeh B'patish – Examples of Completing a Task

The Glassblower, the Scraper, and One Who Makes a Hole

The Rambam says:

How so? One who blows into a glass vessel, one who fires a clay vessel even partially, one who scrapes any amount, and one who makes a hole of any size – this is a toladah of makeh b'patish and he is liable.

How so? He says, **one who blows into a glass vessel** – blowing into a glass vessel, this makes it into a vessel that can be used.

And one who fires a clay vessel, even partially – someone has a vessel but he shapes it, he forms it, even just a part of it.

And one who scrapes any amount – what does scraping mean? He scrapes off, like... he scrapes off what? Some vessel, yes, he makes it smoother, something sticks out a bit, he cuts it off. "Sanding," yes, we call this polishing. He finishes the vessel by scraping off excess pieces from it and so on.

And one who makes a hole of any size – someone makes a hole in something that needs a hole, in wood, in a building, in the Mishkan, in vessels, but the hole makes it into a vessel, **this is a toladah of makeh b'patish and he is liable.**

An Opening Not Made for Bringing In and Taking Out

The Rambam says:

And any opening that is not made for bringing in and taking out, one is not liable for it.

He brings further, **and any opening that is not made for bringing in and taking out, one is not liable for it.** He mentioned an opening earlier, how did he mention an opening? Like when one makes an opening in an abscess. He didn't say that one is not liable for an opening. I don't know what comes in here. It has to do with the next piece, the one who lances an abscess. What does this have to do with an opening that is not made for bringing in and taking out? Okay. How is it for bringing in and taking out? Because he wants to take out the pus and he wants to bring in the medicine, yes? That's how I understood it. I don't know. Medicine? Maybe air? Air doesn't mean anything.

Ah, he brings for example that the hole of a chicken coop is to bring in light and specifically to take out the air, so it should be airy. Perhaps the same thing is with these things. An opening must have a way in and a way out. An opening that is only one way is also an opening. This is somewhat the principle. I don't know but what he means.

Ah, he says for example someone makes a hole and also will fill it in order to insert a nail. This is not really sealing, because a nail will go in, it won't come out. He explains there, nothing comes out of this opening, so it's not makeh b'patish. It could be boneh, perhaps a bigger problem, but makeh b'patish it's not. This is apparently the point.

One Who Lances an Abscess – The Work of a Doctor

The Rambam says:

One who lances an abscess on Shabbat in order to widen the opening of the wound – is liable for makeh b'patish, for this is the work of a doctor. But if he only lances it to remove pus from it – this is permitted.

He says now, he's going to learn another type of makeh b'patish, also apparently a toladah of makeh b'patish, right? Makeh b'patish is hitting with a hammer. When you hit with a hammer, I don't have a hammer, I don't have a hammer. In all those museums of the 39 melachot, the makeh b'patish they haven't figured out how to do it. I don't remember.

Anyway, **one who lances an abscess on Shabbat** – lancing means he opens, he has an abscess, such a blister, something like that, he gives it a squeeze, he opens it, **in order to widen the opening of the wound** – that is, in

order to open the mouth, so that it should heal from it, so that it shouldn't fill with pus, and he intends for healing to widen the opening of the wound, this is a matter of healing, it should come out, as you say pus should come out, air should come, it should be healed through this, apply medicine, I don't know, medicine is another thing. **This is liable for makeh b'patish, for this is the work of a doctor.** That is, he wants to say because this is a repair, therefore this is the work of a doctor. He sees that this **for this is the work of a doctor** says that this makes it makeh b'patish. He sees that not the word is because it's an opening made for bringing in and taking out.

But in truth, because this is the repair. Makeh b'patish means that it's a small repair, adding a small thing. The work of a doctor, one of the things, he does other things also for the work of a doctor besides makeh b'patish, but besides this, this is one of his things. **But if he only lances it to remove pus from it, this is permitted.** This is completely permitted, because this is not a melachah, he's not engaged in other words to make holes, he makes openings in abscesses, he doesn't make openings in abscesses, he simply wants to remove the pus, this is a different action.

Making openings in abscesses, he simply doesn't weigh abscesses on Shabbat.

One Who Scratches on a Stone and One Who Levels a Stone

The Rambam says:

One who scratches on a stone any amount – is liable for makeh b'patish. And one who levels a stone in the foundation of a building and fixes it with his hand and places it in its proper place – is liable for makeh b'patish.

One who scratches on a stone any amount – he makes it a bit smoother on a stone, yes, he makes it straight, he wants to fit it in, **is liable for makeh b'patish** – this makes sense, right?

And we don't take, **and one who levels a stone in the foundation of a building and fixes it with his hand and places it in its proper place** – there's a stone at the foundation, it needs to be very straight. He simply pushes it to be straight, afterwards they'll build on it, it won't be crooked. Basically he only pushed a stone, but he did it in such a way that this makes the entire building stand straight, so **he is liable for makeh b'patish.** If he places it initially, Master of the Universe, the next one doesn't place it, it's already lying there. He just gives it a push a bit so it should be clear, then he is liable for makeh b'patish.

One Who Plucks Lint from Garments

The Rambam says:

One who plucks lint from garments by hand – is liable for makeh b'patish. But if he removes them casually – he is exempt.

One who plucks lint from garments in Judea. Can someone explain what this means in English? What does this mean? On a certain type of garment that has such lint? Yes, lint. If it has a tool to remove, yes? Yes, it's such a machine, not a machine, such a velcro, what's it called? Such a sticky thing. Yes. **One who removes lint from wool garments, is liable for makeh b'patish.** Also, because this is how one finishes the garment. The garment comes like this, and this is the completion of the work of the garment.

I don't believe that's what it means here, because that's something that attaches itself. We're talking here about something more, we're talking about that it wasn't made well. I think that's what he means here, that it's just also a wool garment. It could be that this is a lint remover, he's simply removed from the garment what attaches itself, dust. No, but it's just such a wool garment, and not every garment has this. Certain types of garments, perhaps yes, I don't know. Is this a cleaning or is this the finishing of the garment? I don't know.

The next thing stands even clearer that it's just a no. Ah, says the Rambam, as Yaakov already mentioned, this is only someone who is particular, he wants to be clean, he's a better person, he doesn't need to have the little dust particles on his garment. **But if he removes them casually**, gentlemen, he simply removes, blows off from his jacket, **he is exempt**. But he doesn't do it initially, he's exempt even so.

One Who Shakes Out a New Black Garment

The Rambam says:

One who shakes out a new black garment in order to remove the yellow and white from it so that it should look nice – is liable for a sin offering.

Laws of Makeh B'Patish (Completing a Vessel)

One who shakes a new black garment to remove the yellow and white from it, so that it should look good, is liable for a sin offering. There is something here, people have black garments. I don't know what a black garment means. On this black garment, garment apparently means a piece of clothing, yes, not necessarily a tallit for mitzvah purposes. And it has some yellow or I don't know, green, I don't know some other colors, little hairs, he wants it to be black, and there shouldn't be any white or yellow hairs from the merchandise. It should be shiny and nice. So if he does it so that he won't accept it, this is the part of the Gemara "the garment and liable for a sin offering," which is makeh b'patish from the Torah.

If someone is particular, he doesn't care at all if it's a Hasidic Jew, he goes with a hat here and there, then it's permitted, then it's permitted. For mourning he was only exempt, but one must know the difference. Someone is particular or it's the way of business, what's the difference? Ah, he's also particular. I wouldn't have known to say initially, because if you do it, the way of business means afterwards, "Ah, what did I do? Ah, I did this." If one says that he's particular, it's clear that he is indeed somewhat particular. Ah, particular here, he gives a shake. He shakes and shakes himself. Ah, then that's a different case.

Okay, this is the explanation of a new garment, which is the way how one does it. The new one, yes. From here come the people who don't fold their new ones exactly. In short.

Thus far the laws of makeh b'patish.

Laws of Trapping (Tzeidah) – Primary Category of Labor

Foundation of Trapping: From an Unguarded Place to a Guarded Place

Now comes another primary category of labor that must be learned in this chapter, which is trapping. Here begins the new order of a book, yes, one catches an animal and from it makes a Torah scroll, as Rabbi Chiya did.

So, for which things is one liable for trapping? Everyone knows what trapping is, but which things?

The Rambam says:

One who traps something that is normally trapped – is liable.

"One who traps something that is normally trapped is liable." You are liable specifically for something that it is the way to trap. We will be able, we will soon see things that it is not the way to trap, or they cannot be trapped, then one is exempt.

And this is when he brings it out from a place that is not guarded to a place that is guarded.

And this is, but also, what is trapping? **"That he brings it out from a place that is not guarded to a place that is guarded."** You bring it in, you catch it in a place, you bring it into a place where you don't need to catch it again afterwards.

Examples of Liable

How so? Such as one who chased after a deer until he brought it into a house or garden or courtyard and locked it, or drove a bird and brought it into a tower, or brought fish from the sea into a bowl of water – he is liable.

How so? "Such as one who chased after a deer until he brought it into a house or garden or courtyard, and locked it." You ran after a deer until it went into a house or courtyard and you locked it. **"Or drove a bird,"** a deer, and now it's stuck in your backyard, it won't go out, you'll easily catch it in one time, something like that. Or a bird needs to be a smaller thing.

Drove a bird and brought it into a tower – tower is said to mean a closet, something like that. A tower. A tower, but tower doesn't mean, tower always in the Gemara means a closet. I mean no. I mean no. Therefore one says that a courtyard is a box. Yes, a closed place. Certainly it's locked, because a bird in a courtyard is worth nothing.

Or brought fish from the sea into a bowl of water – a fish one must put into its bucket of water, which it has there. Then he is liable.

Examples of Exempt But Forbidden

But if he drove a bird into a house, or drove a fish and scorpion from the sea into a pool of water, or brought an animal and bird into a wide hall – he is exempt, because it is not complete trapping, perhaps he will need to chase after it.

But conversely, **drove a bird into a house**, if he stuffed a bird into his house, **or drove a fish and scorpion from the sea into a pool of water** – he only stuffed a fish into a pool, something, a pool means a pool, yes, such a small water that he made, **or brought an animal and bird into a wide hall** – if he has a large wide palace, hall means a palace, a large area, **he is exempt**.

Because it is not complete trapping, perhaps he will need to chase after it, he will need to catch it again, so you don't have complete trapping, so it's exempt. Yes, it's not a place that doesn't lack trapping. This is still a place lacking trapping, he will still need to run after the bird. But it's still forbidden, but it's exempt. Exempt but forbidden.

Deer and Lion – Special Laws

Specifically a deer and lion, it comes out a lion, that even in a small area it's still very hard to catch it, so one **is liable until he brings it into a cage**, he must put it literally into its small cage, where there it is caught. Each thing is according to what it is, yes, according to what it is, so it must be caught. A bird is not caught until one puts it in a small box, a lion is not caught until one puts it literally into something where it cannot give one run away.

The application everyone understands, yes. Every place... every place... yes. Aha. Yes. If a Jew is like a bird or a lion, he is not in exile, he is not in the community. Every place... ah.

General Rule: What Does "Not Lacking Trapping" Mean Every place where if he wants to reach the animal in one leap – walls close to each other

So now we will learn what is the meaning, a precise boundary, a precise rule, what does it mean that it doesn't lack trapping. **Every place where if he wants to reach the animal in one leap**, in one run, does leap mean a run? Does leap mean swimming perhaps? Yes. But it doesn't mean when one falls from the roof in a life-threatening situation. Yes. But it doesn't make sense. It doesn't fit the people. It means a grab. Good. With one grab.

Or the walls are close to each other. It's still like a way that one can say, the walls are close one to the other, that in between there is no empty space. A large backyard is to say...

Laws of Trapping – Measurements, Species, and Derivatives

Measurement of "Small Place" Regarding Trapping

Speaker 1: Every place where one can reach the animal in one leap, in one run. Does leap mean a run? Does leap mean swimming perhaps?

Speaker 2: Yes, but it means, it means from the case of the fish in a basket.

Speaker 1: Yes, but it doesn't make sense. It means a grab, good, with one grab.

Speaker 1: Or the walls are close to each other, it's still a way that one can see. The walls are close one to the other, that between them there is no empty space. A large backyard you'll see in the middle like the sun, because the shadow from one comes already to the other. If it's close enough that the shadow from one wall comes to the other wall, this is a small place. And a deer runs in it, this is an animal. Deer means like a deer or another animal.

It's interesting, because the measurement of twelve by twelve has to do with how high the walls are. If there are high walls, it can be quite large.

Speaker 2: I hear, a normal height.

Speaker 1: I don't know. It's a sign, it's not clear what this is. He says such signs.

Speaker 1: A place larger than this, a larger place than this, a pool is exempt. Two signs. What still lacks trapping?

Speaker 2: Yes, such two interesting signs. It's not clear what he means.

Discussion: Lacking Trapping and Completion of Work

Speaker 1: It's interesting that we didn't have on other labors, for example, that it's lacking, that afterwards one didn't need to do anything. A little sewing a drop, one will afterwards still on Shabbat need to still sew.

Speaker 2: Still sew, but the next piece.

Speaker 1: The labor must be finished. Even here he is apparently still exempt, he doesn't say that it's permitted.

Which Animals Are "Species That Are Trapped"

Speaker 1: Now, we learned earlier that it must be things that are species that are trapped.

Speaker 2: Yes, he says so, which things are species that are trapped?

Speaker 1: One of the eight creeping things mentioned in the Torah, which they have for example chovel, as we learned earlier, **and one of the other detestable things and creeping things that have species of trapping**, which people conduct themselves to trap them.

Speaker 2: Yes? That's the meaning "that have species of trapping," it's the way of people.

Speaker 1: That is, the worms are in it. **One who traps one of them, whether for a need or not for a need, but to play with it is liable**, even if he doesn't, he just doesn't need the, I don't know what he has, he just wants to play with it, he is liable, **since he intended the essence of trapping**.

Discussion: "To Play With It" and Labor Not Needed for Itself

Speaker 2: Why should the Rambam hold that it's not labor not needed for itself?

Speaker 1: Liable but... ah, even if he only catches for fun, he says it's not labor not needed for itself. Still he is liable. But according to the other opinion that it's labor not needed for itself, if he just gives it a slap, it's a slap.

Speaker 2: Let's know exactly what "to play" means by him, what makes it one needed for itself? He wants to catch so that he can play with it.

Speaker 1: It's actually not. Perhaps he means "to play" that he plays the "game" of catching?

Speaker 2: That's the same intention.

Speaker 1: He catches it and goes to immediately free it afterwards.

Speaker 2: Yes, so indeed the Rema brings. What does he mean? That he catches. You've once seen, people go in the water, people fish and throw back in the fish. That's such a "trap to play." He has no "point" from this, he doesn't need the fish, he just wants to play the "game" of trapping. So I think that's what he means.

Speaker 1: Okay.

One Who Traps the Sleeping and the Blind

Speaker 1: A trap is a settlement which is a sign of an animal. If someone says he's sleeping or he's blind, one can't catch him anyway, no. He's still an animal, why? He can still run away, or because the type of species still lacks trapping. He wakes up, as he says, he wakes up when one catches him.

Derivative of Trapping – One Who Sends Dogs

Speaker 1: Now, now one must learn what is the derivative of trapping. Normal trapping is when you yourself go and run after the deer until it goes into the room and you lock the door, and the like. What if he sends other animals? He has a dog, or perhaps one can even ask about a "robot" or something like that.

Speaker 1: He sends dogs to trap deer and rabbits and the like. When yes, he sends a dog to catch the deer or the "rabbits." **The deer will flee from the dog and he will chase after the deer, and the deer runs after the dog, and the dog runs after it**, based on how much he pushed the dog. He works together with the dog. The dog runs after it, he catches it, or conversely, he catches it and the dog runs after it, the dog catches it. He is a trapper and liable, he is a trapper and liable. So it also says by birds, also with a...

The Rema: Trapping with a Dog is a Gathering of Scoffers

Speaker 1: He brings that the Rema on Shabbat says on this law that this is not permitted to do even during the week. This is a "sport" which is a gathering of scoffers. With a dog.

Speaker 2: Just catching normally, a Jew catches in order to be able to eat. But this is a "sport." Catching with a dog is a "sport," a thing that one does for "fun."

Speaker 1: Aha. And this is a gathering of scoffers.

Speaker 2: I understand this. The Rav spoke about this, yes, I remember.

Discussion: Is "Hunting for Fun" Permitted?

Speaker 1: It's not so clear what this is. May one do "hunting" for "fun"?

Speaker 2: Yes, I asked the Rav, this is a danger. The Rav answered, I remember I asked him, he answered... an interesting thing in this. One must know, in any case, now one speaks of after the oath. So that I should see it in a manner. It's the same thing, he has some manner that a horse can run after a manner, whatever, yes, once.

Speaker 1: Okay.

Speaker 2: So here is a novelty, that trapping one doesn't need to do alone, he can do it together with his animal, or together with something else.

Two Who Did It by Trapping

Speaker 1: Now there was the interesting inquiry about that essentially two who did it, why exactly is there a pursuer?

Speaker 2: Yes, true. It's the cases that there are, such cases happen one must speak about them. So between I take a bite.

Speaker 1: And if one traps with a dog, one certainly traps with another person sometimes. Because a deer, a dog is a dog, a dog is alone, a dog is not another person. Now one speaks with another person. A deer ran into his house, one locked it before the door. So the one who locked is liable, because the action of locking the door, that is the trapping of the deer. Well, two, two people locked together, they are exempt, because each one could have done it alone. So two who did it, if he cannot do it, and it's two, they are liable, like the rule of two who did it that we already know.

Discussion: One Turns the Lock, One Turns the Door

Speaker 2: What if a person turns the lock, and a person turns the door?

Speaker 1: Very good. Then it's very interesting, but one needs two people. It's a heavy door, one needs two Jews to sit by the door?

Speaker 2: No, if one turns the door he is also liable.

Speaker 1: Yes, that's simple. Now, even in a manner where one needs two people to fill the door, are both liable?

Speaker 2: No, the second is liable.

Speaker 1: One sat on the opening and didn't fill it, but before that, who does he mean "one can"?

Speaker 2: Ah, it wasn't an opening where one needs to have two people sit.

Speaker 1: No, if there is... right. You said that the first person sat there still before the deer came in.

Speaker 2: No, no, no, no. So it says here, so is the law. **One sat**, it can be that he is still exempt on this, but he sat next to the door, he did nothing. Why? Because as long as he sits there, there is still an open door, the deer can run out. He didn't do any trapping.

Discussion: When the First Filled and the Second Comes

Speaker 1: What if... the first sat and he filled it. Afterwards the second came on the side, and the first left. Now the second makes the trapping, is the first liable, probably to be stringent. Why? Because he didn't do the action of trapping, he sat by a closed door where his friend Reuven sat there. Just now Reuven stood up, but he thought that he would sit there. Even if he will sit there, even if Reuven left. He says to Reuven "I am permitted to sit in my place until evening and take the deer." I may sit there until the afternoon, until after Shabbat, and take the deer.

One Who Locks His House to Guard It / A Bird Entered Under His Wings

Speaker 1: In practice, similar to one who locks a house to guard it, locks to guard within it, Shabbat before one within it. He thinks, my person just locked his door and just, he didn't know at all, not even for something unintentional, he didn't know at all that he had a deer, he did nothing. The same thing, the person, he sat down in a proper manner to sit there, the deer was already in the house when he sat there, and therefore to the guard, the same thing, **a bird entered under his wings**, which means only the action of trapping is forbidden, just to be there so they cannot run away from the animal, that's no prohibition. The same thing **a bird entered under his wings**, that the bird has wings, when it goes in under the wings of a person, when it happened many times, wings of a person are his garments, so **he sits and guards them until it gets dark**, it was permitted, and we don't send away, he did nothing. He can be exempt not caught in his way.

Novelty: Once the Trapping Happened, It Doesn't Happen Again

Speaker 2: I think both laws mean basically that once the action of trapping happened, the person opens it, it's contained and he can run away, a trapping already happened. One doesn't say that the whole time happens again and again trapping.

Speaker 1: Right.

Exempt from Trapping – Old, Lame, Sick, Young

Speaker 1: A year it says a sign or sleeping is liable, but an old deer, or a lame one, or a sick one, or a young one, which cannot run well. Exempt, because it's like it's not trapped, like it's trapped.

Speaker 2: No. As it is like it's trapped, it cannot run away.

Speaker 1: Right.

One Who Traps an Animal and Bird in His Domain

Speaker 1: It asks, an animal and life perhaps from trapping, so the exempt what is the meaning and takes them out from what a trapping?

Speaker 2: Ah, is it those that one catches in a trap, meaning in a snare?

Speaker 1: So the exemption... already no longer applies to deer, gazelles, ibexes, as it says... **"One who traps a wild animal or bird in his possession, such as geese and chickens and attic doves,"** that is, things that already belong to him, it's already in his house, he has a coop or he has a dovecote of doves etc., attic doves, then he is exempt. Why? Because they are already trapped, they come back every day, even if they fly around, they come home every day, so they are called "already trapped," so it's not called trapping. So says the holy Rambam.

Discussion: Exempt but Rabbinically Forbidden

Speaker 1: Here regarding this problem, yes, if a person has a bird, a pet bird, and the bird runs out, the Rambam says, he may catch it on Shabbos even lechatchila (from the outset).

Speaker 2: Ah, it says exempt, he may not. Um, exempt.

Speaker 1: There are those who say, the Mishnah Berurah says such a type of bird, for example a chicken, which is generally not trapping at all, because it doesn't run away at all when it's by its owner, it comes out that then it's completely permitted.

Speaker 2: Okay.

One Who Traps Things That Are Not of the Species of Trapping

Speaker 1: **"One who traps things that are not of the species of trapping,"** these are things that one doesn't normally trap, such as for example **"locusts, grasshoppers,"** I don't know what grasshoppers are, some kind of bug, **"hornets,"** a bee, **"a fly, mosquitoes, fleas,"** flies, **"and the like,"** no one traps them, therefore he is exempt. The Sages perhaps said that even if one does trap sometimes, they shouldn't continue doing it, not that one wants them.

Speaker 2: Right, there's also such a thing that this isn't called trapping, right, when one does want them, one wants to have them, not that one is trapping them in order to exempt them.

Speaker 1: But one sees that there is a certain leniency, there are things that one may, one doesn't risk catching them.

Trapping Harmful Creatures – Snakes and Scorpions

Speaker 1: **"One who traps harmful creatures, such as snakes and scorpions and the like, and even though they don't kill,"** even if it's not readily dangerous, even a bee for example, bees, **"behold they bite, it is permitted to trap them on Shabbos, provided that he intends to be saved from their harm,"** that is, not that he should intend to catch them, then it's a type of melachah she'einah tzrichah

legufa (labor not needed for its own sake). No, he only wants to be saved, it's not a melachah she'einah tzrichah legufa. And... he said that it's a continuation. He said, exempt... once it's exempt, it's actually rabbinically forbidden. It's a rabbinic prohibition. In a manner where it's harmful, then regarding... why is it rabbinically forbidden? But if once one needs to be saved. If once one needs to be saved.

End of Chapter 14: The Law of Trapping Harmful Creatures

Continuation of the Reasoning Regarding Harmful Creatures

That is, not that he has an intention to catch because then it's a question of trapping. No, he only wants to be saved, that is, he has no intention of melachah she'einah tzrichah legufa. And he says that it's a continuation. He says once it's exempt, there is a rabbinic prohibition. There is a rabbinic prohibition in a manner that it's harmful, then one may remove it.

Question: Why a Rabbinic Prohibition if It's Not Trapping at All?

He asks, but why is there a rabbinic prohibition if one only wants to be saved? He has no intention of trapping at all. If one says that it is indeed trapping, it's because they are a danger, not because one wants to catch them. He asks, the Rambam learns that melachah she'einah tzrichah legufa is exempt, he should hold that here it's even less than that. That's the point, not clear.

So perhaps I'll say? He asks that in the Gemara it's implied that it has a law of melachah she'einah tzrichah legufa, but the Rambam rules differently. Anyway, we'll say as you say, that here it's even less. In short, it's not trapping at all.

Law 25: Permission to Cover Harmful Creatures with a Vessel

"How should one do it? He covers them with a vessel, or wraps a garment over them and the like, provided that they don't cause harm" — what does he do? He places a vessel over them, or he wraps a piece of cloth around them and the like, provided that they don't cause harm, that is, he cannot kill them, but he can place a vessel over them so they won't cause harm.

This is the law of something that disturbs, yes? It's not a type of life-threatening danger, even simply that it's harmful, one may not trap these types of harmful creatures.

End of Chapter 14 and Laws of Shabbos

Thus far Laws of Shabbos Chapter 14. Yes, this is a third of the Laws of Shabbos. More than a third, no? There are thirty chapters, no?