

# XIII.

---

## BAVLI SHABBAT CHAPTER THIRTEEN

### FOLIOS 105A-107A

#### 13:1

- A. R. Eliezer says, “He who weaves three threads at the beginning [of the web], or [who added] one onto that which is already woven, is liable.”
- B. And sages say, “Whether at the beginning or at the end, its measure [for culpability] is two threads.”

#### 13:2

- A. He who makes two meshes for the heddles or the sley [of a loom],
  - B. [or two meshes] in a sifter, sieve, or basket,
  - C. is liable.
  - D. He who sews two stitches [is liable].
  - E. And he who tears in order to sew two stitches [is liable].
- I.1** A. [He who weaves three threads at the beginning:] *When R. Isaac came, he taught the Tannaite formulation as **two**.*
- B. *But lo, the wording that we have learned in the Mishnah is, **three threads!***
  - C. *No problem, the one refers to thick thread, the other to thin.*
  - D. *There are those who spell the matter out on the one side, and there are those who spell it out on the other.*

- E. *There are those who spell the matter out on the one side: In the case of thick threads, three won't break, two will. In the case of thin threads, even two won't break.*
- F. *And there are those who spell it out on the other: If there are thin threads, three will be recognized, two not; of thick threads, even two will be recognized.*

**I.2** A. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. He who on the Sabbath weaves three threads to begin with, or added one thread to what is already woven, is liable.
- C. And sages say, "Whether to begin with or at the end, the requisite measure of weaving for liability is two threads."
- D. As to the selvedge, the requisite measure is two threads over the breadth of three meshes.
- E. To what is the matter comparable? To weaving a small belt, in size two threads over the breadth of three meshes.

**I.3** A. He who on the Sabbath weaves three threads to begin with, or added one thread to what is already woven, is liable — the unattributed statement accords with R. Eliezer.

B. *It has further been taught on Tannaite authority:*

C. **He who weaves two threads on the thick part of the web or on the border — lo, this one is liable.**

D. **R. Eliezer says, "Even one."**

E. **As to the selvedge, the measure is two threads over the breadth of three meshes. To what is the matter comparable? To weaving a small belt, two threads over the breadth of three meshes [T. Shab. 12:1A-E].**

F. *This unattributed statement accords with rabbis.*

**II.1** A. **He who makes two meshes for the heddles or the sley [of a loom], [or two meshes] in a sifter, sieve, or basket, is liable:**

- B. *What is the meaning of for the heddles?*
- C. *Said Abbaye, "Two in a mesh and one in the crosspiece."*

**III.1** A. **Or the sley [of a loom]:**

- B. *What is the sley [of a loom]?*
- C. *Said Rab, "The slips [to which the threads of the warp are attached]."*

**IV.1 A. He who sews two stitches [is liable]:**

- B. *Lo, we have learned this item in the catalogue of generative classifications of labor: **he who sews two stitches!***
- C. *It is because the Tannaite framer wanted to include the latter clause, **And he who tears in order to sew two stitches [is liable]**, he repeated the earlier one as well, namely, **He who sews two stitches [is liable]**.*
- D. *But that item, too, is included in the catalogue of generative classifications of labor!*
- E. *Rather, it is because he wanted to go on to the further clause, **He who tears [his clothing] because of his anger or on account of his bereavement, and all those who effect destruction, are exempt** — on that account he went over the present ground as well.*

**V.1 A. And he who tears in order to sew two stitches [is liable]:**

- B. *How would you find such a case?*
- C. **[105B]** *If he made the garment like a pocket [so part has to be torn open so as to re sew it].*

**13:3**

- A. **He who tears [his clothing] because of his anger or on account of his bereavement,**
- B. **and all those who effect destruction,**
- C. **are exempt.**
- D. **But he who destroys in order to improve — the measure [for] his [action] is the same as for him who improves.**

**13:4**

- A. **The measure for one who bleaches, hackles, dyes, or spins is a double sit.**
- B. **And he who weaves two threads — his measure is a sit.**

- I.1**
- A. **[He who tears his clothing because of his anger or on account of his bereavement, and all those who effect destruction, are exempt.]** *But by contrast: He who tears his clothing because of his anger or on account of his bereavement or for his deceased is liable, and though he violates the Sabbath, he has carried out his obligation to tear his clothing as a mark of mourning!*
  - B. *No problem, the one speaks of doing so for his own dead [so what he has done serves a purpose and he is liable], the other, for the dead in general.*

- C. *But the language of the Mishnah explicitly refers to **his bereavement!***
- D. *In point of fact, it does refer to his deceased, but but it speaks of those whom he is not obligated to mourn [brothers, sisters, children, wife, husband].*

## I.2

- A. *But if it was a sage, he would be obligated to mourn for him, as has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- B. When a sage dies, everybody is regarded as related to him?
- C. *Do you really think that the rule is, When a sage dies, everybody is regarded as related to him? Rather, When a sage dies, everybody is regarded as if he were related to him!*
- D. [In consequence:] All tear their clothing on his account, all bare their shoulders on his account, and all provide a meal for those who mourn on his account in the public space.
- E. *Our Mishnah paragraph's ruling is required to deal with the case of one who was not classified as a sage.*
- F. *Still, even if it was merely a worthy person, people are obligated to tear their clothes on that account, as it is stated on Tannaite authority: How come someone's sons and daughters died young? It is so that a person should weep and mourn for a worthy person.*
- G. *Are weeping and mourning obligations to be carried out in advance [that is, is it the rule that one is given a cause to weep anticipating some worthy person may die and not be fittingly mourned by the person whose sons or daughters have died in infancy (Lazarus)]?*
- H. Rather, [How come someone's sons and daughters died young?] It is because one did not weep and mourn for a worthy person.
- I. Then is it the fact that anyone who weeps and mourns for a worthy person is forgiven for all his sins on account of the honor that he has paid to him?!
- J. [The statement of the Mishnah paragraph is required to cover the case] in which the deceased is not a particularly virtuous person.
- K. *But if someone is standing right there at the time that the soul goes forth, he still is obligated, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Simeon b. Eleazar says, "He who is standing at the side of the deceased at the very moment that the soul comes forth is obligated to tear his garment. To what is this comparable? To a scroll of the Torah that catches fire. For one is liable on that account to tear his clothing."*

- L. *[The statement of the Mishnah paragraph is required to cover the case] in which someone is not standing right there at the time that the soul goes forth.*

**I.3** A. *Well, that works out the problem of his dead. Nonetheless, the two rulings as to his doing so in his anger contradict one another!*

B. *There is no contradiction between the rulings as to his doing so in his anger, since the one represents the view of R. Judah, the other, R. Simeon.*

C. *The one represents the view of R. Judah, who has said, "For performing on the Sabbath an act of labor that is not required for its own purpose one is liable."*

D. *The other represents the view of R. Judah, who has said, "For performing on the Sabbath an act of labor that is not required for its own purpose one is exempt."*

E. *Well, I can concede that R. Judah takes that view in the case of one who improves something, but do you know that he holds that view in the case of one who causes damage [for example, tearing his clothing]?*

F. *Said R. Abin, "Here, too, he also improves something, because by doing the tearing he appeases his wrath."*

G. *But is it permitted to do it that way? And hasn't it been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Simeon b. Eleazar says in the name of R. Hilpai b. Agra which he said in the name of R. Yohanan b. Nuri, "If a person pulled out his own hair, tore his clothing, broke his utensils, scattered his coins, in a fit of anger, he should be regarded by you as though he performed an act of service for an idol. For if his temper should say to him, 'Go do an act of service for an idol,' he would go and do it. And that is the sort of thing that the evil impulse can do: Today it says to him, 'Do this,' tomorrow 'do that,' until he tells him, 'go serve idols,' and he goes and does just that" [T. B.Q. 9:31K-M]?*

H. *Said R. Abin, "What verse of Scripture indicates that? 'There shall be no strange god in you, neither shall you worship any strange god' (Psa. 81:10) — what is the stranger that is in one's own body? Say: That is the impulse to do evil."*

I. *Well, at any rate, that rule pertains in particular only where he does it so as to put fear into the members of his household, like what*

*R. Judah did: He pulled the thrums of his garment to show his anger, R. Aha bar Jacob broke dishes, R. Sheshet threw brine on his slave girl's head, R. Abba broke a lid.*

### **Topical Composite on Mourning for a Sage**

- I.4** A. Said R. Simeon b. Pazzi said R. Joshua b. Levi in the name of Bar Qappara, “Whoever sheds tears for a good man — the Holy One, blessed be He, counts them up and puts them away in his treasure house: ‘You count my grievings, put my tears into your bottle, are they not in your book’ (Psa. 56: 9).”
- I.5** A. Said R. Judah said Rab, “Whoever is dilatory in lamenting a sage is worthy of being buried alive: ‘And they buried him in the border of his inheritance in Timnath-serah, which is in the hill country of Ephraim, on the north of the mountain of Gaash’ (Jos. 24:30) — [since the word Gaash shares consonants with the root for rage] this teaches that the mountain raged against them to kill them.”
- B. Said R. Hiyya bar Abba said R. Yohanan, “Whoever is dilatory in lamenting a sage won’t live a long time: measure for measure: ‘In measure when you send her away you contend with her’ (Isa. 27: 8).”
- C. *Objected R. Hiyya bar Abba to R. Yohanan, “‘And Israel served the Lord all the days of Joshua and all the days of the elders, who lived a long time after Joshua’ (Jos. 24:31).” [Freedman: They lived a long time in spite of failing to mourn for Joshua.]*
- D. He said to him, “Babylonian! They had lots of days, but not lots of years.”
- E. Then what about this: “So that your days may be long and the days of your children” (Deu. 11:21) — does that mean, days not years?
- F. *A blessing is exceptional.*
- I.6** A. And said R. Hiyya bar Abba said R. Yohanan, “If one among brothers dies, **[106A]** the others should start worrying. When one of the members of an association dies, all of the association should start worrying.”
- B. *Some say, that means when the principal dies, and some say, when the youngest of them dies.*
- II.1** A. ...and all those who effect destruction are exempt:
- B. *A Tannaite statement of R. Abbahu before R. Yohanan: R. Abbahu repeated as a Tannaite formulation before R. Yohanan: “All actions that serve destructive purposes done on the Sabbath are exempt from liability on account*

of violating the Sabbath, except for someone who does injury to another and one who sets a fire for a destructive purpose.”

- C. *He said to him, “Go and repeat the Tannaite version outside: The exceptions for someone who does injury to another and one who sets a fire for a destructive purpose form no part of the Mishnah teaching. And should you propose that these do form part of the formulation, then the reference to causing a bodily injury would speak of a case in which one needed blood to feed a dog [and hence the action is not purely destructive] or one needs the ashes for some purpose [with the same result].”*
- D. *We have learned in the Mishnah: **and all those who effect destruction are exempt!***
- E. *Our Mishnah passage accords with R. Judah, while the external Tannaite formulation cited by R. Abbahu accords with R. Simeon.*
  - F. *What is the basis for the position of R. Simeon?*
  - G. *Since a verse is required to show that it is permitted to perform a circumcision on the Sabbath, it follows that under other circumstances causing a wound is culpable. And since the All-Merciful has forbidden burning as a penalty for a priest’s daughter who commits adultery, it follows that for kindling a fire in general, one is liable.*
  - H. *And R. Judah?*
  - I. *In that case, he makes an improvement, in line with what R. Ashi said, for said R. Ashi, “What difference does it make to me whether one improves the foreskin by circumcision or improves a utensil by fixing it, and what difference does it make to me whether one melts a lead bar [to execute the person put to death by burning] or boils dyes?”*

**III.1 A. The measure for one who bleaches, hackles, dyes, or spins is a double sit. And he who weaves two threads — his measure is a sit:**

- B. *R. Joseph demonstrated that it was a double measure.*
- C. *R. Hiyya bar Ammi demonstrated that it was a single measure.*

### 13:5

- A. **R. Judah says, “He who hunts a bird into a tower trap,**
- B. **“or a deer into a house,**
- C. **“is liable.”**

- D. And sages say, “[He who drives] a bird into a tower trap, or a deer into a house, [106B] into a courtyard, or into a corral.”
- E. Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel says, “Not all corrals are the same. This is the governing principle: [If] it yet lacks further work of hunting, he [who pens it in on the Sabbath] is exempt. [If] it does not lack further work of hunting, he is liable.”

### Comment on Intersecting Mishnah-Passage

- I.1 A. *There we have learned in the Mishnah: They do not catch fish in a vivarium on a festival day. And they do not cast food for them. But they do catch a wild beast or fowl in a vivarium. And they do cast food for them [M. Bes. 3:1A-D].*
- B. *They pointed out a contradiction [to M. Bes. 3:1C-D]: Vivaria for wild beasts, fowl and fish they do not catch from them on a festival day. And they do not cast food for them [T. Y.T. 3:1]. [Therefore] the rulings concerning wild beasts are contradictory, and the rulings concerning fowl are contradictory.*
- C. *Well, now, the rules concerning wild animals are not contradictory. For this [rule, M. Bes. 3:1C, which permits catching beasts] is the opinion of R. Judah; while this [rule that prohibits catching beasts], is the opinion of sages.*
- D. *But the rulings on birds are contradictory.*
- E. *And should you say, the rulings on birds do not contradict one another, the one representing a covered vivarium, the other uncovered, one may ask, still, a house is covered, and yet both R. Judah and rabbis maintain, one is culpable only if he hunts a bird into a turret but not into a house!*
- F. *Said Rabbah b. R. Huna, “Here we deal with a ‘free bird,’ which does not submit to domestication.*
  - G. *“For the school of R. Ishmael taught on Tannaite authority: Why is it called a ‘free bird’ [root: DRR ]? For it dwells [root: DR ] in a house as in the fields, [without becoming domesticated and easily caught].”*
- H. *Now that you have come to this point, then it may well follow that the rules for wild beasts likewise are not contradictory.*



I. *This [rule, which permits catching wild beasts in a vivarium, M. Bes. 3:1B], refers to a small vivarium. [Once the beast is trapped in this enclosure it is caught without any hunting.] While this [rule that prohibits catching the beast] refers to a large vivarium. [Even when trapped in this large enclosure, the beast is not easily caught. It still must be hunted, which is forbidden on the festival day.]*

J. *What is the definition of a small vivarium, and what is the definition of a large vivarium?*

K. *Said R. Ashi, “Whenever one runs after [the beast] and catches it with one lunge, that is a small vivarium. Otherwise, it is a large vivarium. Or if you prefer, I shall say, if one can run after and catch it with a single grab, that is a small vivarium; if there is space for a beast to hide, it is a large vivarium. Otherwise it is a small vivarium. Alternatively: Any [vivarium] in which the shadow of one wall falls upon the other is a small vivarium. Otherwise it is a large vivarium.”*

**II.1** A. **Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel says, “Not all corrals are the same. This is the governing principle: [If] it yet lacks further work of hunting, he [who pens it in on the Sabbath] is exempt. [If] it does not lack further work of hunting, he is liable”:**

B. *Said R. Joseph said R. Judah said Samuel, “The decided law accords with the view of Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel.”*

C. *Said to him Abbayye, “‘The decided law — This [statement that the law follows Simeon b. Gamaliel] implies that [other rabbis] differ [and hold that the law is the same for all vivaria].” [Yet we know that no one differs, since, in the preceding unit, there is no dispute that the rule for a small vivarium is different from that for a large one.]*

D. *[Joseph] said to him, “What practical difference does it make to you?” [Whether you believe that the matter is under dispute or that all parties agree, the law still is the same, that all vivaria are not equivalent.]*

E. *[Abbayye] said to him, “Is the lesson to be recited in a sing-song, [without reasoning]?”*

**II.2** A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

B. **He who hunts a blind or sleeping deer, he is liable; a lame, aged, or sick deer, he is exempt [T. Shab. 12:4A-B].**

**II.3** A. *Said Abbaye to R. Joseph, "So what's the difference between them?"*

B. *"The former try to run away, the latter don't."*

**II.4** A. *And hasn't it been taught on Tannaite authority: He who hunts a sick deer is liable?*

B. *Said R. Sheshet, "No problem, the one speaks of a deer that was sick with fever, the other, through exhaustion."*

**II.5** A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

B. *"He who hunts locusts, wild locusts, hornets, or gnats on the Sabbath is liable," the words of R. Meir.*

C. *And sages say, "In the case of any, the species of which is hunted, he is liable, but in the case of other species of which is not hunted, he is exempt."*

**II.6** A. *It has further been taught on Tannaite authority:*

B. *He who hunts locusts at the time of dew is not liable, but at the time of dry heat, is liable.*

C. *Eleazar b. Mahabai says, "If they were coming along in swarms, he is exempt."*

**II.7** A. *The question was raised: Does Eleazar b. Mahabai refer to the first or the second clause?*

B. *Come and take note: He who hunts locusts at the time of dew is not liable, but at the time of dry heat, is liable. Eleazar b. Mahabai says, "Even if it was at the time of dry heat, if they were coming along in swarms, he is exempt."*

### **13:6**

A. **A deer which entered a house, and someone locked it in —**

B. **he [who locked it in] is liable.**

C. **[If] two people locked it in, they are exempt.**

D. **[If] one person could not lock the door, and two people did so, they are liable.**

E. **And R. Simeon declares them exempt [M. 10:5].**

**I.1** A. *Said R. Jeremiah bar Abba said Samuel, "He who on the Sabbath hunts a lion is liable only if he brings it into its cage."*

### 13:7

- A. [If] one of them sat down at the doorway and did not completely fill it [so that the deer could yet escape], but a second person sat down and finished filling it,
- B. the second person is liable.
- C. [If] the first person sat down at the doorway and filled it up, and a second one came along and sat down at his side,
- D. even though the first one got up and went along, the first remains liable, and the second exempt.
- E. Lo, to what is this equivalent?
- F. To one who locks his house to shut it up [and protect it], and a deer turns out to be shut up [and trapped] inside.

#### I.1

- A. [107A] Said R. Abba said R. Hiyya bar Ashi said Rab, "If on the Sabbath a bird crept under one's garments, he may sit and watch it until it gets dark."
- B. *R. Nahman bar Isaac objected*, "[If] the first person sat down at the doorway and filled it up, and a second one came along and sat down at his side, even though the first one got up and went along, the first remains liable, and the second exempt. *Doesn't this mean*, he is exempt, but it is forbidden to do something like this?"
- C. "*No, it means, he is exempt and it is permitted to do this. And that stands to reason, since it is further repeated as the Tannaite statement at the end of the same passage: Lo, to what is this equivalent? To one who locks his house to shut it up [and protect it], and a deer turns out to be shut up [and trapped] inside. So it follows that he is exempt and it is permitted to do so.*"
- D. *That proves the point.*
  - E. *There are those who say, said R. Nahman bar Isaac, "So, too, have we learned in the Mishnah: Even though the first one got up and went along, the first remains liable, and the second exempt. Doesn't this mean*, he is exempt, and it is permitted to do so?"
  - F. "*No, what it means is*, he is exempt but it is forbidden to do so."
  - G. *But since it is repeated as the Tannaite statement at the end of the same passage: Lo, to what is this equivalent? To one who locks his house to shut it up [and protect it], and a deer turns out to be shut up [and trapped] inside. So it follows that he is exempt and it is permitted to do so.*"

H. *That proves the point.*

- I.2** A. Samuel said, “Every reference to ‘exempt’ in the matter of the Sabbath bears the meaning, ‘exempt but forbidden,’ except for these three, in which the action is both exempt and permitted; and this case [trapping a deer] is one.” [The others are capturing a snake, and manipulating an abscess.]
- B. *But how do we know that he is exempt and that the action is permitted?*
- C. *Since it is repeated as the Tannaite statement at the end of the same passage: **Lo, to what is this equivalent? To one who locks his house to shut it up [and protect it], and a deer turns out to be shut up [and trapped] inside.***
- D. *A second is this: **He who cuts open an abscess on the Sabbath — if it is to make an opening for it, he is liable. But if it is to draw out the pus from it, he is exempt [M. Ed. 2:5B-D].***
- E. *But how do we know that he is exempt and that the action is permitted?*
- F. *Because we have learned in the Mishnah: **It is permitted to handle a sewing needle to take out a thorn [M. Shab. 17:2G].***
- G. *And the third is this: **And concerning him who traps a snake on the Sabbath — if he got involved with it so that it would not bite him, he is exempt. But if it was for purposes of healing, he is liable [M. Ed. 2:5G-H].***
- H. *But how do we know that he is exempt and that the action is permitted?*
- I. *Because we have learned in the Mishnah: **They cover a lamp with a dish so that it will not scorch a rafter; and the excrement of a child; and a scorpion, so that it will not bite [M. Shab. 16:7E]***