

Laws of Shabbat Chapter 21 (Auto Translated)

English

Auto Translated

Shiur Overview

Summary of Shiur – Rambam Hilchos Shabbos, Chapter 21 (Shevusin / Rabbinic Prohibitions)

Introduction to the Chapter – The Rambam's Division of D'Oraisa and D'Rabbanan

The Rambam dealt in the previous chapters (approximately chapters 7 through 19) with **d'Oraisa prohibitions** – the 39 melachos, chiyuv chatas, sekilah, patur aval assur. **Now he begins with the d'Rabbanan prohibitions – the shevusin.**

Chidushim:

The Rambam **divided** in Hilchos Shabbos the d'Oraisa from the d'Rabbanan – something that **no other sefer** (not the Mishnah, not the Gemara, not the Shulchan Aruch) has done in Hilchos Shabbos. The Rambam made extra chapters specifically for a **list of shevusin**. This is consistent with the Rambam's general approach in other halachos, but in Hilchos Shabbos it is a chiddush because no one else did this.

Halacha 1 – The Source of "Shevus"

The Rambam says: "It is stated in the Torah 'tishbos' – even from things that are not melacha one must rest from them. There are many things that the Chachamim prohibited because of shevus."

Explanation:

Besides the 39 melachos, it says in the Torah "tishbos" – one must rest even from things that are not melacha. The Chachamim prohibited various things "because of shevus."

Chidushim:

1. **The source of the word "shevus":** The word "shevus" comes from the Torah's language "tishbos." "Mishum shevus" is a shortening of "mishum tishbos." The Chachamim **relied** on the verse "tishbos" as an asmachta (according to the **Maggid Mishneh** it is an asmachta, not a d'Oraisa derasha).

2. **Two categories of shevusin:** The Rambam divides:

- **(a) Domeh l'melachos** – things that **look** similar to a melacha, even if they don't lead to any melacha.

- **(b) Gezeirah shema yavo mehem lidei issur sekilah** – things that can **lead** to doing a d'Oraisa melacha.

3. **The difference between "domeh l'melachos" and "shema yavo":** "Domeh l'melachos" means that **other people** shouldn't stumble because it looks like melacha; "shema yavo" means **the person himself** will stumble.

4. **The Rambam versus the Ramban:** The **Ramban** (Parshas Emor) has a famous question: after all 39 melachos, a person may still exert himself, drag boxes, work – how is this "tishbos"? The Ramban learns that "tishbos"/"Shabbos Shabbason" means that besides melachos there is a **d'Oraisa obligation to rest** even from non-melacha things. **But the Rambam doesn't mean this here.** The Rambam's shevus

here is clearly **d'Rabbanan** with specific reasons (domeh l'melacha or shema yavo), not a general obligation of rest. The Rambam's concept of "rest" in general comes first in **Chapter 24**, and there it comes from "l'ma'an yanuach" – this is a **separate category** (dinim of tircha), not the same as shevus. According to the Ramban, one wouldn't need to say "domeh l'melachos" or "gezeirah shema yavo" – simply because one must rest. But the Rambam doesn't say so.

5. **The Maggid Mishneh's first answer** aligns with the Ramban's approach, but it doesn't connect with the Rambam's language here.

General Principles in Rabbinic Decrees:

All "shema yavo lidei" are not distant concerns, but things that the Chachamim saw that in the weekday routine, the next step after the permitted action is a d'Oraisa melacha. It's a "slippery slope" that is very close – it's from the same category of melacha. The rule is: don't do one step before the melacha.

Decrees Related to Chores – Meshavet Gumos

The Rambam says: "Anyone who levels holes is liable for chores" – this is a toldah of chores (stated explicitly in Chapter 9).

(a) Prohibited to Relieve Oneself in a Plowed Field

"It is prohibited to relieve oneself in a plowed field on Shabbos lest one level holes."

Explanation: One may not go to the bathroom in a field that has already been plowed, because he will come to level holes (when he takes earth to cover).

Chidushim: This is a **shema yavo** prohibition – the next step after the permitted action is a d'Oraisa melacha.

(b) One Who Empties a Storehouse on Shabbos

"One who empties a storehouse on Shabbos... even for a mitzvah purpose such as to bring in guests or establish a study hall – he should not finish the entire storehouse lest he come to level holes."

Explanation: One may not empty a room down to the floor, because when he encounters the exposed earth, he will come to level holes. Even for hachnasas orchim or beis midrash – he should not finish down to the bottom.

(c) Mud on One's Foot

Explanation: One may not wipe mud from one's foot **on the ground** – lest one level holes. But one may wipe it on a wall or beam (on a wall or beam).

(d) One Should Not Spit on the Ground and Rub with One's Foot

"It is prohibited to spit on the ground and rub with one's foot, lest one level holes. But it is permitted to step on spit that is on the ground and walk normally."

Explanation: One may not spit on the earth and then rub with one's foot – lest one level holes. But one may step on the spit incidentally, because then he is not intentionally smoothing the earth.

Chidushim: The distinction is between intentionally rubbing (which is prohibited) and stepping incidentally (which is permitted), because incidentally he is not intentionally leveling the earth.

(e) Women Playing with Nuts and Almonds

"Women who play with nuts and almonds and the like, it is prohibited to play with them on Shabbos, lest one come to level holes."

Explanation: Women who play with nuts and almonds – it is prohibited on Shabbos because one needs to make the ground level in order to play properly.

Chidushim: It is asked why the Rambam says specifically "women" – men didn't play with such things. The mechanism: when one plays with nuts on the ground, one needs the floor to be level, and this leads to leveling holes.

(f) Sweeping the Floor

"It is prohibited to sweep the floor lest one level holes, unless it is paved with stones."

Explanation: One may not sweep the floor, because this can lead to leveling holes, unless the floor is paved with stones.

Chidushim: It is interesting that the Rambam didn't begin with the halacha of sweeping the floor, which is a daily matter (relevant every Shabbos after the meal), and only afterward brings the more rare halachos.

(g) Pouring Water on the Ground

"It is permitted to pour water on the ground and one need not be concerned lest one level holes, since he does not intend to do so."

Explanation: One may pour water on the earth, because he is not intending to level holes.

Chidushim:

- **Question:** By sweeping too, it's also *davar she'eino miskavein* – he only intends to gather dirt, not to make holes?

- **Answer:** By sweeping it is "*mihavsa lei*" (*pesik reisha* / it comes out almost unavoidably) – when one sweeps soft earth, it is very close to leveling holes. But by pouring water, usually no leveling of holes occurs.

- **Alternative explanation:** "*Eino miskavein*" doesn't mean *davar she'eino miskavein* in the technical sense, but that usually when one pours water one is not engaged in leveling the floor – it's not an action that naturally leads to holes.

- Perhaps "*eino miskavein*" means that as long as he doesn't have in mind leveling holes, he may pour. But if he does have in mind leveling holes, even pouring water would be prohibited.

(h) Oiling, Sweeping, Washing – Even Paved with Stones

"One may not oil the floor even if it is paved with stones, and one may not sweep it, and one may not wash it, even on Yom Tov, certainly on Shabbos, so that one should not do as one does on weekdays and come to level holes."

Explanation: One may not oil the earth, not blow (remove dust), not wash with water – even on paved earth, even Yom Tov.

Chidushim:

- **Distinction between pouring water and washing:** Pouring water means simply pouring water, but washing means washing with a rag – a full weekday procedure.

- **Question:** By stones there is no leveling of holes, why is it prohibited? It's a decree for a decree!

- **Answer:** The Rambam's reason is "so that one should not do as one does on weekdays" – when one does the entire weekday routine (oiling, blowing, washing), this leads to leveling holes in a place that is not paved. In ancient times there weren't stones everywhere – the middle of the room was stones, but the sides were sand. So washing the stone part is part of the same routine that leads to leveling holes on the earth part.

- **Rule:** One may not do the entire weekday routine, because this leads to the next step which is a *melacha*. A little leveling one may do, but not the full procedure.

(i) A Courtyard Muddied by Rainwater

"A courtyard that became muddied by rainwater, one brings straw and spreads it. And when he spreads, he should not spread with a basket or container but with the bottom of the container, so that he should not do as one does on weekdays and come to level holes."

Explanation: A courtyard that became flooded from rain – one may bring straw and spread it, but only with a change (with the edge of the container), not in the normal way.

Chidushim: The change serves as a reminder that it is Shabbos – when one does it in a professional weekday manner, one forgets that it is Shabbos and one can come to level holes. The change prevents the "*slippery slope*."

Decrees Related to Zore'a

"One who waters seeds is liable for zore'a. Therefore, it is prohibited to draw water from a well with a wheel, a decree lest one fill for one's garden or ruin. But if it was a wheel well in a courtyard, it is permitted to fill from it with a wheel, since we are not concerned lest one fill for one's garden."

Explanation: Watering plants is a *toldah* of *zore'a*. Therefore, one may not draw water from a well with a wheel (wheel mechanism), because this makes it easy to draw large amounts of water, and he can come to water his garden. But in a courtyard it is permitted, because there it is not near the garden.

Chidushim:

- "**Churvaso**" doesn't mean a ruin in the usual sense, but a place where one plants – a place where planting is relevant.

- **The distinction between with a wheel and without a wheel:** Without a wheel it is permitted because it is *k'le'achar yad* – it's harder, and the change from the normal way serves

as a reminder. With a wheel it is as professional as on weekdays, and there is no reminder.

- **Courtyard vs. outside:** In a courtyard it is permitted even with a wheel, because there it is not near the garden and there is no concern that he will water.

Decrees Related to Kotzer

(a) Extracting Honey

"One who detaches is liable for kotzer. Therefore, it is prohibited to extract honey from a beehive on Shabbos, because it is like detaching."

Explanation: Removing honey from a beehive is prohibited because it is similar to tolesh (kotzer).

Chidushim: This is perhaps a different category of decree – not "shema yavo lidei melacha" but "**domeh l'melacha**" (similar to melacha). Although honey is not attached to the ground and it's not a true kotzer, but the form of the matter is similar – from a distance it looks like one is tearing out something that is planted.

(b) Climbing a Tree

"One may not climb a tree whether moist or dry, and one may not hang on a tree, and one may not lean on a tree... a decree lest one detach."

Explanation: One may not climb, hang, or lean on a tree – whether living or dry – because one can come to detachment.

Chidushim: Here we're already not just talking about tolesh specifically, but a broader decree: in general one may not use anything attached to the ground on Shabbos. The mechanism: when one is on a tree, one sees a living branch, it's easy to forget and tear off.

(c) Fruit That Fell on Shabbos

"Fruit that fell on Shabbos – it is prohibited to eat them until after Shabbos, a decree lest one detach."

Explanation: Fruit that fell by themselves from a tree on Shabbos – one may not eat them until after Shabbos.

Chidushim: Although there was no kotzer (they fell by themselves), it is prohibited – because if one were permitted to eat such fruit, one would come to intentional detachment. The person will have pleasure from a fresh fruit that fell, and will forget the prohibition and will detach himself.

(d) Attached Hadas – Smelling Attached to the Ground

"Attached hadas that has a scent – it is permitted to smell it. But an esrog and apple and anything fit for eating – it is prohibited to smell it when attached, a decree lest one cut it to eat it."

Explanation: A fragrant plant (hadas) that is still attached to the ground – one may smell it. But a fruit that is fit for eating (esrog, apple) – one may not smell it when it is attached.

Chidushim: The distinction: by hadas the pleasure is only the scent – he has no reason to tear it off, because he can smell it as it stands. But by a fruit, when he smells it, he gets a desire to eat, and then there is a decree lest one cut it to eat it. The rule: "They only taught regarding scent in it" – only when the

pleasure is only scent, it is permitted; when it is fit for eating, it is prohibited.

(e) Roots – Sitting on a Tree

"A tree that makes an impression on one's body – one may not climb it on Shabbos. Roots that protrude above three tefachim – prohibited. Within three – permitted. If it protruded above three and within three – permitted to use the part within three. If it was three high even if one side is level with the ground – prohibited to sit on it."

Explanation: Roots that stick out from the earth higher than three tefachim – prohibited to sit/use. Under three tefachim – permitted (lavud). If one side is higher than three and the other side not – prohibited.

Chidushim:

- The principle of "lavud" is applied: under three tefachim we consider it as if it's together with the earth, therefore it's not called "sitting on a tree" but as if he sits on the earth.

- By sitting on a tree we are already quite far from the practical concern of cutting (tolesh). This is already a decree in itself.

- By a hilly place where one side is higher than three and the other side not – prohibited, because half of it is a proper use of a tree.

(f) Riding on an Animal

"One may not ride on an animal on Shabbos, a decree lest one cut a branch to lead it. And one may not lean on an animal. Not to ascend and not to descend. Sides of sides – permitted."

Explanation: One may not ride on an animal on Shabbos, not lean, not ascend and not descend. But sides of sides (leaning on something that is leaning on an animal) – permitted.

Chidushim:

- Seemingly one could ride because of "chai nosei es atzmo" – the animal carries itself. But the reason for the prohibition is a decree: lest one cut a branch – he will cut a twig to drive the animal, which is tolesh (or mechamer if outside).

- Sides of animal (sides of animal) – prohibited, which looks like a decree for a decree. But sides of sides – permitted, and this is the normal rule.

(g) B'dieved – Climbed a Tree / Animal on Shabbos

"If one climbed a tree inadvertently – he should descend. Intentionally – it is prohibited for him to descend (penalty). But with an animal – whether inadvertent or intentional he descends, because of tza'ar ba'alei chayim."

Explanation: By a tree: inadvertent – may descend; intentional – stays on the tree until after Shabbos (penalty). By an animal: always he descends, because we cannot penalize at the animal's expense (tza'ar ba'alei chayim).

Chidushim: The distinction: by a tree the penalty is only on the person – he stays on the tree. But by an animal the penalty would affect the animal (tza'ar ba'alei chayim), therefore we don't penalize.

(h) Unloading the Burden from the Animal

"One unloads the burden from the animal on Shabbos because of tza'ar ba'alei chayim. If his animal was loaded with a sack of grain – he places his head under it and pushes it to the sides (k'le'achar yad)."

Explanation: One may remove a load from an animal on Shabbos because of tza'ar ba'alei chayim, but one does it k'le'achar yad – with the head putting under the sack and pushing it out.

Chidushim: The prohibition of removing with hands is because the grain is muktzeh (grain that is set aside for storage – not animal food, not fit). Therefore one may only move it k'le'achar yad.

(i) Coming from the Road on Friday Night – Animal Loaded
"If one was coming from the road on Friday night and his animal was loaded – when he reaches the outer courtyard, he takes the vessels that are movable on Shabbos. And those that are not movable – he unties the ropes and the sacks fall."

Explanation: When one arrives Friday evening with a loaded animal: things that are not muktzeh – one removes properly. Things that are muktzeh – one opens the ropes (a knot that is not permanent) and lets it fall.

(j) Pillows and Blankets – Mevatel Kli Meheichano
"If they were small sacks and likely to break – one brings pillows and blankets and places them underneath, and the sacks fall on them. And there is no issue of mevatel kli meheichano – because if he wants to pull he can pull, since the sacks are small and light."

Explanation: By fragile small sacks – one places soft things underneath so they fall softly. This is not mevatel kli meheichano because one can afterward pull out the pillow.

Chidushim:

- The principle of "mevatel kli meheichano": one may not make a vessel that one may use become unusable on Shabbos. Here however, because the sacks are small and easy, one can always pull out the pillow – therefore it is not mevatal.

- **Broken glass** (pieces of glass): here there is no heter of pillows and blankets. The reason: broken glass doesn't have a great loss when it breaks, because one will anyway grind/melt it to make new glass – "everything stands for melting." For a small loss the Chachamim didn't trouble to make special enactments.

- By large sacks with glass vessels, where there is a great concern of breaking, and a pillow/blanket doesn't help (because one will be mevatel kli meheichano – one won't want to pull out the pillow), they permitted **unloading gently** – removing slowly.

- Why doesn't one put down the large sacks from the animal in order to avoid the muktzeh problem? Because **we are not concerned about the animal** – tza'ar ba'alei chayim is a greater concern than the concern of muktzeh.

Decrees Related to Me'amer**(a) Sticking Fruits Together**

"One who sticks fruits together until they become one body is liable for me'amer."

Explanation: When one glues together small fruits until they become one body (for example making a fig cake), one is liable for me'amer.

Chidushim: The distinction between fruits (me'amer) and cheese (boneh) – both are an action of gathering, but by fruits it is me'amer because it is similar to the original me'amer of grain.

(b) Fruits Scattered in the Courtyard

"If fruits scattered in the courtyard – one gathers and eats, but should not put into a basket or container so as not to do as one does on weekdays."

Explanation: When fruits have scattered in the courtyard, one may gather them and eat, but not put them into a basket or container as one does on weekdays.

Chidushim: The reason: lest one press them with one's hand in the container – when all the fruits are already together in a vessel he will squeeze them, which is a toldah of dash, and lest one come to squeezing.

(c) Scattered Salt

"And similarly if salt scattered – it is prohibited because it appears like me'amer."

Explanation: Salt that has scattered one may not gather, because it appears like me'amer.

Chidushim: Me'amer d'Oraisa is only on something whose growth is from the ground – salt doesn't grow. But the process of how one extracts salt near the Dead Sea looks similar to gathering grain/fruits, therefore it is prohibited d'Rabbanan because it appears like me'amer.

Decrees Related to Dash – Squeezing / Mefarek**(a) Squeezing Olives and Grapes**

"Mefarek is liable for dash. One who squeezes olives and grapes is liable for mefarek."

Explanation: Mefarek (extracting one thing from another) is liable for dash. Squeezing olives (oil) and grapes (wine) is liable d'Oraisa for mefarek.

(b) Mulberries and Pomegranates

"It is prohibited to squeeze mulberries and pomegranates – we find that people squeeze them like olives and grapes, lest they come to squeeze olives and grapes."

Explanation: Mulberries and pomegranates are prohibited d'Rabbanan to squeeze.

Chidushim: The basis of this distinction: olives and grapes are fruits that stand for squeezing – their purpose is oil/wine. This is mefarek d'Oraisa. Mulberries and pomegranates don't stand for squeezing, but because certain people squeeze them, it looks similar, and lest they come to squeeze olives and grapes. Other fruits like apples and the like that no one squeezes – are permitted.

(c) Pickled and Cooked Vegetables

"Pickled and cooked vegetables that one squeezed – if to soften their body it is permitted, but if to extract their liquid it is prohibited."

Explanation: Pickled/cooked fruit – when one squeezes to soften the body it is permitted, but to extract the juice it is prohibited.

Chidushim: This is a stringency in other fruits d'Rabbanan. Pickled and cooked are different from regular apple juice – by pickled and cooked it is relevant that one drinks mei shelakos (like mei dagim).

(d) Snow

"If one crushes snow so that its water flows – prohibited. But in a cup or bowl one may crush it."

Explanation: One may not crush snow on a large scale so that it becomes water, but in a cup/bowl one may.

Chidushim: It is discussed what "in a cup" means – one reasoning is brought that it means a cup that already has water in it, so that the snow goes into water and it's not nolad/molid. Another reasoning: "cup" means directly for drinking – similar to other halachos where direct use is a leniency. The issue here is mefarek, not just molid.

(e) Garlic, Hemp, Unripe Grapes, Salted Vegetables – Crushed Before the Day

"Garlic, hemp, unripe grapes, salted vegetables that one crushed before the day – if they lack pounding with a vessel it is prohibited to finish pounding them on Shabbos, but if they lack grinding by hand it is permitted to finish grinding them on Shabbos."

Explanation: When one has already crushed (crushing) before Shabbos: if it still needs pounding (with a vessel) – prohibited; if it only needs grinding by hand (squeezing with hands) – permitted.

Chidushim: The principle is that the main melacha of disha was already done before Shabbos, and what remains is only a small thing – grinding by hand. This is compared to grinding arifos (disa/purina) – it's already cooked, already essentially finished, one just squeezes a bit into powder, which is "it only appears like grinding by hand" – permitted.

(f) Rubbing Salted Vegetables

"One who rubs salted vegetables – rubs with a change so that it should not appear like dash."

Explanation: One who rubs grains with the hands to extract grain, must do it with a change.

Chidushim: Three levels: (1) dash – the full melacha with a vessel; (2) salted vegetables – with the hands (already a leniency); (3) salted vegetables k'le'achar yad – with a change (for example back-hand). Only the third way is permitted.

(g) Sucking Milk with One's Mouth

"One who sucks milk with his mouth – exempt (but prohibited). Milking – a toldah of dash."

Explanation: One who sucks milk with his mouth is exempt but prohibited. Milking is a toldah of dash.

Chidushim:

- Sucking with one's mouth is mefarek k'le'achar yad – with the mouth is not the normal way of dash. The Rambam says "exempt" which means exempt but prohibited.

- The practical difference: when someone has pain (for example a sick person from an animal), he may suck with his mouth – because it's only mefarek k'le'achar yad, and in a place of pain they didn't decree.

- The Chachamim don't want Jews to suffer on Shabbos ❖❖❖ this is an important principle in Shabbos halachos.

- An example of Shabbos elevator is brought as an analogy: it's not a d'Oraisa prohibition but a shevus, and because it's difficult for people to walk stairs, they were lenient.

(h) Fruits from Which Liquids Flowed on Shabbos

"Fruits from which liquids flowed on Shabbos: if olives and grapes – prohibited to drink until after Shabbos, a decree lest one squeeze. If mulberries and pomegranates – if one brought them in for eating, liquids that flowed from them are permitted; if one brought them in to squeeze, liquids that flowed from them are prohibited until after Shabbos."

Explanation: By olives and grapes, where squeezing is d'Oraisa, we prohibit even what flowed by itself – a decree lest one squeeze. By mulberries and pomegranates (where squeezing is only d'Rabbanan) it depends on intention: brought in for eating – permitted; brought in for squeezing – prohibited.

Chidushim:

- By mulberries and pomegranates brought in for squeezing: because on his "list" it says for squeezing, he is closer to squeezing – if we let him take what came out by itself, he will next time give a push himself.

- This is a special type of decree: the person didn't touch anything, it flowed by itself, and nevertheless the Chachamim prohibit drinking it until after Shabbos. This is not like other melachos inadvertently/by accident where one did something.

(i) Olives and Grapes Crushed Before Shabbos

"Olives and grapes that one crushed before Shabbos and liquids flow from them by themselves on Shabbos – permitted. Like honeycomb that one crushed before Shabbos – liquids that flow from them on Shabbos are permitted, since there is no place to decree since they already crushed before."

Explanation: When one has already crushed before Shabbos, there is no decree lest one squeeze, because everything is already crushed – one doesn't need your help anymore.

Chidushim:

- Why does crushing before Shabbos help? Once it's already crushed, there's nothing to squeeze – everything is already crushed.

- Technically one can perhaps still squeeze, but practically people don't conduct themselves that way – therefore there is no concern.

Decrees Related to Zoreh and Borer

(a) Blowing Salted Vegetables

"Even though it is permitted to rub salted vegetables with one's fingertips (with a change), one blows with one hand with all one's strength, but not with a winnowing basket or tray – a decree lest one winnow with a sieve or strainer."

Explanation: One may blow away the chaff with one hand, but not with a vessel – even a vessel that is not specially made for selection – because it's a decree that he will come to use a sieve or strainer, which is liable d'Oraisa.

Chidushim: Why doesn't the Rambam say the av of zoreh and borer as he does by mefarek: by mefarek one needs to explain that it's a toldah of dash. But zoreh and borer are themselves avos – everyone knows what they are.

(b) Straining Wine

"It is permitted to strain clear wine or clear water through cloths or an Egyptian basket, but one should not make a funnel shape in the cloth, so as not to do as one does on weekdays and come to strain with a strainer. It is prohibited to hang the strainer as one does on weekdays, lest one come to strain."

Explanation: Clear wine/water one may pour through a cloth or Egyptian basket (not through a proper strainer), but not in a way that looks like the weekday way. Also one may not hang a strainer on a vessel even if one doesn't use it now.

Chidushim: "Hanging the strainer" means he hangs it above a vessel, so that when one pours the sediment won't come along. Even if he won't use it now – it's a preparation step that leads to straining.

(c) Makbitz (Making Cheese)

"Makbitz is a toldah of borer – separating the hard part from the watery part of milk."

Chiddush: One may put sesame and nuts into honey, but should not press with one's

Continuation of Translation

(c) Makbitz (Making Cheese)

"Makbitz is a toldah of borer – separating the hard part from the watery part of milk."

Chiddush: One may put sesame and nuts into honey, but should not press with one's hand – one should not squeeze/separate with the hands, because this is similar to borer.

Decrees Related to Tochen

(a) Cutting Vegetables Very Fine

"One who cuts vegetables very fine in order to cook them is a toldah of tochen and is liable. Therefore, one should not grind carobs for an animal whether small or large – it appears like tochen."

Explanation: Cutting vegetables very small is a toldah of tochen (d'Oraisa). Crushing carobs for an animal is prohibited d'Rabbanan because it looks like tochen.

Chidushim:

- Why is cutting vegetables very fine a toldah of tochen? Tochen means making powder from wheat, but cutting a

tomato into small pieces? The answer: it doesn't need to be actual powder, but small pieces.

- The distinction between cutting (toldah d'Oraisa) and crushing (d'Rabbanan): crushing is a bit larger than tochen, but a bit smaller than what would be permitted.

(b) There Is No Tochen in Fruits

"One may cut squash for an animal and a carcass for dogs – because there is no tochen in fruits."

Explanation: One may cut fruits (like squash/gourds) for an animal, and a carcass for dogs, because by fruits there is no prohibition of tochen.

Chidushim:

- The distinction between vegetables and fruits: **Grain** – this is the classic tochen (making flour). **Vegetables** – one cannot eat them as they are, one must prepare them for cooking, therefore this cutting is a preparation that has an aspect of tochen. **Fruits** – one can eat them as they are, one just makes smaller pieces, therefore there is no tochen.

- This also explains why **carcass** is mentioned together with fruits – the dog eats it as it is, one just makes it easier for him. The rule "there is no tochen in fruits" also applies to carcass.

(c) Untying Bundles / Softening Small Bundles

"One may untie bundles of straw for an animal, and one may soften small bundles by hand, but not large bundles because of the effort involved."

Explanation: One may open a bundle of grain for an animal, and small bundles one may soften with the hands (rubbing), but not large bundles.

Chidushim: The reason why one may not do large bundles is **not** because of tochen, but **because of the effort involved** – because of the tircha. It is asked why the Rambam places it here by tochen, when tircha matters come later. The answer: it's a small addition because it's a related matter.

(d) Bundles of Hyssop and Ezov – Crushing with Fingertips

"Bundles of hyssop and ezov and horns that one brought in for animal food – one crushes and eats with one's fingertips, but not with much hand, so as not to do as one does on weekdays."

Explanation: Certain plants that one brought in for animal food – one may crush them with the fingertips, but not with full hands, in order not to do as on weekdays.

Chiddush: The reason is that if one does it like on weekdays, one will come to actual tochen.

(e) One Who Needs to Crush Pepper – Change in Vessel

"One who needs to crush pepper and the like to put into food on Shabbos – crushes with the knife handle and on a plate. But with a mortar – liable for tochen."

Explanation: When one needs to crush pepper for Shabbos food, one may do it with a change – with the handle of a knife on a plate (dish). But in a mortar (grinder) one is liable for tochen.

Chidushim:

- The change consists of two things: (1) with the thick side of the knife (not its normal way), (2) on a plate which is not the normal vessel for tochen. We see that the Rambam is speaking of a situation where one is in the middle of eating – it's part of eating, not preparation.

- The main distinction: **The vessel matters more than the action.** Even when one is one step away from tochen, one may still do it when it's part of eating. But with a mortar – this is actual tochen.

The Decree of Medicine on Shabbos – Grinding Medicines

(a) The Basis of the Decree

"Therefore, it is prohibited for a healthy person to heal himself on Shabbos, a decree lest one grind medicines."

Explanation: Because by a mortar one is liable for tochen, and medicine often requires grinding medicines (crushing medicinal things), Chazal prohibited a healthy person from healing himself on Shabbos.

Chidushim:

- The Rambam connects the prohibition of medicine on Shabbos directly with tochen – the "therefore" shows that the decree lest one grind medicines stems from the fact that grinding in a mortar is liable for tochen.

- The prohibition is only for a **healthy person** (or someone who is not so healthy but not a choleh she'yesh bo sakanah). A choleh she'ein bo sakanah – one may do rabbinic prohibitions for him.

- **All medicines** that the Rambam speaks of here, even those for which one is not grinding medicines (like simply drinking a potion), are prohibited. Because **since it's a medicine, and for medicine in general there is grinding of medicines**, they decreed on all medicines.

- **The reasoning of the decree – why only medicine?** By medicine the person is **more desperate** – he needs specifically this, and will go grind medicines. But by regular food, if he doesn't have this, he eats something else – he's not desperate enough to go grind medicines.

(b) Food of Healthy People vs. Food That Is Not Food of Healthy People

"One should not eat things that are not food of healthy people, such as hyssop and afua. And not things that are laxatives such as wormwood. And similarly one should not drink things that healthy people don't drink, such as water in which fish and herbs were cooked."

"But: one may eat foods and drinks that healthy people eat and drink, such as coriander and endive and hyssop, even though they have healing power, and even though one eats them in order to be healed by them – it is permitted, since they are food of healthy people."

Explanation: Things that healthy people don't eat – one may not eat on Shabbos (even not for healing, because it looks like medicine). Things that healthy people do eat – one may eat even for healing.

Chidushim:

- **Interesting double rule:** Food that is not food of healthy people – prohibited even not for healing (because the mere act of eating such a thing looks like medicine). Food of healthy people – permitted even explicitly for healing. The Rambam says "one should not eat things that are not food of healthy people" – he doesn't say "for healing," but simply one may not eat such things.

- Example: cholent – even if one says "this is a medicine," one doesn't need to stop eating, because it's food of healthy people.

- The definition of "food of healthy people" doesn't mean that everyone eats it, but that it happens that people eat it – like a "health food" that is not exactly a medicine but also not a typical food, but people eat it.

(c) One Who Drank Chiltis Before Shabbos

"One who drank chiltis before Shabbos and sees that it is helping and continuing – it is permitted to drink it on Shabbos, in a place where healthy people are accustomed to drink chiltis."

Explanation: Someone who began drinking chiltis (a medicinal drink) before Shabbos and it is still working, may continue drinking on Shabbos, in a place where healthy people drink it.

Chidushim:

- **Difficult question on the text:** If it is a place where healthy people are accustomed to drink – why do we need the condition that he began before Shabbos? It's already food of healthy people! And if it's not food of healthy people – what does it help that he began before Shabbos?

- **The Maggid Mishneh's emendation:** The Maggid Mishneh corrects to read **"even in places where healthy people are not accustomed"** – this makes more sense, because this is a chiddush: even where healthy people don't drink it, one may continue drinking because he already began before Shabbos.

- **A suggestion to understand our text:** Perhaps it means that because the person made himself a routine of drinking this regularly, it has become **for him** like food of healthy people – it's no longer a one-time medicinal act, but a normal routine. But this remains **unclear**.

- **A second suggestion:** Perhaps the permission is based on the fact that stopping in the middle of a medical treatment can be dangerous. But this is also not accepted because danger is a completely different category.

(d) Oils That Healthy People Anoint With

"Oils that healthy people anoint with – it is permitted to anoint with them on Shabbos, even if one intended for healing, and there is no recognizable sign. But those that are not the way of healthy people – are prohibited."

Explanation: Oil that healthy people also use to anoint themselves, one may use on Shabbos even with intention for healing, because it is not recognizable that he is doing it for healing. But things that only sick people use – is prohibited.

Chidushim: The Rambam says **even if one intended for healing** – this is different from previous halachos. By oils that

are the way of healthy people, even with intention for healing it is permitted, because it is not recognizable (there is no recognizable sign).

(e) One Whose Loins Hurt – Anointing with Wine and Vinegar

"One whose loins hurt should not anoint with wine and vinegar, but anoints with oil, and not rose oil. Except in a place where people anoint with it. And it is permitted to anoint with king's oil in any place."

Explanation: Someone with pain in the loins may not anoint with wine or vinegar (because healthy people don't do this), but oil one may (because healthy people do it too), not rose oil (flower oil) except in a place where healthy people also use it. King's oil is permitted everywhere because healthy people use it constantly.

(f) One Whose Hand or Foot Is Sprained – Bandaging with Wine

"One whose hand or foot is sprained – may bandage it with wine but not with vinegar. And if he was sensitive – even with wine is prohibited."

Explanation: Someone who sprained a hand or foot, may bandage (stop bleeding) with wine (because healthy people also use it), but not with vinegar (because that is only for healing).

Chidushim: **"And if he was sensitive – even with wine is prohibited"** – vinegar works weaker than wine, but by a person who is sensitive (delicate), even wine works like a medicine, and therefore is prohibited.

(g) One Whose Teeth Hurt – Vinegar

"One whose teeth hurt should not rinse with vinegar and spit out, but rinses and swallows."

Explanation: Someone with a toothache may not gargle vinegar and spit out (because this is clearly a medicine), but he may gargle and swallow – because then it looks like he is eating/drinking it, similar to food of healthy people.

(h) One Whose Throat Hurts – Oil

"One whose throat hurts should not gargle with oil, but swallows oil which is permitted."

Explanation: Someone with a sore throat may not gargle with oil and spit out, but may swallow oil.

Chidushim:

- The language **"gargle"** is noted as an interesting Lashon Hakodesh word for gargling. Lashon Hakodesh has specific words for practical daily things that we don't know because one doesn't use Lashon Hakodesh for everyday things.

- The mechanism: to heal the throat the throat needs to come in contact with oil. Gargling and spitting out keeps the oil long at the throat (clearly a medicine). Swallowing oil bit by bit also makes the throat "oily" but it looks like normal drinking.

- The concept of **"as if innocently"** – he drinks oil, but it should look like incidentally, not showing that it's a medicine.

(i) Rubbing One's Teeth – Stick/Sucking

"And if he rubbed his teeth with it – if he intended for healing it is prohibited, but if he intended for bad breath – permitted."

Explanation: One may not rub the teeth with a medicinal salve if one means healing, but if one means for bad breath it is permitted.

Chidushim – Question About Toothpaste/Mouthwash on Shabbos:

- According to the Rambam, if one does it for bad breath (hygiene) it is permitted, but for healing it is prohibited.

- **Prevention is not medicine** – preventive hygiene (like regular tooth brushing) is not medicine. "Someone eats healthy doesn't mean medicine." It's also like food of healthy people, not medicines.

- But if a doctor gave a **special cream** for a specific time – this can already be medicine.

- There are **other questions** by tooth brushing on Shabbos: (1) blood coming out, (2) smearing (memacheh), (3) the Acharonim have a dispute whether toothpaste is permitted at all.

(j) Medicine for Eyes – Wine on Eyes

Explanation: Putting wine on the eyes – permitted in a certain way.

Chidushim:

- It is connected with the custom of dipping a finger in wine at Havdalah and putting on the eyes – this has a connection to an old medicinal practice.

- The way one puts it on (on the eye, so it drips in) is **not clearly recognizable** that it's a medicine.

(k) Fasting Saliva

Explanation: Saliva after waking up, before one has eaten or drunk anything, has only the original taste (without a side taste of food) – this is a medicine. Because it doesn't have the name of wine or other drinks, one does it only for medicine, not for any other purpose.

(l) Kilor (Medicine for Eyes)

"Kilor that one soaked before Shabbos – one passes it over one's eye on Shabbos and need not be concerned. But on Shabbos itself it is prohibited to soak."

Explanation: A kilor (medicine for eyes, made with wine) that one soaked before Shabbos, one may put on the eyes (from outside) on Shabbos. But on Shabbos itself one may not soak.

Chidushim: The kilor has the same law as wine itself – on the eye (from outside) one may, but into the eye one may not. The reason why one may not soak on Shabbos itself is because this is actually preparing a medicine on Shabbos, which is a greater problem than simply applying an already-prepared medicine.

(m) One Whose Hand or Foot Is Sprained – Extracting Blood

"One should not bind a reed on his hand to extract the blood."

Explanation: Someone who sprained a finger, may not bind a reed to heal, and may not extract the blood, even not with the hands.

Chidushim:

- Medicine on Shabbos is prohibited even when there is no medicine at all, but an exercise or physical action that helps.

- **Dispute between Rashi and Rambam:** Rashi implies that pushing out blood is a violation of **chovel**. But the Rambam appears that it is only a **shevus of medicine**, not chovel.

- **Reasoning according to Rambam:** By chovel one needs pleasure – "tzricha l'gufah" or pleasure of his inclination. Here, although he wants specifically that the blood should come out, it's not the type of pleasure that makes chovel. Here there was already chovel before (the blow), and he only removes the blood – therefore it is only a concern of medicine.

(n) Hot Water and Oil on a Wound

"One does not put hot water and oil on a wound, and not on cotton that is on a wound."

Explanation: Warm water with oil (a known medicine for wounds) one may not put directly on the wound, and also not on cotton (gauze) that lies on the wound.

Chidushim:

- **What may one do?** One may put wine **outside the wound** (outside near the wound), and it drips by itself onto the wound – because this way it's not direct medicine.

- **Dry cotton:** A dry piece of cotton one may put on a wound, because it's not evident that it's for medicine – perhaps he puts it for comfort.

- **Old cotton (used):** An old piece of cloth one may put. A **new** one is more evident that it's for medicine. It is asked: seemingly on the contrary, a new one is more a common thing for other purposes (comfort, warmth), and the old one is evident that there is no other reason? – remains a question.

(o) Bandage – Fell Off and Putting Back

"A bandage that separated on a vessel – it is permitted to return it. If it separated on the ground – prohibited."

Explanation: A bandage that fell on a vessel (table, bench) one may put back. If it fell on the earth, one may not, because it looks like a new bandage.

Chidushim:

- The principle: as long as one can make it seem incidental ("I'm just putting it back"), it is permitted. But when it becomes a whole new act of bandaging, it is prohibited.

- **Ra'avad disagrees:** The Ra'avad holds that even on the ground one may put back.

(p) Bandage in the Temple

"One places a bandage on a wound initially in the Temple."

Explanation: In the Beis Hamikdash one may initially put a bandage, because there is no shevus in the Temple.

Chidushim:

- It is interesting that the Rambam says it specifically by bandage – does he mean a general thing on all medicines in the Temple, or only bandage?

- **Reasoning why specifically bandage:** In the Temple the Kohanim needed more to quickly fix wounds, because a wound can make a baal mum which disqualifies them from service. The Ra'avad doesn't agree with the reasoning.

(q) Wiping with a Sheet

"One does not wipe with a sheet."

Chidushim: A sheet is smeared with creams, and if one wants to wipe from a wound with a sheet, there is an issue of memachek (the melacha of memachek). This is a separate prohibition besides medicine on Shabbos.

(r) Anointing and Massaging

"Anointing and massaging – permitted. Anoints and massages at once, so as not to do as one does on weekdays."

Explanation: One may anoint oil and massage – for example by a baby who is constipated, one anoints oil and rubs the belly. But one should do both together at once, not in two steps (first anoint, then massage) as one does on weekdays.

Chidushim:

- This is permitted because it's not really a way of medicine – one can do it for pleasure too.

- **Text question:** "Memamshesin" vs. "mesamsesin" – both are the same word, only the Rambam perhaps didn't write in precise Lashon Hakodesh, and printers fixed it.

- But one should not "straighten" – straighten out with force, because this is already a real medicinal act.

- The Rambam doesn't say that the change is so that it should look less like medicine, but so that it should look less like **weekday**. This means, all medicines are inherently a "weekday" thing – the prohibition is to do it in the usual way as one does on weekdays.

(s) One May Not Exercise on Shabbos

"And one may not exercise on Shabbos. What is exercising? This is one who treads on the body with force until he becomes tired and sweats, or walks until he becomes tired and sweats... because it is prohibited to tire oneself in order to sweat on Shabbos."

Explanation: "Exercising" (from the language of toil) means two things: (1) a strong massage – one treads/pounds on a person until he becomes tired and sweats; (2) walking/strolling until one becomes tired and sweats. Both are prohibited because the sweating is a medicine.

Chidushim:

1. The Rambam inserts the words **"to tire in order to sweat"** – this means that exercise that doesn't bring sweating is perhaps not in this prohibition.

2. **Tosefta is brought:** "One may not run on Shabbos in order to exercise, but exercises in his way and need not be concerned even the entire day" – one may not run on Shabbos

in order to exercise, but one may walk in his way. "That one should not run on Shabbos" is an extra halacha that has nothing to do with medicine.

3. Question: How does this fit with grinding medicines? Exercise is not directly connected with grinding medicines. Two answers:

- "**Lo plug**" – once they prohibited medicine, they prohibited all medicine things, even when grinding medicines is not relevant.

- **Perhaps there is another reason too** – simply tircha, or because one must rest on Shabbos.

4. An interesting opinion is mentioned that the prohibition is "simply because one must rest on Shabbos." But this is not according to the Rambam's way here – the Rambam speaks of medicine specifically.

(t) Hot Ground

"And similarly it is prohibited to stand on hot ground."

Explanation: According to the Aruch, this is a place where the ground is hot (like Tiberias hot springs), where one stands and sweats for medicine. One may not go there on Shabbos.

(u) Bathing in Bad Waters – Pain vs. Pleasure

"And not in soaking water... and not in the Dead Sea... and not in the bad waters of the Great Sea, since all these are painful, and it is close to the matter that Shabbos bathing should be pleasure. Therefore if one did not stay there except a little, even the measure to scratch one's head... permitted."

Explanation: One may not wash in bad waters (Dead Sea, dirty mikveh, water where leather was soaked) because this is pain, and Shabbos must be pleasure. But if one is there only a short time, it is permitted.

Chidushim:

1. **The Rambam's reason here is not medicine but "toward Shabbos pleasure"** – this is prohibited because it's pain, not because it's a medicine. This is a separate category.

2. **Question:** If a person goes there because his stomach hurts (medicine), the pain from the bad water is less than his illness – he is making up what is a greater pleasure. Why should it be prohibited? **Answer:** Pleasure is **objective**, not subjective. The fact that a person wants to do something that is not pleasure, doesn't make it pleasure – it only makes it a thing he wants to do. Medicine things a person doesn't do at the time he wants to enjoy himself, but at the time he **needs** to do it.

3. **A broader perspective is presented:** Perhaps the entire basis of the prohibition of medicine on Shabbos (not just grinding medicines) is connected with "**v'karasa l'Shabbos oneg**" – one should not think about what he lacks, not think about his pain, but focus on what is good. Just as one may not request one's needs on Shabbos. This would give an alternative reason for all medicine prohibitions.

4. **Practical difference:** If the person can no longer bear it, he becomes a **choleh she'ein bo sakanah** for whom one may do rabbinic prohibitions. We're only talking about things he can wait until after Shabbos.

(v) Scraping with a Scraper

"One may not scrape with a scraper, but if there was dirt or filth on him – permitted... scrapes in his way."

Explanation: One may not scratch oneself with a scratcher (medicinal purposes), but if there is dirt on him, he may – because we don't think he is doing it for medicine. Even if he also has pleasure from it.

(w) Anointing and Massaging a Person But Not an Animal

"One anoints and massages a person for his pleasure, but not an animal... but it is permitted to remove its pain through anointing and massage."

Explanation: One may anoint and massage (massage) a person **for his pleasure** (for his enjoyment/pleasure), but not an animal. For an animal – only to remove pain.

Chidushim:

1. **"For his pleasure" stands right after "v'karasa l'Shabbos oneg"** – for a person pleasure is a reason to permit, but by an animal there is no concept of "pleasure of his animal." There is shvisas behemto, but not pleasure of his animal.

2. **Distinction between pleasure and pain by an animal:** For pleasure of the animal a person may not work on Shabbos. But **tza'ar ba'alei chayim** – one may remove through anointing and massage, because this is a need (not just pleasure).

(x) Medicine for Animals

"An animal that ate many vetch one makes it run in the courtyard. And similarly one seized by blood one stands it in water so that it should cool, and we are not concerned lest one grind medicines for it."

Explanation: An animal that overate one may make run around in the courtyard, and an animal that has a blood problem one may stand in water so it should cool, and we don't worry that the owner will come to grind medicines.

Chidushim:

- The Rambam says **directly** "and we are not concerned lest one grind medicines for it" – this means it is indeed a medicine, only by animals there is no concern that the person will come to grind medicines.

- The Rambam didn't say that one may give **actual medicine** for an animal – he only permitted running around and standing in water, which are not directly connected with medicines.

- **A reasoning why animals are different from people:** By a person, because we were lenient by choleh she'yesh bo sakanah (one may do everything), there is a concern that "since you were lenient for him at his end, he will be stringent at his beginning" – when he is not yet sick he will already start making medicines. But by an animal, for which one may **never** desecrate Shabbos (no choleh she'yesh bo sakanah applies), the person already has a boundary – he won't come to grind medicines.

(y) One Who Vomits His Food on Shabbos

"One may not vomit one's food on Shabbos — speaking of vomiting through medicine. But if one wants to vomit without medicine it is permitted."

Explanation: One may not vomit by taking a medicine, but without medicine (for example with the hands) it is permitted.

Chidushim: The prohibition is **directly** connected with grinding medicines — taking medicine to vomit is very similar to medicines. But vomiting without medicine is not medicine at all, therefore permitted.

(z) Pressing a Baby's Belly

"And it is prohibited to press a baby's belly to bring out his stool, lest one come to grinding laxative medicines."

Explanation: One may not squeeze on a child's belly to bring out stool, because this can lead to making laxative medicines.

Chidushim: These are all distinctions that the Chachamim made based on **experience** — what leads to grinding medicines and what doesn't. Learning halacha is "very much learning reality" — it's not theory but practical observation.

(aa) Cupping on the Navel, Swaddling a Baby, Raising Ears, Raising Ankles

"And it is permitted to cup on the navel on Shabbos to raise it. And one must swaddle the baby and wrap... to raise ears and to raise ankles. All these and similar things, these are from craftsmen so that they should not come to grinding medicines, and this is when he has pain from them."

Explanation: One may place an inverted cup (similar to cupping/suction cups) on the navel to make suction, one may swaddle/tighten a baby, raise ears, raise "ankles." All these things are permitted because they don't lead to grinding medicines — **but only when he has pain.**

Chidushim:

- **The condition "when he has pain"** is a clear distinction: these things that are not connected with medicines are permitted, but **only when there is pain.** This is not a "blanket permission" — it's a conditional permission.

- **Great rule: "There is no such thing that a Jew must sit on Shabbos and it should hurt him because the Chachamim don't let him take a medicine."** First of all, if it really hurts him, he is a choleh she'ein bo sakanah (which has its leniencies). But even less than that — every time there is a problem, there is a way how one can do it, not in the most convenient way, but yes. **"On Shabbos one doesn't do like the weekdays"** — one makes a distinction so it shouldn't be weekday-like, but one doesn't let people suffer.

- **By d'Rabbanan there is no such thing as pain** — the Rabbanan don't want to make people suffer. By d'Oraisa one can sometimes be "stuck" because the Torah doesn't allow, but by d'Rabbanan one always finds a way.

Decrees Related to Merakeid (Sifting)

"Merakeid is from the avos melachos, therefore one does not sift straw with a sieve, and one should not place a sieve that has straw in it [because it is like

merakeid]. But one takes straw in a sieve and brings it to the feeding trough."

Explanation: Merakeid (sifting) is an av melacha. Therefore one may not sift straw in a sieve, and even hanging a sieve with straw so the chaff should fall out is prohibited because it is similar to merakeid. But one may take straw in a sieve and carry to the feeding trough (feed trough), even if on the way the chaff falls out.

Chidushim:

- **Hanging a sieve** — even if he doesn't do it with hands, but he hangs up the sieve and the chaff falls out by itself, this is prohibited because it is "like merakeid."

- **Question whether this is d'Oraisa or d'Rabbanan:** Hanging a sieve is **k'le'achar yad** (not the normal way of merakeid), and also **lo nicha lei** (he doesn't want directly the result), therefore it is d'Rabbanan. Merakeid itself (with hands, with a sieve) is d'Oraisa.

- **The permission of carrying to the feeding trough:** When one carries straw in a sieve to the feeding trough, even if the chaff falls out during walking, it is permitted — because the intention is not to sift but to carry.

Decrees Related to Lash (Kneading)

(a) Roasted Flour

"One who kneads is liable for lash. Therefore, one does not knead much roasted flour, and it is permitted to knead the roasted flour little by little."

Explanation: Roasted flour (roasted flour) doesn't become a true dough when one mixes it with liquid — it becomes something else, not really a dough. Therefore it is not a d'Oraisa lash, but d'Rabbanan one may not knead a lot at once. A little at once one may, because it doesn't look like lash.

Chiddush: The basis of lash is specifically when from flour becomes a dough — a "whole new type of material." By roasted flour it only becomes a bit thicker, but it's not the dramatic change like from regular flour to dough.

(b) Grain That Didn't Reach a Third — Roasted

****"Grain that didn't reach a third roasted, after its**

Continuation of Translation

(b) Grain That Didn't Reach a Third — Roasted

"Grain that didn't reach a third roasted, after its grinding it is coarse like sand and is not called ground — it is permitted to knead from it with vinegar and the like much at once. But hard — prohibited."

Explanation: Early grain that one roasted and coarsely ground, which is like sand — one may knead even a lot at once with vinegar, because it doesn't become a dough. But if it becomes hard, it does look like lash and is prohibited.

Chiddush: Even by what one may do, one needs a change — one uses vinegar instead of water, or one does it in a different order (first vinegar then ground flour). The ground flour/shus is mentioned as a Pesach food that one buys in stores.

(c) Mursan (Bran from Grain)

"Mursan – one may not knead, lest one come to knead earth and the like. And one puts water on mursan and brings with it the chicken feed back and forth, but does not knead with one's hand. And if it did not mix – one pours from vessel to vessel until it mixes."

Explanation: Mursan one may not knead like a dough, because mursan is mixed with dirty things like earth, and making a kneading with earth is similar to actual lash (making cement/clay). But one may: (1) pour water on mursan, (2) mix with a spoon but only back and forth (lines), not like normal lash, (3) not mix with the hand, (4) if it didn't mix – pour from one vessel to another.

Chiddush: The distinction between spoon and hand: with a spoon back and forth is a change from the way of lash, but with the hand it looks like actual lash. The permission of pouring from vessel to vessel is only for babies and sick people (the sick).

(d) Mursan – Amount (One Vessel)

"And it is permitted to mix mursan... and mixes in one vessel even a kor even two korim."

Explanation: One may mix mursan in one vessel even a large amount, and afterward divide into smaller vessels for each animal.

Chiddush/Question: Why is specifically one vessel better? Seemingly one large vessel looks more like a large lash operation! The reason remains unclear. The Rambam simply says that this is how one should do it – one vessel, then divide.

Laws of Feeding Animals on Shabbos

(a) Rule: One Does Not Feed as One Feeds on Weekdays

"One does not feed animals, beasts and birds on Shabbos as one feeds on weekdays, because of grinding legumes and kneading flour and the like."

Explanation: On weekdays one makes special preparations for animal food (grinding, kneading) to make it tastier. On Shabbos one may not.

(b) Amount of Feeding

"One should not feed a camel food for three or four days. And one should not lay down a calf... and open its mouth and put into its stomach. But one feeds more than what the animal eats, and gives it a little to drink."

Explanation: One may not stuff a camel with food for 3-4 days. One may not force food into an animal's mouth/throat. But one may stand there and hold the plate and give to eat, even more than it would normally eat.

Chiddush: The distinction between "to a place where it can return" (where the animal can spit out – permitted) and "to a place where they cannot return" (deep in the throat – prohibited). By beasts and birds one may put into the mouth to a place where it can return, and certainly one may place it before them.

(c) Whose Sustenance Is Upon Him vs. Whose Sustenance Is Not Upon Him

"In what case are we speaking? In one whose sustenance is upon him – his animal and his beast and house doves and geese and chickens. But one whose sustenance is not upon him such as a pig and dovecote doves and bees – one should not place before them."

Explanation: Only animals/beasts for which the person is responsible for their food may one feed on Shabbos. Creatures that gather food themselves (dovecote doves, bees) – even if they belong to him – one may not feed.

Chiddush/Question: What is the reason for this prohibition? Two possibilities: (1) unnecessary tircha (as the Ramban brings), (2) lest one come to stumbling (concern of melachos). It remains unclear what the main reason is.

(d) Muktzeh Grass for Animals

"And it is permitted to stand one's animal on grass and it will eat. But if they were on something that was muktzeh – one should not stand it on it, but stands before it so that it should eat."

Explanation: One may stand an animal on grass so it should eat. But on muktzeh grass (set aside for merchandise) one may not stand the animal directly. But one may stand there and encourage/push the animal so it should eat from the muktzeh.

Chiddush: The distinction: directly standing the animal on muktzeh is a type of moving/handling the muktzeh object. But simply standing and encouraging – this is not moving. **And so on Yom Tov** – even Yom Tov which is more stringent in muktzeh, one may use the permission of "standing before it."

[Digression: Custom of Shabbos Shirah – Putting Food for Birds]

The Magen Avraham and other Acharonim are mentioned regarding the custom of Shabbos Shirah to put food for birds. The question is: birds are "their sustenance is not upon you" – one may not feed! It is mentioned that someone argued that because it is a custom it is permitted, but this is rejected – "custom is not a proof."

The simple answer is that one puts it **before Shabbos** (one prepares it before Shabbos begins). **Teshuvah Me'Ahavah** is mentioned as a source that has "always good answers" for the custom.

A sharp comment is made humorously: one doesn't do this custom for the animal's sake – the animal doesn't need this food, one does it because one has a custom. "Did you ask the animal if it's okay that one Shabbos one should suddenly remember that it exists?" – a moral point that one should truly care about animals the entire year, not only once a year as a custom.

[Digression: Multiple Tzitzis – "To Distance from Strangeness"]

A story/responsum is told about the custom to wear multiple tzitzis (like R' Chaim Soloveitchik). It is asked: if each garment is a mitzvah, why not wear more? **R' Dov Lando** answers: **"To distance from strangeness"** – one must distance oneself from strange things, even at the expense of a mitzvah, because it can pull other people away from Torah and mitzvos. **R' Chaim** answers cleverly: if so, one will demand from every

person to make a hundred small rooms with a hundred mezuzos, and every day slaughter a hundred chickens. It is noted that the rule of "strangeness" is subjective.

With this Chapter 21 is concluded.

Full Transcript

Rambam Hilchot Shabbat Chapter 21 – Shevutim: Similar to Melacha and Lest One Come To

Introduction to Chapter 21 – The Transition from D'Oraita to D'Rabbanan

The Rambam says in Hilchot Shabbat, the twenty-first chapter. Baruch Hashem, we're already holding close to the end.

In the previous chapters... They don't say that it's coming to the end, by the way, they're very happy with each chapter. In the previous several chapters from the beginning, the Rambam spoke about the d'Oraita prohibitions. We dealt with whatever was in the chapter, whether one was chayav or patur. The question is, is it a d'Oraita? If it's a d'Oraita, one is chayav a chatat or sekila, or patur. But the Rambam already said back then, at the beginning in the first chapter, that not only that, there are still many things that are forbidden mi'd'rabbanan.

The Rambam's Innovation: Separation of D'Oraita and D'Rabbanan

And unlike other places in the Torah where the Rambam explains the d'Oraita prohibitions together with the d'rabbanan prohibitions, in Hilchot Shabbat he separated the d'Oraita prohibitions from the d'rabbanan prohibitions.

Or rather, just as the Rambam always separates the d'Oraita prohibitions from the d'rabbanan prohibitions together, so he does also in Hilchot Shabbat, unlike any other normal sefer in Hilchot Shabbat - the Mishna, the Gemara, the Shulchan Aruch. No one thought that one could do this in Hilchot Shabbat. But the Rambam thought that one could make an extra ten chapters, let's say, until... the last ten chapters, I mean aside from hotza'ah, from chapter 7 until chapter 19, let's say, is d'Oraita, and now he writes all the d'rabbanan prohibitions, all the shevutim of Shabbat. There is no other sefer in Hilchot Shabbat that has a list of shevutim. Shevut is in any case, on the d'Oraita prohibitions there are shevutim from the Rabbanan, yes, because the shevutim are under the melachot. Here there is choresh with the d'Oraita prohibitions, and here there is choresh with the d'rabbanan prohibitions. All of choresh with the d'rabbanan prohibitions, and so on, the Rambam will say from here onward.

Halacha 1 – The Source of Shevut

The Pasuk "Tishbot" and the Two Categories

The Rambam says as follows, **it is stated in the Torah, it says in the pasuk "tishbot."** This is the pasuk that we brought earlier, the Mishna "tishbot" and "lema'an yanuach." The Rambam says, we learn from here, **"even from things that are not melacha one is obligated to rest from them."** It leads us to the simple explanation. Not only the 39 melachot, but "tishbot" means that one must rest even more than that, even things that are not melacha one is obligated to rest from them. And what does this mean? What else is forbidden, even things that are not melacha? The things that are not melacha are forbidden mi'd'rabbanan. **"There are many things that the Sages forbade because of**

shevut." Various things the Sages forbade because of shevut. I think one must say the mitzva of tishbot. Okay, regarding the shevutim. And it comes to the purpose of resting.

Why did they forbid things? What kinds of things did they forbid? He says, they forbade two kinds of categories of things. **Some of them are things that are forbidden because they are similar to melachot**, there are things that were forbidden because they are similar to a melacha, they look like a melacha. Not because this will bring about a melacha, even if it won't bring anything, but it looks similar to a melacha. So, let's say, the person who sees it, it looks like a melacha. **And some of them are things that are forbidden as a decree lest one come from them to a prohibition punishable by sekila**, a thing where the prohibition is not because it looks like a melacha, but because this can lead to doing a melacha for which there is the prohibition of sekila.

Explanation: The Rambam's Understanding of "Shevut"

So, here one must say as follows, apparently according to my humble opinion, the Rambam is simply coming to explain the word "shevut." Everyone knows that mi'd'rabbanan is called shevut, related to shevut, a rabbinic decree. And the Rambam explains that the word comes from the language of the Torah where it says "tishbot." And somehow the Sages learned, according to the Maggid Mishne it's an asmachta, because it doesn't come from the derasha, but the Sages learned that here there is a hint that one must rest, aside from what one may not do, "lo ta'aseh chol melacha," there is also a concept of resting, a positive commandment of "tishbot." There is also a shevita that is somewhat broader than melacha. And here they based all these rabbinic matters, and they call it "mishum shevut." And "mishum shevut" is an abbreviation like "mishum tishbot." And this is the reasoning for it.

The Difference Between the Rambam and the Ramban

But one must say, as Rav Viznitzer-Bluming said, and I think it's correct, and as other commentators say, there is a different interpretation in the Ramban, which everyone, the Maggid Mishne in his first answer presents it, but it doesn't connect. Because the Ramban has a question, yes? And here we spoke about this another time, it's very similar to the question that the Ramban has on many mitzvot in the Torah, that in the Torah it says that one should rest on Shabbat, and meanwhile there are 39 melachot that one may not do. But he may exert himself, he may drag boxes, he may work, he may do very many things all day. How can this be? It turns out that the 39 melachot haven't yet caused "tishbot." This is the Ramban's question, that after finishing the 39 melachot he still hasn't rested, because he may still carry himself around, he may still carry muktzeh, and so on.

The Ramban says that from this comes "shevut," that shevut means essentially that aside from all the melachot, there is a Torah prohibition on doing things that are not Shabbat melachot. And the Ramban learns that all shevutim are d'rabbanan, perhaps indeed d'rabbanan, but it's an obligation from the idea, apparently, of "Shabbat Shabbaton" and

"tishbot," the Ramban in Parshat Emor, and he speaks about this at length.

But, one must say here, one must give chapter 24 its true place where the Rambam speaks about this topic. This is certainly not what the Rambam means here, because the Rambam truly holds that there is indeed such a thing as resting, but that is a different category, as it were. The Rambam brings it from "lema'an yanuach," and regarding that there are indeed laws that exertion is forbidden. So the Rambam speaks about that, that there are things that are not Shabbat-like that one may not do. But what he says here about shevut, doesn't speak about that, because he speaks here clearly, those things are perhaps even d'Oraita or perhaps another kind of d'rabbanan. Here he speaks clearly about d'rabbanan prohibitions that are, as he says, a category of similar to melacha or lest one come to. It's not that topic. Because if one goes according to the Ramban, it wouldn't need to be a language of similar to melachot or a decree lest one come to, but simply because one must rest. But the Rambam doesn't say because one must rest. Resting means the 39 melachot. But because there is something, an extra word, another word "tishbot," to say that besides the 39 melachot one can still drag along, can still bring in other prohibitions, but these prohibitions will be rabbinic prohibitions. And there is indeed such a concept of resting, but that is a different matter, not the matter of shevut according to the Rambam.

Summary: The Rambam's Approach to Shevut

So that's what one can say about this. There we will come to that chapter, we will see more about that. So, and here the Rambam will enumerate all the prohibitions. He will go further according to the order of the 39 melachot, and by each of the 39 melachot he will say what is forbidden mi'd'rabbanan, either because it's similar to melacha or because lest one come from them to melacha.

Halacha 2 – Shevutim of Choresch: Meshavet Gumot

Discussion: Similar to Melachot and Lest One Come To

Speaker 1: The Rambam says... no, that's not the language. He says "similar to melachot" means I think, that it's similar to the d'Oraita prohibitions. But I'm saying, the melachot means... but "similar to melachot" is the simple meaning, and what did you say, let's learn it well. But when the melachot, one must know, why indeed are things similar to melachot forbidden? Also apparently because it confuses the person, but not because if you do this you will slip into a prohibition punishable by sekila. Apparently, on the surface it can't be consistent internally. Similar to melachot means other people should be prevented from stumbling, because it looks like you're doing melacha. Lest one come to means the person himself will stumble. It could be, but it's different. Let's see.

Speaker 2: Okay, let's find the Gemara. It's perhaps inside. Because here the Rambam will enumerate all the shevutim, rabbinic prohibitions.

Meshavet Gumot – A Toladah of Choresch

The Rambam says as follows, he begins with choresch. The Rambam says, **anyone who levels holes**, the main choresch means when one makes a hole to plant, one digs the earth to plant. But there is when one digs the earth not to plant. The Rambam says, anyone who levels holes, one who levels little holes, he levels the earth, **behold this one is chayav because of choresch**. This is chayav. This is the main

obligation. It's a toladah of choresch perhaps. I'll open here, so we should always have the Rambam. The Rambam also, he says so. Meshavet is chayav, it's a toladah of choresch. It's stated explicitly in chapter 9. Okay, this is an obligation, even if it's not part of planting. Yes, it's a toladah. A toladah of planting.

The Prohibition of Clearing in a Plowed Field

Fine, what toladot were added? It's forbidden to clear... It's indeed, comes to a rabbinic prohibition. What is the rabbinic prohibition that is similar to this? Something else that one may not do. **It's forbidden to clear, one may not go to the bathroom in a plowed field on Shabbat**, in a field where one has already made a plowed area, where one has already begun to cultivate, **lest one level holes**. Because when he goes there, he will come to level holes. If he wants to fulfill "and you shall go out to outside the camp," if he eats from the trees.

Very good. If he says, he will take earth to cover with his feet, he will throw it into the hole. Very good. So, further.

One Who Clears a Storehouse on Shabbat

One who clears a storehouse on Shabbat... Another thing that one may not do because of lest one level holes. Lest one level holes is like the second, lest one come from them, and the next is similar. Okay, let's see. Look, look. Further is lest one come to. One who clears a storehouse on Shabbat, one who empties out a storehouse that has a room filled with things, and he empties it out, even when it's not for the purpose of a mitzva matter, even if he needs it for an important reason. Why does he say there is? Because one doesn't just do exertion for no reason. But even if one may do exertion, but if the manner is that he empties out everything that's in the room for a mitzva matter. What is the mitzva matter? **Such as if he will bring in guests**, he wants to place guests there, the mitzva of hospitality, **or he will establish a study hall in it**, he wants to make a beit midrash there, a shiur. He may not take out everything down to the earth. He shouldn't take out the storehouse, one can literally leave until the sand. He may not reach the sand. He may not reach until the sand. Why? **So that he not finish the entire storehouse**, he should not reach the wall, to the bottom of the entire storehouse. Why? Because when he will encounter the exposed, the exposed earth, and he will see holes, **lest he come to level holes**. So it was forbidden that he may not at all reach the temptation, he should not finish until reaching the holes.

Mud on One's Foot

Further, **mud on one's foot**, one can also on a wall or on a beam, but if he has a bit of mud on his foot, he wants to wipe it off, he doesn't want to make leveling of holes here, he just wants to wipe it off. But it was also forbidden to wipe one's foot on the ground, also the same thing, **lest one come to level holes**. He will rub his mud on the ground, perhaps he will thereby make a leveling of holes, he will level the ground.

One May Not Spit on the Ground and Rub with His Foot

Another prohibition, **one may not spit on the ground and rub with his foot**. One also may not spit and then rub the spit with his foot. For the same reason, lest one level holes. When he rubs with his foot and he will want to erase the spit, he will also thereby level holes. But what may one do? But if one has spit, one may indeed walk on it afterward and erase it in passing. **It's permitted to step on spit that's on the**

ground, and walk innocently, because then he's not intentionally rubbing the earth and doing the same things.

Women Who Play with Nuts and Almonds

Further, **women who play with nuts and almonds are permitted**, specifically women? Men don't play with such things?

Speaker 2: Men play with the Gemara. "For a commandment is a lamp and Torah is light," that's my fun.

Speaker 1: Okay. The answer is it was much from Shabbat. Yes.

Speaker 2: There won't come upon it a complete oath, because the nuts and almonds will fall on a specific place. Yes, one pushes them into level earth in order to be able to play better. Ah, they can play better... one plays with them there between.

Rabbinic Decrees Related to the Melachot of Chores, Zore'a, and Kotzer

Continuation of Decrees Related to Chores (Leveling Holes)

It's Forbidden to Spit and Rub with One's Foot

He also may not spit and then rub the spit with his foot, for the same reason, lest one level holes. When he rubs with his floor, he will want to erase the spit, he will also thereby level holes.

But what may one do? But if one has spit, one may indeed walk on it afterward and erase it in passing. It's permitted to step on spit that's on the ground, and walk innocently, because then he's not intentionally rubbing the earth and doing the same thing.

Women Who Play with Nuts and Almonds

Further, **women who play with nuts and almonds and similar things**. Specifically women? Men don't play with such things? Men play with the Gemara. Songs they will say and praises, that's my fun.

Okay, **it's forbidden to play with them on Shabbat, lest one come to level holes**, because the nuts and almonds will fall on a specific place, one must level the earth in order to be able to play properly better. Ah, the earth should be level. Not that he will push in the nuts and almonds. Okay. Yes, but he's playing with them, it's part of the game that it should be good.

It's Forbidden to Sweep the Ground

Okay, **and it's forbidden to sweep the ground**. It's interesting he didn't begin for example with "and it's forbidden to sweep the ground," because that's the daily thing, that's indeed the main thing, and all these others are rare halachot. No, there are other things. Yes, but he begins, "it's forbidden to sweep the ground" is something that's relevant every Shabbat after the meal, that one shouldn't sweep. All these things are more superficial.

Lest one level holes, unless it was paved with stones, but if it's paved with stones, then there's no leveling of holes. But when there's earth, soft earth, and when one sweeps and makes a hole, there's indeed no intention, he indeed means to gather the dirt, but when he sweeps he levels the earth. He goes into the earth, he saw that there's a hole, he went to fill it. That means he transgressed chores.

It's Permitted to Pour Water on the Ground

But what one may do is, one may sprinkle water on the ground, **one may sprinkle water on the ground, and**

one need not be concerned lest one level holes. With water one can also level holes, **for behold he doesn't intend for this**.

Discussion: Why is Sweeping Forbidden but Pouring Water Permitted?

Speaker 1: Except sweeping is also a davar she'eino mitkaven.

Speaker 2: No, that will indeed bring to it. He intends to sweep. There's no question that it won't come by mistake. He's going to sweep and also do that. Whereas when one throws water, it doesn't happen that one does that.

Speaker 1: That's what I mean. Do you understand what I mean? Not that it needs to be soft, he indeed translates it so, but I wouldn't have thought that the davar she'eino mitkaven is the other discussion. I would have said, she'eino mitkaven means that usually when one sprinkles water one is not engaged in leveling the floor.

Speaker 2: One must say so, because one won't be able to say about forbidden to sweep also she'eino mitkaven. One indeed only means to... It's a different discussion.

Speaker 1: Right, he's indeed not mitkaven. If it were a davar she'eino mitkaven it would be permitted. The question is that it's psik reisha.

Speaker 2: Right, even if it's a davar she'eino mitkaven, the Sages forbade it. It's indeed a stringency, it's not a Torah prohibition. But the Sages forbade it anyway because it's too strongly similar or it's too close that one should level holes, one wouldn't have decreed. And one must say she'eino mitkaven, when he's mitkaven one would forbid even if it's not a proper leveling of holes. For example, let's say, the water itself already made something a...

Speaker 1: I'm telling you, I would have said it brings. I don't see that this is the point. It seems to me... One must see the others here.

Speaker 2: Yes, what I would have said, it could be that one says as long as he's not mitkaven, one may sprinkle. Also, if he indeed has in mind leveling holes, then one shouldn't be allowed even through water.

Speaker 1: Yes, but I understand that, that's indeed... I don't understand. Okay.

One May Not Oil the Ground

Another halacha. **One may not oil the ground, even if it's paved with stones**. One may not smear oil on the ground, even if it's a ground that's covered with stones, where then there's no prohibition of sweeping, sweeping one may indeed do, but oiling one may not.

"and one may not sweep it", one may not blow on the ground either. All these things are ostensibly to remove the dust. Blowing, or **"and one may not wash it"**. What is the difference between sprinkling water and washing it? It seems sprinkling means simply spraying, and washing means with a rag, the way one uses water and cleans with water.

"Even on Yom Tov, all the more so on Shabbos". Why? **"So that one should not do it in the manner that one does on a weekday"**.

Discussion: Why is it forbidden even on stones?

Speaker 1: If so, even by stones one may not. Ah, by stones there is no concern of leveling holes. But it's a weekday activity, and he's going to let himself do a weekday activity,

"and he will come to level holes" in a place that is not paved. It's a bit of a decree for a decree. We're afraid that he will go so... leveling holes is...

Speaker 2: Yes, but he's talking about stones, there's no leveling holes by stones.

Speaker 1: Right, but the problem is that you're doing such a weekday activity, which is the next step. Usually during the week, one washes the floor, and afterwards one levels holes. Not exactly on the stones, it seems usually there weren't stones like today. Perhaps today, where everything is paved, it's really not the question. But there were stones in the middle, but on the side there is sand. So, it's part of the routine. Don't do the whole weekday routine, that's the point. A little straightening he may do. Don't do the whole weekday routine, because that leads to this. It's a very practical thing. I understand all these things.

A courtyard that became muddy from rainwater

Further, "**a courtyard that became muddy from rainwater**", a courtyard that got too much rain on it, it became muddy, that one cannot walk there. Yes, it's a puddle everywhere. He may bring straw "**and trample it down**". Chop it down, I mean. Does it mean like from the language of trampling? Simply spread it on the floor? Or... okay, yes. In short, he puts out straw so it should dry up a bit, so one should be able to walk on the water. This one may do. It's also a bit similar to leveling holes, but this is not leveling holes, he's only putting it so one should be able to walk on the water.

But "**when he tramples**", but when he does it, when he spreads the straw, "**he should not trample it with a basket or with a container but with the bottom of the container**". He can do it in an unusual manner, with the edge of the container, but not that he should take the container and put it all around on the straw. Why? "**So that one should not do it in the manner that one does on a weekday and come to level holes**". Again the same thing, when he does things like during the week, he's going to do a perfect job of the straw, trample it like he does during the week, then he has come to leveling holes. He must do it with a change, so he remembers that he's not doing it as he does on a weekday, and he won't stumble.

Summary: Basic principles in rabbinic decrees

Further, and with this we have finished all the toladot of plowing.

General innovation: An important principle is brought out in all rabbinic decrees related to Shabbos labors: all the "lest one come to" are not distant concerns, but things that the Sages saw that in the weekday routine, the next step after the permitted action is a Torah-level labor. It's a "slippery slope" that is very close – it's from the same category of labor. The principle is: don't do one step before the labor.

Decrees related to sowing

Let's go further, sowing. The Rambam says, **one who waters seeds**, one who gives to drink to the seeds, he waters the plants, **is liable for sowing**, this is sowing itself, this is a toladah of sowing.

Therefore, what is the rabbinic decree in this? **It is forbidden to draw water from the well with a wheel**, one may not draw water from the well with a wheel, **a decree lest one fill for his garden and his ruin**. Because if it will be very easy for him to draw water, he will use it as he uses

during the week, he will draw a lot of water, and when he draws a lot of water to fill large vessels to water his garden, his... his ruin. Why a ruin? How does a ruin come in? A ruin doesn't mean a ruin. It seems it means something a place where one used to plant. I don't mean in a ruin one used to plant. In short, a place that is proper... where there is indeed a concern, where it's called sowing.

But with a wheel. Without a wheel one may. He does it in an unusual manner, a bit. It's similar to this as he does on a weekday. When one does something in a professional way, one doesn't remember that it's Shabbos, and one does more things. It's not that one doesn't remember that it's Shabbos, this is the manner, one does it on a weekday, there's no distinguishing sign, and one can easily stumble.

If there is, **if there was a well with a wheel in the courtyard**, one good, then it is permitted. That is, what is forbidden to draw water from the well means what is not in a courtyard, what is in a public domain or a private domain, a public domain with a partition of width, whatever. But if it's in a courtyard, one may. Why? **It is permitted to fill from it with a wheel**. Why? **In the courtyard we are not concerned lest one fill for his garden**. Because there it's not next to the garden, or whatever. It seems. It's not a manner that is a plan, which I understand, it's difficult. Not difficult, but simple.

Okay. One doesn't do it with a large wheel. There where it's still. The next step. This I tell you, these are all things where the whole week the next step is to do a Torah-level labor. Don't do those things. Things that can bring, not just anything, it's not what occurred to me, I wonder I think. All these "lest one come to" are things that the Sages looked at, on Friday one does so, and the next step is a labor. On Shabbos, don't do one step before the labor. Right? Right. It's called a "slippery slope". It's not even a slope, it's very close, it's not very far. It's from the same category of labor.

Decrees related to reaping

Okay, further. Reaping. The Rambam says, **one who detaches**, when one tears out a fruit, a plant, **is liable for reaping**. And what is the rabbinic decree from this?

It is forbidden to extract honey from its beehive

Therefore, one may not do something that is not detaching. **Therefore, it is forbidden to extract honey from its beehive on Shabbos**, one may also not take out honey from the beehive, from the hive, on Shabbos, from the "beehive", on Shabbos, **because it is like detaching**. It looks like detaching. Although it's not attached to the ground, it's not a true reaping, but it looks a bit like reaping. Because reaping is there something lies attached to the ground and you cut it off. And here is how the bees work, it's like planted, it has some similarity, and you tear it out. It looks similar to... This is perhaps like that which is similar to a labor, not lest one come to a labor, but similar to a labor. Yes, it has no connection to reaping, but it looks similar. To someone who sees from a distance how something he's pulling out from there. It has a similar form, the form of the thing is similar.

One may not climb trees

Further, next prohibition. **One may not climb trees**, one may not climb up a tree, **whether moist or dry**, whether it's a dry tree, whether it's a dried-out tree. **And one may not hang on trees**, one may also not hang on a tree. **And one**

may not lean on trees, one may not lean on a tree. Not only that, but even one may not go up even on erev Shabbos on a tree to remain there during Shabbos, **to place his vessels on it**. And here we're already not talking about attached to the ground at all, but more generally, in general one may not use anything that is attached to the ground on Shabbos, because all these things are **a decree lest one detach**. He will go on the tree, he will see a live one, it will be easy for him, or he will forget and reap.

Fruits that fell on Shabbos

More decrees of reaping: **fruits that fell on Shabbos**, fruits fell by themselves on Shabbos, there was no reaping at all, but **it is forbidden to eat them until after Shabbos**, you may not eat them until after Shabbos.

Laws of Shabbos – Decrees on detaching and using a tree

Fruits that fell on Shabbos – decree lest one detach

He will go up on the tree, and it will be easy for him, or he will forget and reap.

Very good.

More decrees of reaping: **fruits that fell on Shabbos**, fruits fell by themselves on Shabbos, there was no reaping at all, **but it is forbidden to eat them until after Shabbos**, one may not eat them until after Shabbos, because **a decree lest one detach**. He will have pleasure, "ah, suddenly I had a fresh fruit now that fell from a tree," and he will have pleasure from it, and he will forget that one may not on Shabbos, and lest he detach, he will make a toladah, he will go cut, tear.

Myrtle that is attached – smelling something attached to the ground

Myrtle that is attached, a myrtle, a fragrant plant, yes, the myrtles that one uses in the four species, **that has a fragrance, it is permitted to smell it**, one may smell it. You shouldn't think that just as one may not take from a tree, one may not... one should be afraid that if one will smell one will tear it off.

No, one may, **"they only taught about its fragrance"**. A fruit, if one will let touch a fruit that is still... one may smell a leaf that is made to smell, why? "They only taught about its fragrance". The pleasure is that it should smell, for a fragrance that emanates. The fragrance is very good, it lies there, it stays fresh, and when he wants to smell he can go there, he has no reason to tear it out.

But there are things that one may not smell when it's attached to the ground. **An esrog and an apple and anything fit for eating, it is forbidden to smell it when attached**, one may not smell when it's attached. Why? **A decree lest one cut it to eat it**. When he will have pleasure from it, indeed to smell, but he will already catch a desire to eat, there is a decree lest one cut it to eat it.

Makes sense.

Yes.

A tree whose roots make an impression on its body – roots out of the ground

A tree, now this law the Rema wrote so erev Sukkos, he thought of myrtles and esrogim. **"A tree whose roots make an impression on its body, one may not climb it on Shabbos"**, a tree whose roots stick out from the ground, here too the roots will come out back, so because a person thought

that this is already not a tree, we already said "forbidden attached to the ground", but this is forbidden to sit on it. We already saw one may not sit on this, one may not sit on a tree, one may not sit on something attached to the ground, one may not lean on something attached to the ground. He says, if the roots come out from the ground three tefachim, one may also not.

But if they are under three tefachim, the small little branches that are right by the ground, is indeed lavud, a distance is indeed a law of lavud, he says that we don't look at something that is next to the ground that you're not going to go cut it down. The point is lavud or because... I mean that lavud would remove the concern of cutting. It's a bit interesting to say. He says that here you already have a practical reason, but we're not afraid he will cut.

No, no, on the contrary, the concern of cutting, we hold by sitting on a tree we already hold quite far from the practical concern of cutting. Therefore it's only like a decree. As it's called sitting on a tree is forbidden, but when you sit when it's close to the ground, doesn't mean you're sitting on the ground, you're sitting indeed on the tree, you don't need essentially the tree, you can say you're not using any tree, you're sitting simply on the floor, ah, a step higher.

And here he goes to details but, **if it protrudes**, yes, Yonasan, three tefachim, a distance of ground, **if it protruded above three and within three**, the tree grew in a way that it comes out from the ground, it goes higher than three and afterwards it comes back down to three, **it is also permitted to use them**. That means already the part where it's within three, yes?

If it was three high, even if one side is level with the ground, it's such a hilly place, so there is a place where the root that sticks out is three high and the other place is not three high, **then it is forbidden to sit on it**, because half of it doesn't mean he's sitting on the ground, half of it is indeed a proper use of a tree.

One may not ride on an animal – decree lest one cut a branch

Let's say more laws of using a tree or similar things that are toladot. The Rambam says, **one may not ride on an animal on Shabbos**, one may not ride on an animal on Shabbos. Ostensibly one would have thought one should be allowed because of "a living thing carries itself", it doesn't mean the animal is carrying. As my brother mentions, if a person would be riding it wouldn't be called an animal. Right, right, right.

Why may one not ride on an animal on Shabbos? **A decree lest one cut a branch**, he will cut off a twig **to lead it**, to drive the animal. And then he will be transgressing on... okay, yes.

This is still detaching, detaching, yes. Perhaps on a donkey if it's outside.

And one may not take from an animal. True. One may also not lean on an animal, hang on an animal. And also one may not even go up on trees on Shabbos, **not to ascend and not to descend on Shabbos**, and not **rest on the side of an animal**. These are interesting things, because this already looks like a bit of a decree for a decree, yes?

Yes, yes. **But the side of sides is permitted**. This looks in general, this is the normal way. That is, the side of sides, that

means leaning on something that is leaned on an animal.

Right. This is further the normal thing. That is, a thing that... the order of things looks like, we don't ride on animals, we don't know, but when people ride on animals, they hold on dragging branches in order to drive the animal. Therefore the Sages forbade riding on an animal on Shabbos. And the side of sides is permitted, yes. Go further.

What is the law that one can make an animal for a partition? One can do nothing.

After the fact – climbed a tree or animal on Shabbos

After the fact, climbed a tree on Shabbos. I now want to know what happens if someone forgot the prohibition, or... he did indeed climb a tree on Shabbos. So, **inadvertently**, if he climbed the tree inadvertently, with an error, **we fine him.** **But intentionally**, if he climbed the tree intentionally, he didn't follow the Sages, there is a fine, **it is forbidden for him to descend**, he may not come down on Shabbos from the tree.

One minute, I didn't know. He stays on the tree until night.

But on an animal, if he climbed on the animal, then there is no distinction between inadvertent or intentional, **he should descend**, he should get off the animal. **Because of animal suffering**, why would you fine him on the animal's account?

Right, good.

One unloads the burden from the animal – animal suffering

And so, for animal suffering they were more lenient about something else. **One unloads the burden from the animal on Shabbos.** One may indeed take off the load from an animal on Shabbos, although perhaps one would have thought that it's a burden, they permitted it because of animal suffering.

How? This explains. **If his animal was loaded with a sack of grain**, if his animal is loaded with a sack of grain, **he places his head under it**, he may put his head under the sack that lies on the animal, so that he makes such an indirect movement, or movement not with his hands in the regular order, but with his head, **and pushes it to the sides**, and with this he moves the sack, as soon as it falls off. That is, one doesn't do it properly with hands. What is the prohibition of taking off from an animal with hands?

I mean that it can be muktzeh or carrying?

We're going to talk. We're talking now that one does it, can only do it in all kinds of ways in an unusual manner.

In an unusual manner, yes.

So, why? I mean that it's... perhaps it's muktzeh? Are we talking in a way that it's muktzeh?

Aha.

I mean that we're talking about muktzeh. Perhaps the grain is muktzeh? It's muktzeh, yes. So it seems, the things that are muktzeh. Okay, let's learn.

And a sack of grain means, what does it mean? It's not animal food, it's not fit, when it's grain that one put away for storage.

Coming from the road on Friday night – animal loaded

If he was coming from the road on Friday night, and his animal is loaded, he arrived coming from the road on Friday night, and his animal is loaded, **when he reaches the outer courtyard**, when he comes to the outermost

courtyard, the closest to where he arrives, where it's already a private domain, where one may already carry, then **he takes the vessels that may be handled on Shabbos**, he should take off the things that are not muktzeh, vessels that may be handled on Shabbos, he should properly take off. That is, a Gemara simply animal utensils or something like that, or not? It's a connection with the animal, yes, it's a relationship with the animal, this one may do.

And those that may not be handled, the things that are muktzeh, they also permitted because of animal suffering, but only in an unusual manner. **He unties the ropes**, he should open the rope, which this is a knot that is not permanent, **the sacks fall**, sacks that should fall.

He says, behold the sacks are similar to breaking, that there are things there that seem to break, and therefore he doesn't have the solution of simply opening that it should fall. So, **if the sacks were small**, there is a solution, **he brings pillows and blankets and places them under them**, he brings pillows and blankets, soft things, he puts them underneath, **and the sacks fall on the pillows**, the sacks with the fragile things should fall on the soft things.

Nullifying a vessel from its readiness – pillows and blankets under sacks

Lecture on Melachos: Me'amer, Dash, and Related Laws

Yes, seemingly there would be a prohibition here, as we learned that one may not place a vessel under a lamp, because one is mevatal kli mehechano, one causes a vessel to become muktzeh, a vessel that one could have used has now been made so that one may not use it on Shabbos. And what is the prohibition of mevatal kli mehechano? I don't remember the prohibition, but there is a prohibition to do mevatal kli mehechano on Shabbos.

He says no, here it is not mevatal kli mehechano. Why? Because they are small sacks. Even though they are small sacks, even if there are things that can easily break, that is only if it falls from the animal's back which is high. But on the floor, even small sacks, one can always find a careful way and remove the pillow afterwards if one needs it. Therefore it is not mevatal kli, because there is always a way that one can still use the vessel on Shabbos, so one is not mevatal kli mehechano. **Sha'im yirtzeh lishlof**, to pull out the pillow, **sholef, shehashaqim ketanim vekalim**, they are light and small sacks, it won't break from just pulling it out from the sack that it's lying in, from the pillow and cushion that it's lying on.

Broken Glass – Minor Loss

But if there were broken glass there, pieces of glass, things that are very fragile, on the contrary, then there is no heter, there is no heter. Broken glass is something that will indeed break, but on the other hand there is no loss there. Why? Because one will grind it anyway, to melt it. So then there is no heter to place pillows and cushions, because the heter even that we just said is only bedi'eved. Ah, right? Interesting, he says it's not mevatal kli, but still bedi'eved, it's a bit mevatal kli. Okay.

So then one does not say that one should place a vessel, and the Gemara says we permit even if it breaks. Simply if it breaks, there is no great loss, since everything is destined for melting. All these broken pieces of glass are pieces of glass that one needs to have to make good glass from them. So it's

normal anyway that one should leave it, one should cook it in fire and make new glass. So for a minor loss, for a minor loss, we are not concerned. They did not permit anything for a minor loss.

But if there is a large sack, and one places glass vessels and the like in it, because then there is indeed a great concern that it will break, and then one also cannot place a pillow, if one places a pillow or cushion it still won't help, because yes, one will be mevatel a kli mehechano, because he won't want to pull it out. Then they permitted unloading gently, it is permitted, yes. Unloading gently is permitted even gently, yes. Then they permitted properly, gently, gently. That is the word, gently, gently. Yes, he should unload. Yes, he doesn't want to load, therefore he is permitted. Unloading gently, yes, when he is afraid that his glass vessels will break.

Right. But he says, why didn't they actually permit? Why didn't they say one should take it off? Why shouldn't one load the large sacks on the animal, so that one shouldn't stumble with the concern of muktzeh? He says, nevertheless we are not concerned about the animal. It's still different that he should transgress something that is a concern of muktzeh than it should be on the animal, than there is a problem of causing pain to animals. Causing pain to animals.

The Melacha of Me'amer

We have finished choresh, zorei'a, kotzer. Now we will learn the next melacha which is me'amer.

Law 1: One Who Sticks Fruits Together Until They Become One Body – Liable for Me'amer

What else does one not do that is similar to me'amer, or what leads to me'amer?

The Rambam says, **One who sticks fruits together until they become one body, one glues together small fruits until they become one body, is liable for me'amer.** We have already learned in the laws of me'amer, yes, for example one makes a fig cake and the like. Unlike cheese, which is boneh, yes? Okay. This is fruits. Fruits is usually me'amer, one takes together two. Also, one glues together fruits, ah, one is liable. This is the Torah prohibition of me'amer. Always the first thing is the Torah prohibition. Liable without qualification, means liable.

Rabbinic Prohibition: Fruits Scattered in the Courtyard

What is the rabbinic prohibition? **Fruits scattered in the courtyard**, oh, fruits have spread out in his courtyard, he may not gather all the fruits in one place, which would look similar to me'amer. **He may gather**, but what then? He may gather the fruits **and eat**. But he may not gather all the fruits and put them in a vessel, **but he may not put them in a basket or in a box so that he should not do as he does on a weekday.** He may not properly gather them as usual, **lest he do as he does on a weekday**, I am afraid **lest he press them with his hand in the box**, when they are all together he will press them together, because then it will become a toladah of dash, and it is called lest he come to squeezing.

Salt – Appears Like Me'amer

And similarly if salt scattered for him, one may not gather the salt so that it should be in one place, because it appears like me'amer. Because it is not something that grows from the ground, it is not something that grows. Me'amer is perhaps only on things that actually grow. But the matter of

salt means not that it scattered on the table, it means the place where one makes it, near the Dead Sea, and how one takes it, is somewhat similar to fruits, because salt doesn't grow, but yes, one takes it out from the earth, it looks somewhat similar to gathering fruits or gathering grain. It's the process of how one makes the salt.

The Melacha of Dash – Squeezing

Now we will learn about the melacha of dash.

Law 2: One Who Separates is Liable for Dash

The Rambam says, **One who separates is liable for dash.** If someone separates, he takes out one thing from another, for example he takes out the kernels of wheat from the whole grain, he is liable for dash. **One who squeezes olives and grapes is liable for separating**, a type of separating, taking out the inside from the olives, the oil from the olives.

Rabbinic Prohibition: Squeezing Berries and Pomegranates

And so, what is the rabbinic prohibition? The rabbinic prohibition is that not only olives and grapes may one not, but also **it is forbidden to squeeze berries and pomegranates.** Why? **We find that people squeeze grapes like olives and like grapes**, we are afraid **lest they come to squeeze olives and grapes.** It's interesting, because we don't even know yet at all why there is actually a distinction between olives and grapes and berries and pomegranates. Because that is the way, now say, it's a revelation.

Again, why are berries and pomegranates not separating? Olives and grapes are fruits that are meant for squeezing. From olives comes out oil, from grapes comes out wine. Separating is to finish the... to finish something that is meant to be taken out, and one takes it out. Simply if you squeeze a piece of wood, water comes out from it, it's not squeezing, it's not separating. But berries and pomegranates, since certain people, yes, even by certain people it's still not the same as olives and grapes. But since by certain people it looks similar, they will think that perhaps also olives and grapes, or lest they come to squeeze olives and grapes. Whatever he means, we've learned a thought. Ah, the Rambam says yes, lest they come to squeeze.

Other Fruits – Permitted

But **other fruits such as peaches and apples** and so on, which no one squeezes, yes, one does squeeze them when one is thirsty for squeezing, these are not things to which squeezing applies so strongly.

Pickled and Cooked – Stringency with Other Fruits

Further, **pickled and cooked**, pickled fruits or vegetables, **that one squeezed.** So, **if to soften their body**, if one squeezes it simply because one wants the flesh from it to become softer, it is permitted. **And if to extract their liquids**, if one wants to take out the water from it, then yes it is forbidden. This is a stringency with other fruits, a rabbinic prohibition, the same thing. Yes, this is a stringency with other fruits. This is indeed something that is cooked in water, not only by a crazy person who drinks apple juice, I said that a good person drinks apple juice is not a normal thing. But pickled and cooked happens, one drinks the cooking water, we learned here a thing, one makes from the fish water.

Snow – Crushing Gently

And if one crushes the snow so that its water flows, if someone wants to have water, he may not take snow and beat

it so that the water should run out. This one may not do on a large scale that he takes a huge bowl of snow. But in a cup or in a bowl one may indeed crush snow.

Discussion: What Does "In a Cup" Mean?

Speaker 2: A cup that already has water in it?

Speaker 1: What is the word? Because it's a small amount?

Speaker 2: No, it doesn't say how large. I think it's into the cup because... yes, because it goes into water and it's not nolad. This is molid, he makes water. Here you see that he makes water, and here there is water.

Speaker 1: We're talking here about separating. We're talking here about separating. So it says here in the... in the... we're talking here about separating. I don't know what you saw in other places, in the Rambam. But the... a cup do you mean to say that already has water? I don't know, already here in this something. Yes, a full cup, not an empty cup. Or directly... it also doesn't say what I'm saying. But so it says in the commentators that it means this.

Speaker 2: We would have thought, snow is something for a larger amount. I know going out to the fields and making is all snow, but in a cup, a small amount.

Speaker 1: No, you can say that it's direct. Directly he's going to drink it now. Just as we learned by other things, there's a distinction if it's direct, right?

Okay.

Garlic, Hemp, Unripe Grapes, Ears of Grain – Crushed Before the Day

Garlic, hemp, and unripe grapes, ah, young fruit, **and ears of grain**, right? **That one crushed before the day**, that one beat before the day, so, **if they lack crushing**, if it still needs to be crushed, ground, **it is forbidden to complete their crushing on Shabbos**. One may not do crushing with a vessel on Shabbos. But if it only lacks **grinding by hand**, a bit of squeezing with the hands, then **it is permitted to complete their grinding on Shabbos**. Squeezing with the hands one may, because it was already crushed before the day. That is, the main melacha of dashing one has already done, one already beat it on erev Shabbos. Now only to finish, to finish is only a small thing, grinding by hand one may.

Therefore, it is permitted to complete the grinding of groats in the pot on Shabbos, except what they said to us it is forbidden to fill. If someone wants not so one may make the grinding of groats basically on Purim one may.

Speaker 2: Yes, in Yiddish, it means grits. It's a type of farina, a type of thing, that comes in pieces, that one squeezes it a bit more into powder. It's already cooked, basically. But it's basically finished. It's similar to the "it only appears like grinding by hand", which this is permitted.

Speaker 1: Very good.

One Who Rubs Ears of Grain – With a Change

One who rubs ears of grain, if someone with his hands rubs on grains so that it should take out the grain from it, it's similar to what one does threshing, but he does it on a small scale with his fingers. **He rubs with a change, so that it should not appear like threshing**, that he should do it with a change, he should not do it on a large scale that he takes out the kernels from the grain. He must still do it with a change. There is a normal way, there are three things: there is

threshing, there is rubbing ears of grain, which one does with the hands, and there is rubbing ears of grain backhanded, I know, he does it in a weaker way. He does it with a change, yes.

One Who Nurses Milk in His Mouth – Exempt But Forbidden

So, let us learn about nursing milk. **Nursing milk in his mouth, exempt**. It means that he may not. It means forbidden, exempt but forbidden. Nursing, yes. Milking is a toladah of dash. But he already finished with the exempt, he should have said forbidden. How is this nursing milk? If he is a sick person, if it hurts him and he needs to have the milk for a cure, not exactly a cure, but to calm himself, and with all the nursing in his mouth, one may nurse in his mouth, because it's not a true separating. At least, it's a separating backhanded. It's backhanded, because in his mouth is not the normal way of threshing. If someone milks from an animal, usually from a cow, he does it with his hand into a vessel, he does it, milking another thing, he drinks it, yes, a vessel, a thicker one, he doesn't put it into a mouth, he puts it into a vessel.

Because it's still separating backhanded, it's not a proper separating, and because of pain, the sages, in a place of pain they were lenient on this.

Laws of Shabbos: Separating, Winnowing and Selecting, and Grinding

Separating - Nursing from an Animal

Speaker 1: It's a change, separating backhanded.

It's backhanded. Backhanded, because in his mouth is not the normal way of milking. He milks from an animal, usually from a cow, he does it with his hand into a vessel. He does it with a different thing altogether, he drinks from the vessel to a vessel. The main thing is, he doesn't put it into a mouth, he puts it into a vessel. Therefore it is only separating backhanded, it's not a proper separating. And because of pain, the sages, in a place of pain they were lenient on this... even not in danger, even if it's not a danger the sages may do so. But here, it's not a danger, they permitted on this rabbinic prohibition of similar to separating. The rabbis don't want Jews to suffer on Shabbos. It's very important to know.

Very good. More laws of separating are as follows: Fruits from which liquids flowed on Shabbos. I want to say another thing that is permitted because of pain. For example, riding on a Shabbos elevator is not a Torah prohibition, it's a shevus. Since it's very difficult for people to walk the stairs on Shabbos, they were lenient.

Speaker 2: What does that mean?

Speaker 1: I hear.

Separating - Fruits from Which Liquids Flowed on Shabbos

Speaker 1: Fruits from which liquids flowed on Shabbos. Fruits from which it already ran out. We learned earlier that one may not squeeze out on Shabbos any olives and grapes, and berries and pomegranates one also may not because it's similar, and so on. What happens if it ran out by itself? Someone peeled, cut fruits, and liquids ran out from it. So if they are olives and grapes, which if one would have done it initially it would have been actual squeezing, because these things are meant to be squeezed in order to have the oil or wine which is changed for the better, then **it is forbidden to**

drink those liquids until after Shabbos. One may not drink it until after Shabbos.

Why? **A decree lest one squeeze grapes on Shabbos.** The decree is that he will next time cut and play with olives and grapes, yes, with the intention to squeeze them out. Next time he will squeeze.

Speaker 2: No, perhaps... it doesn't say that you didn't cut at all. You put in a whole mass when you cut.

Speaker 1: Ah, it's like it means by itself. It's lying in a bowl, which ran out by itself. It squeezed itself. If he will take the grapes from it and he will... initially on Shabbos.

Speaker 1: Fruits berries and pomegranates, if it's berries and pomegranates which is not a Torah prohibition of separating, then **if he brought them in for eating**, if he prepared the berries and pomegranates to eat, then **the liquids that flowed from them are permitted**, then the liquids that ran out from them are permitted. **And if he brought them in to squeeze them**, if he brought them in to squeeze for the liquids from them, then **the liquids that flowed from them are forbidden until after Shabbos.**

Speaker 2: Aha. Very good. Yes.

Speaker 1: Why? Because then it's closer that he should squeeze. He brought them in, he brought them into the house in honor of this, on the label of the berries and pomegranates it says for squeezing. So if one will let him take what came out by itself, he will give it a push by itself next time.

Very good. But it's obvious that one can eat it after Shabbos, right? It's not like a thing... it's not even a melacha, it's a new type of decree. We learned by mistake, oops, until after Shabbos and the like on various melachos that one does on Shabbos. And here he didn't even do anything wrong, the person did nothing, it ran out by itself. Rather what, the sages forbade because if he will drink, he will come to do it by himself.

Very good.

Separating - Olives and Grapes Crushed on Erev Shabbos

Speaker 1: Further. Now we will learn the rabbinics of winnowing and selecting.

Olives and Grapes That Were Crushed on Erev Shabbos

Olives and grapes that were crushed on erev Shabbos, they were squeezed on erev Shabbos, **and liquid came out of them by itself**, it flowed out during Shabbos, **it is permitted**. That means, what's the difference from before? Because here he already did crush them on erev Shabbos. So, there's no longer the decree of lest he squeeze, because it's already squeezing by itself.

Honeycombs that were crushed on erev Shabbos, which we learned earlier that it's rabbinically forbidden, because it looks similar to separating. But here, **the liquid that comes out of them on Shabbos is permitted**, because there's no place for a decree here, since he already crushed them on erev, he already did the crushing earlier. That means, on erev... So therefore after crushing there's no longer any connection to squeezing or anything like that? It's not clear.

Speaker 2: What is he saying? I don't have it clear.

Speaker 1: Makes sense. There was the concern of lest he squeeze, but once it's already crushed there's nothing left to squeeze, everything is already squeezed. You don't need your help anymore.

Speaker 2: Interesting.

Speaker 1: Something's bothering you. But he sees that, he sees that in this manner people don't conduct themselves to squeeze. But perhaps it could technically be that fact, you understand what I'm saying? It's perhaps a practical thing. But for this manner there isn't the concern.

Speaker 2: Okay. Yes.

Winnowing and Selecting - Introduction

Speaker 1: Further on a bit, winnowing and selecting. Okay. Yes.

Winnowing and selecting are primary categories of labor. But why doesn't the Rambam say the primary category of it? Because everyone knows what winnowing and selecting are.

Speaker 2: Ah yes? More than threshing?

Speaker 1: Yes, because threshing is a subcategory of this. He only says about things where you need the subcategory in order to explain the thing. But winnowing is winnowing. Winnowing and selecting are the same type of labor, right? He learned that it's just a bit different.

Selecting - Blowing Away Chaff

Speaker 1: Winnowing and selecting are primary categories of labor. What are the rabbinic prohibitions derived from them? **Therefore, even though it's permitted to rub stalks with one's fingertips**, which we learned earlier that one may squeeze one, half while eating, he may for example eat nuts, he may break the shells and take out the nuts with his fingertips.

Speaker 2: Ah, with his fingertips, which looks like what he meant to say with a change.

Speaker 1: With a change, yes, and no utensil. But when he blows away the shells afterward, so that the shells should go away, **he blows with one hand with all his strength**. One may with the hand one may send away the shells, but **not with a basket or with a tray**. But he may not with a utensil. But even though the utensil is not a utensil that one normally uses for selecting, like a sieve.

But one may not, because if one uses a utensil there's a concern one will start using the utensil that's made for selecting, **a decree lest he winnow with a winnowing fan or with a sieve**, in which case he will be liable. Actually.

Selecting/Straining - Filtering Wine

Speaker 1: Because **one who strains sediment**, wine he wants to remove the sediment from the wine... sediment... sediment?

Speaker 2: Okay.

Speaker 1: **It's a subcategory of selecting or sifting**, he says yes. Therefore... it must be that it's not... it's biblical right? So it's like... when what has really mixed sediment... that's actually selecting or sifting. But wine that's already clear, and he just wants to remove a bit of sediment that's there, but it's no longer a labor, because it's already wine, he's not going to improve anything with this. He doesn't do it with the utensil, but with a cloth or with an Egyptian basket.

Even it's permitted to filter clear wine or clear water with cloths or with an Egyptian basket, not with the regular utensil that one normally uses for straining, but one should not do it **in a manner where he places the cloth as a filter**. One shouldn't make it so that the cloth goes in and the wine should run through, because that's similar to how one pours over, **so that he shouldn't do it the way he does on a weekday and come to strain with a strainer**. That's too strongly similar to how one does it with a utensil that's appropriate for this. It's too similar to how one does it professionally, and then he will come to take a strainer.

And similarly, it's forbidden to hang the strainer over the wine the way one does on a weekday. One may not hang the strainer over the wine the way one does on a weekday, even if he's not going to do the... he places it so it should pour... no, or on top of the vessel or what, so that when one turns over the vessel it should pour. He hangs it on the top of the vessel, so that when one pours out the sediment shouldn't come along. One may not do this on Shabbos, **lest he come to strain**. Even if he's not going to do it now, he just places it on top so that when he pours himself a cup it should go through the...

Speaker 2: On top of the vessel? On his cup? Or on his bottle?

Speaker 1: Well, sediment is like a soup, right? A type of wine soup, basically. So, how does he hang it?

Speaker 2: On the barrel, on top of the barrel.

Speaker 1: Whatever it is. It's funny to me. Perhaps he hangs it in the air, and then one pours?

Speaker 2: No, he doesn't want to do the step before that.

Speaker 1: Could be, wherever one places the strainer. I'm trying to understand this "the way one does on a weekday".

Speaker 2: Okay, it's a step where the next step is to do the... again, the straining of the wine.

Selecting - Making Cheese

Speaker 1: And similarly, one who curdles, curdling means making cheese from milk, **it's a subcategory of selecting**, separating the hard part, whatever the part from the water. It's a subcategory of selecting. He's not talking here about the curdling of the cheese, he's talking here about doing something else before that.

Speaker 2: Forbidden... or, yes? Curds... yes?

Speaker 1: Subcategories of selecting, therefore, even though one may put sesame and nuts into honey, one may put in, one may put in sesame and nuts into honey, but **one should not press together with his hand**. He shouldn't with his hands press together what? Some part... also the honey too, one makes the hard things from the honey that stick to the sesame and nuts, because it's similar to the thing of removing the solid matter from the more liquid thing, one may not do it with his hand.

Grinding - Subcategories and Rabbinic Prohibitions

Speaker 1: We're going to grinding. Grinding, until medicines.

Speaker 2: Yes.

Speaker 1: Now we're going to learn the rabbinic labors of grinding, the rabbinic prohibition that's similar to grinding. Grinding means to grind, like making flour from wheat. **And**

one who cuts vegetables very finely, he means he cuts vegetables into very small pieces **in order to cook it, it's a subcategory of grinding and he's liable**.

Um... that's actually grinding, a subcategory of grinding. **Therefore**, what's the rabbinic prohibition derived from it? One may not crush, squeeze, break into pieces, **one shouldn't crush carobs before an animal, whether small or large**. Small animal, large animal, but **it appears like grinding**.

Speaker 2: What does "appears like grinding" mean? ... What's a real grinding that it appears like grinding? It's not real grinding, why not?

Speaker 1: I don't know. Why cutting vegetables very finely is grinding, is also a bit interesting. Grinding... grinding is one makes that from wheat should become flour, but... making that a tomato should become cut into small pieces?

Speaker 2: Yes, small pieces, does it have to be how small? That it becomes actually, that you make it into a powder, or you make it into...

Speaker 1: Not a powder, not a powder, a bit bigger than a powder.

Speaker 2: But this crushing looks like it's not so small, but also not so big. I know the word that what he's crushing, he's chopping it. So he gives a whack on a watermelon it should become cut into pieces. When a crushing person is used to cutting with a knife, he chops it with his foot. It's a bit bigger than grinding, and a bit smaller than it would have needed to be big enough not to be called grinding. But **when one cuts them for gourds before an animal**, which is a **carcass before dogs**, one may indeed cut a fruit for a gourd or a carcass before dogs. Why?

The Labor of Grinding (Continued) - Medicine on Shabbos

There Is No Grinding With Fruits

For example, he gives a whack to a watermelon, it becomes in a whack pieces. Whatever, I'm mixing him up. When a crushing person is accustomed to cutting with a knife, he chops it, he chops it with his foot.

In short, it's a bit bigger than grinding, and a bit smaller than... it would have needed to be big enough not to be called grinding.

But one may cut gourds before an animal, and a carcass before dogs. One may indeed cut a fruit, a gourd, or a carcass before dogs. Why? **Because there is no grinding with fruits.**

What does that mean? Only vegetables have grinding and not fruits? What's the difference between vegetables and fruits?

With grain there certainly is, right? Grain is the grinding that one normally speaks of, making flour. Right.

And vegetables is in order to cook it, that's vegetables like that, vegetables one can't eat as they are. So in preparation for cooking one does grinding.

Fruits one can eat as they are, you just want to make smaller pieces.

And this is apparently also why he says also about a carcass. What does a carcass have to do with fruits? A carcass is also, because the dog eats it as it is. You're just making it easier for the dogs so they won't have to figure out what to do with a

large piece. Because of this the "there is no grinding with fruits" is also good for the carcass.

I hear, very good, makes sense. There are other versions and explanations, but yes, this explanation makes sense.

Untying Bundles - Because of the Effort

And one may untie bundles of straw before an animal, one may open a large bundle, bundle means a bundle of grain, before an animal. **And one may crumble by hand small bundles**, one may make with the hands, crumbling means to rub, yes, to squeeze with the hands, make it soft, small bundles. **But not large bundles because of the effort involved.** Large bundles one doesn't do.

Interesting, not because it has something to do with grinding, but because of the effort involved. Why does he place it here? Because it's the same thing.

No, because things of effort he will apparently later in the efforts. It's a small one line that he adds here.

Bundles of Hay - Crushing with Fingertips

Bundles of hay and hyssop and horns if one has already used for animal food, a package of certain things that one uses for animal food, certain plants, coarse, which one has used for animal food, there's a doubt if one can use from it. **And one crushes and eats with his fingertips**, one can grind it with the hands a bit and eat it, **but not with the hand a lot**, one may not fill the hands with the coarse and grind it, **so that he shouldn't do it the way he does on a weekday and come to this**, if you'll do it the way one does it on a weekday, you'll come to actually do grinding.

One Who Needs to Grind Peppers - Change in Utensil

One who needs to grind peppers, someone has peppers, such a small fruit from the peppers, pepper, and he wants to make it so it should be crumbs, **and in such a case to take into food on Shabbos, behold he crushes with the handle of a knife and in a bowl**, one can take, one doesn't do it with the knife itself, one should do it with a change, one should do it with the handle, the thicker side of the knife, and in a bowl, on the... or perhaps a bowl means? No, in the bowl. One may perhaps not on a large board or a thing that's appropriate for grinding. Not in its usual manner.

So one sees that he holds in the middle of eating with eating, that he doesn't prepare the grinding because he's working now. **But with a mortar he's liable for grinding**, if one does it in a mortar he's liable for grinding, that's actually grinding.

So here he emphasizes more the utensil. That even though you're one step away from grinding one may still yes, when it's part of the eating.

Therefore It's Forbidden for a Healthy Person to Take Medicine - A Decree Lest He Grind Ingredients

Therefore, ah, says the Rambam, he must learn, and since there's a prohibition of grinding with the mortar, that when one takes a food that one needs, like peppers that one wants it to be crumbled, and one crumbles it with a mortar one is liable, **therefore it's forbidden for a healthy person to take medicine on Shabbos, a decree lest he grind ingredients.**

When one wants to make medicine, one must also squeeze certain things, grind, chop certain things, and it's very easy that it should be grinding, because if one does it with a

machine, with a mortar, it's liable for grinding. So they forbade taking medicine, because by taking medicine one needs to do something that has the appearance of grinding. And to take medicine means only to eat, but even a healthy person would see it. Yes.

How so? The sick people we already learned at the beginning of the laws of Shabbos, which they spoke about. Not a healthy person, even a sick person who's not in danger, who may do rabbinic prohibitions, may do even rabbinic prohibitions, and all the more so that he can't be a new rabbinic prohibition that he doesn't do. But here we're talking about a healthy person.

A healthy person who has a medicine, not so healthy, he makes it true.

Law 21 - Food of Healthy People Versus Medicine Food

How so, yes? How so, one shouldn't eat things that aren't food of healthy people, one may not eat things that normal healthy people don't eat, **such as hyssop and colocynth**, but he eats it explicitly for medicine. **And not things that are laxatives**, one may not eat things that are laxative, it makes him should go out, **such as wormwood and the like.**

And similarly one shouldn't drink things that healthy people aren't accustomed to drink, such as water in which they cooked herbs and plants, because it's not food that healthy people eat, it's food that's made for medicine.

But what may one yes? Things that are normal for healthy people also to eat, one may. **A person may eat foods and drinks that healthy people are accustomed to eat and drink**, one may indeed eat things that healthy people also make such food and drink, **such as coriander and endive and hyssop, even though they have medicinal power, and even though he eats them in order to be healed by them**, even if he ate it for the sake of his medicine, **it's permitted, since they are food of healthy people**, since it's food of healthy people there isn't in this the concern.

Discussion: The Difference Between Food of Healthy People and Medicine Food

Speaker 1: It's interesting, yes, food that isn't of healthy people one may not eat even not for medicine, and food of healthy people one may eat even yes for medicine. How did he say not for medicine? He said things that healthy people aren't accustomed to drink, one shouldn't eat things that aren't food of healthy people, he didn't say for medicine.

Speaker 2: In the beginning yes, section 21. Things that are customary to eat one may even for medicine. One doesn't know, because the only reason why he eats such a thing is the medicine.

Speaker 1: No, the only reason why he eats such a thing is the medicine. That's not clear. Anything that's medicine one may never. He's not a normal person, he drinks things that are medicine for a good reason.

Speaker 2: Is there a prohibition to be a not normal person?

Speaker 1: No, he's just crazy. The Torah speaks of normal people.

Speaker 2: Okay, I already know, one must be one with this.

Speaker 1: What do you mean?

Speaker 2: Okay, the novelty is, even when it's for the purpose of medicine, if it's food of healthy people. Food of healthy people doesn't mean also that no one eats it. That

everyone eats it. Cholent, even though Shabbos cholent it says it's a great medicine, we're not talking about it. We're talking about things that, some health food, such a thing. It's not actually medicine, but also not a normal thing, but it happens that people eat it.

Speaker 1: It should be that when someone calls out while eating cholent, "ah, this cholent is medicine", does he have to stop eating? No, because it's food of healthy people.

Speaker 2: Okay.

One Who Drank Asafetida Before Shabbos - A Question on the Version

One who drank asafetida before Shabbos, asafetida is some medicine, **and sees that it's helping and going**, he may continue drinking also on Shabbos. Ah, and sees that it's helping and going, he started a new routine of drinking asafetida, he may. **It's permitted to drink it on Shabbos, in a place where healthy people are accustomed to drink asafetida.** In a place where healthy people drink it.

Speaker 1: So what do I need to drink it on Shabbos itself? I don't understand. No, so what I don't understand, why does it need to come the drinking before Shabbos? If it's a place where healthy people are accustomed, I'm asking. It's not clear to me. I don't understand.

Speaker 2: I don't understand.

Laws of Shabbos – Medicine on Shabbos: Oils, Anointing, and Treatments for Mouth and Eyes

Oils That Healthy People Anoint With

Ah, there are actually other versions, even in places... what? "Drinking milk before Shabbos, in places where healthy people were accustomed." There are other versions, even in places where healthy people were not accustomed, which makes more sense. This is something of a new leniency. But according to our version it's the opposite. If so, it's really not a novelty. In our version it comes out as a stringency, that even things that are also food for healthy people, one may only if the person... he means to say that just like other healthy people eat it, doesn't help me, because you're drinking it only as medicine. But if he himself drinks it in a manner of perhaps medicine, even if you ask, it asks you, if it's something that is food for healthy people, clearly, perhaps the other version makes more sense, or it's a leniency, in such a way that could be... I would have thought... what is the leniency? Why then may we because of thinking to create an interesting halacha? There is, one would say, it would be confusing. There needs to be a reference in the middle. Or I would have thought... ah, the Rambam speaks strongly about danger. Danger is a different category, because for all things. I thought, perhaps differently. I thought, that if the person has made himself a new routine that he drinks this... now, for him it has become food for healthy people. It's like more of a boundary. It's something that exists... like the general rule isn't for healthy people, but he has been drinking this for several Shabbosos. He makes it normal. Not for medicine. For medicine, but in a normal way. It's something for two weeks. You know, not something he does only once in a while for medicine. Because it becomes his normal... Not clear. According to the commentaries. Only... the Maggid is troubled, specifically because it doesn't fit, and all the manuscripts that he saw, and so Profanowitz says something about this... the Maggid says even in places where they didn't practice? Is that in his emendation? Yes, but he

doesn't understand. He says that because if he started, he did something, if he goes every time, one doesn't need to come to the leniency of what comes out the way of healthy people... One with me. I see that the if is even when it's a very distant concern. The law of a sick person without danger, still wasn't permitted, but it's not a good thing to stop. Must one make some compromise? Not clear... okay... It's relevant practically, because it brings that many poskim say that one must... yes... what this has from the halacha... ah, good, it's not clear... okay...

Must one make some compromise. Not clear. Okay. It's relevant practically, because it brings many poskim say... yes, if one may rub, yes. Yes. One must know what this has from the halacha. Ah, good. It's not clear. Okay. Yes.

"And likewise oils that healthy people are accustomed to anoint with them", oils that it's the custom also for healthy people to anoint themselves with this, **"it's permitted to anoint with them on Shabbos, even if he intended for healing"**. Even if he intended for healing, even if he intended for healing. Here it says differently, here it says even when he intends for healing, if it's something that healthy people may. **"And there's no recognizable sign"**. Here you don't see the recognizable sign. He also doesn't have the recognizable sign, and also not the recognizable sign that you said that he must not intend. Even if he's certain that things that it's the custom, one may do for healing, whether oil, whether eating, and the like. **"But that which is not the way of healthy people to eat from them"**, if it's something that only sick people do, **"is forbidden"**.

The Reasoning Behind the Decree – Why Only Medicine?

What is actually the reasoning for this? I think, if the prohibition is "lest one come to grind ingredients," perhaps something that one does especially for medicine, one needs to especially begin to grind. Because this is something that one sells in the grocery. Because the concern was said only about medicine. It's more such a decree? Yes. Interesting. Why shouldn't one say every thing that is... ah, because things for medicine, it could be because the person is more desperate to have it, he will go grind it. As opposed to ordinary food, if he doesn't have the food, he'll eat something else. But something he needs for medicine, because that's what I think. There's a comparison. Not about this, if he has a recognizable sign before Shabbos, there isn't the concern lest one come to grinding weaker, because he already has his stock. I don't know, because that's what I think, all medicines that are discussed here, one speaks even of such medicines that one doesn't grind ingredients for them. Simply drinking a potion, there are no ingredients that one grinds. But since it's medicine, and for medicine there are ingredients.

Aha, interesting. What is there?

One Who Has Pain in His Loins – Anointing with Wine and Vinegar

"One who has pain in his loins", someone who has pain in his loins, **"may not anoint wine and vinegar"**, he shouldn't anoint wine and vinegar, because this is something that healthy people don't do, only for healing. **"But oil"**, which is indeed customary, one may yes, **"and not rose oil"**, not any oil from any flowers, **"except in a place where people anoint with it"**, because this is something that yes, people apply it, except in a place where also healthy people do it, this one may. **"And it's permitted to anoint royal oil"**

"in any place", because this is something healthy people always do also.

If His Hand or Foot Was Injured – Bandaging with Wine

"If his hand or foot was injured", he struck his hand or foot, bandaging with wine, it says to bandage, he makes it so it shouldn't bleed or something like that, something he does, some kind of band-aid. Yes, one may pour some wine there, I don't know what, **"but he shouldn't bandage with vinegar"**, because also the same thing, wine is more customary that one may do it, not only for healing, but with vinegar one doesn't do it.

"And if he was accustomed", then it's forbidden. Why? Even with wine it's forbidden. Why? I don't know. Ah, he says that vinegar works less well than wine, so therefore, a person who is accustomed, does it work yes? Someone who says that with water, this is the law follows Rabbi Akiva. Who is the accustomed one? This we will learn in halacha 104.

One Who Has Tooth Pain – Vinegar

"One who has tooth pain", someone who has a toothache, so, one may not actually be engaged in healing, but one can do other tricks. So, **"he may not sip the vinegar"**, vinegar helps for teeth. He shouldn't swallow vinegar **"and spit it out"**, because this is the custom, when someone needs to have vinegar for medicine for his teeth, he doesn't swallow it down, he holds it so it should do what it needs to do on the teeth, and he spits it out. But then he clearly shows that he's doing a matter of healing. **"But he may sip and swallow"**, but he may yes like rinse his teeth with it, and then swallow it, because then it's not so clearly obvious that it's medicine. He eats it, like similar perhaps to food for healthy people. He eats it, one doesn't see that it's clear medicine.

One Who Has Throat Pain – Oil

The same thing, **"one who has throat pain"**, someone who has a sore throat, **"may not gargle with oil"**. What does gargle mean? You understand what it means, he gargles. But the language "gargle" is an interesting language. If we knew a lot of lashon hakodesh we would know many more practical words for practical things. We don't know because one doesn't use lashon hakodesh, one doesn't read the old lashon hakodesh, for practical daily things. There is for every specific. Gargle and sip is for us simply the same thing, but it's a different word because it's a different...

One may not gargle with oil and spit it out. **"But swallowing oil is permitted"**, one may yes swallow oil. A lot. It's medicine. Because apparently the point is this, to heal your throat your throat needs to come in contact with the oil. So one is there's an advice of gargling it and spitting it out, so the point is that the throat is there a long time. The other way that it should be medicine is that you need to drink a lot bit by bit a bunch of oil so the throat should become oily.

Those Who Become Burned Get Burned

"And those who become burned get burned", it's an interesting language, those who become burned get burned. It's such a language like we saw earlier here by kefei tumah, that he thirsts for kefei tumah. He drinks, but it means to say that it's incidentally, he shouldn't show that it's medicine, rather he drinks oil and ah, what should I do, it became burned. Obviously he does it yes intentionally, not a ruse, but it only means to say that he shouldn't do it explicitly. Yes.

Splinter in His Teeth – Splinter/Suction

An important halacha. **"If to make a splinter suction"**, there is a suction, there's something that one chews and it helps for which illness? Apparently also for the teeth or something like that? Okay, but simply, it's such a toothpaste perhaps? Okay, something like that, they say it's a liquid from a tree. **"And if he rubbed his teeth with it"**, one doesn't brush the teeth, Rebbe, one doesn't rub the teeth with medicine, with some sort of medicine on Shabbos, for example, if one intends for healing. This is if one means medicine, **"but if one intends for bad breath, it's permitted"**.

Discussion: Toothpaste and Mouthwash on Shabbos

Do we have here a good question, if someone asks whether one may use toothpaste or mouthwash, these things, if one does it for healing is a question, but if normally one does it for bad breath...

One does it for other reasons, not healing, to maintain hygiene, to maintain the teeth. Perhaps that's called healing? I don't believe that it's a question of healing. No, I don't have a question of healing. Prevention doesn't mean healing. Someone eats healthy doesn't mean healing. It's certainly also like food for healthy people, it's not any ingredient things with this.

It's however yes, let's say for example if someone only started because the doctor warned him... he already started after having children normally. I'm talking about my children, I hope they won't hear this how the father shames them here publicly. But small children, many times only after the doctor has tortured them several times with crowns and things, they begin, they look at it like medicine, but really it's normally... It's prevention, yes.

There is if the doctor gives perhaps a special cream, such medicine that, a different sort of toothpaste that one uses for a period of time, then perhaps yes. But there is what others say, there are people who claim that brushing teeth brings out blood. It can bring out blood, that's also a question if blood comes out, and the question is whether to anoint, is a question about anointing, like someone from... smoothing... I don't know, the later authorities have a dispute whether toothpaste is forbidden entirely, that there is about doing it.

Medicine for Eyes – Wine on Eyes

Further, but we'll go further. There is a way of healing the eyes, from placing wine in them. I mean that what one dips on motzai Shabbos at havdalah by the eyes, one simply did something with this, okay. I say, the segulah has something with something that one used to do, it's not so far, it's not a strange thing.

I learned last night in some historical book, that... ah, one says, when does one need the trait of courage, yes, bravery, a very important trait. He says, when does one need it? When one needs to heal oneself. And the commentators explained to me what's relevant. But many times, the doctor says, put in the eye some thing. One needs to have courage to do the... so a part of the healing is something painful.

Digression: Multiple Tzitzis – "To Distance from Strangeness"

Yes, no, I think why the segulah must have to do with something that one used to do. It's not to me... Simply, I saw an interesting... I saw someone published a book on tzitzis. I read it on Shabbos because one read the portion of tzitzis. And

he asks from several great ones, from the Lithuanian great ones, whether one should do the custom of going with multiple tzitzis, like Rav Chaim Shmuelevitz went. He asks a question, that if it's... he brings proofs that every garment is a mitzvah, so why shouldn't one grab the most mitzvos?

I saw, Rav Dov Landau answers him that one shouldn't, and he says "to distance from strangeness". One must distance oneself from crazy things, even at the expense that perhaps one can grab a mitzvah. It was interesting, I saw it. He has great fear... It's also a bit interesting because it's subjective. Yes, enough people look at Bnei Brak as strangeness. They're right. But in any case, he says that even at the expense that perhaps one will grab a mitzvah, there is a matter of staying away from crazy things. It's a question, this will drag other people away from Torah and mitzvos.

And Rav Chaim answered that one doesn't do so. He tells him, because if yes, one will demand from every person to make a hundred small rooms in his house and place a hundred mezuzos, and every day slaughter a hundred chickens. So Rav Chaim answers him with his cleverness. But it's a question, that one doesn't need to, one needs to weigh why.

Continuation: Medicine for Eyes

Okay, okay, we don't see anymore which support. Okay, he places it on your... It's not clear, people when one sees them do it place on the eye, and then it should drip in, it's not clear that he does it for healing.

Tasteless Saliva – Saliva as Medicine

"**And tasteless saliva**", raw saliva. Saliva before one has eaten something else is real saliva, otherwise it already has some taste of coffee or whatever one has just eaten or drunk. Tasteless saliva, saliva after waking up, needs to be medicine without an added taste, it only has the original taste, it's some medicine. But this one does only for medicine, because it doesn't have any name of wine. Therefore one doesn't do it for color.

Medicine on Shabbos – Continuation of Laws: Kilor, Bloodletting, Hot Water and Oil, Bandaging, and Massage

Kilor for Eyes – Soaking Before Shabbos

Speaker 1: Saliva before one has eaten something else is real saliva, otherwise it already has some taste of coffee or whatever one has just eaten or drunk. Tasteless saliva, saliva after waking up, needs to be medicine without an added taste, it only has the original taste. But this one does only for medicine, this one does only for medicine to place on the eye, it's not a nice thing. Therefore one doesn't do it.

"**And on the eye is forbidden.**" Kilor, because on this one cannot not be careful. Right. Kilor is also medicine for the eyes, "**kilor for eyes**". What it looks like is that the kilor is... I'm actually not sure, kilor is perhaps the painter, the brush that one already uses with the kilor, with the... because he says "**kilor that he soaked**", understand? "**That he soaked**". Kilor is such a sponge or something that on this one places the ointment.

Let's see, he likes that one should see the picture. What is a kilor? Kilor is medicine, is the medicine that heals the eye. Okay, I know. It's not visible, ah, external. Let's see. "**And soaked in wine**". "**Kilor that he soaked**" which one soaked on erev Shabbos, "**he passes it over his eye on**

Shabbos and doesn't worry", one may place it on the eyes on Shabbos.

Why? He says, because it looks like incidentally, ah, incidentally, because it has wine, one makes the medicine together with wine. People don't see you. It has the same law as wine itself, which was stated that on the eye one may place, in the eye one may not. It has the same thing with kilor.

On Shabbos itself one may not soak, because that will be a bigger problem. That will be what? Because that will literally mean preparing medicine on Shabbos, or it could be simply a prohibition in preparing medicine at least. Yes, but if one already soaked it on erev Shabbos, it has the same law as ordinary wine, which one may place it on his eye from outside, and he doesn't worry.

One Whose Finger Was Struck – Bloodletting

Okay. "**One whose teeth were struck**", someone who struck his finger, **he shouldn't wrap grass on it to heal it**, he shouldn't wrap grass around to heal, **and he shouldn't press a reed in his hand to extract the blood**. Also if for example there formed a blister, there formed a collection of blood, and he wants to remove the blood, one may not do it, even not with the hands.

Discussion: Injuring or Rabbinic Prohibition of Medicine?

Yes, one sees clearly that medicine on Shabbos was forbidden even when there's no medicine at all, but even when it's only an exercise to do something that one sees here.

It's very interesting, which is very far from... he brings, Rabbi Blum brought that there are places in Rashi which implies that pushing the blood is a transgression of injuring. The Rambam looks like it's only a rabbinic prohibition of medicine, not any issue of a prohibition. It's not to be injuring only in a manner... ah, according to the Rambam it's to be injuring because he has benefit from it.

Prohibition of Medical Treatment on Shabbat: Exercise, Anointing and Massaging, and Bathing in Harmful Waters

On the contrary, according to the Rambam it's only a prohibition of shevut. Sugah belo dam (bruising without blood) doesn't exist in chovel, we learned earlier. That when he does it for pleasure, for his desire, it's also called that. Even if he doesn't need the blood, he's not benefiting regarding pleasure, it's certain that he specifically wants it to come out. Right, he specifically wants it to come out. But according to others, it's only when he needs the blood, when he's mefareik (setting a bone) is when he needs the blood. Even when the blood won't be there. But according to the Rambam that's not a thing, according to the Rambam it's only that he has pleasure from it, he has even a hana'at yitzro (pleasure of desire) is enough.

In any case, the Rambam says that this isn't that. It seems that he says because it was already, it's already chovel beforehand, he's not taking out the blood. It's perhaps something else, just a concern of medicine. That's how it seems.

Hot Water and Oil on a Wound

Okay, other things that one may not do. **One may not place hot water and oil on a wound**. Hot water and oil helps for the wound, one may not do it on Shabbat, **and not on cotton that's on the wound**. Even if one doesn't place it directly,

one places it on the cotton, and from there it should soak into the wound.

Speaker 2: Yes, warm water with oil.

Speaker 1: Hot water and oil that his mother heated, that's the way of treating the wound. **And not on cotton to place on the wound**, not on the cotton that's already lying on the wound, and also not on the cotton even before placing it on the wound, one may not in any case.

What May One Do?

But what may one do? **But one may place wine outside the wound**, the ilpesa (compress) on the eye, outside next to the wound, **and it drips and descends to the wound**, and afterwards it drips down onto the wound. Further, because bread and oil isn't medicine, it's a normal thing. What happens on the wound, one places it on the hands, and as long as one doesn't place it on the wound, one doesn't see that it's medicine.

Dry Cotton and Old Cotton

But old cotton, it was an old cotton where there's no reason for it to lie there. But **one may place dry cotton on a wound**, one may place dry cotton, a dry piece of cotton, on the wound, because it seems that it's also not such a clear thing that he's placing it for medicine. Perhaps he's placing it, I don't know why, something is uncomfortable for him there.

But old cotton, if it's already an old gauze pad, an old cotton that one has already used and it's already soaked in medicine or what?

Speaker 2: Old means it's from an old garment.

Speaker 1: Ah, an old garment. It's not new. A new one is something else, I don't know why. A new one is more obvious that it's medicine.

Speaker 2: Seemingly on the contrary, a new one is more a common thing that one would place it for other reasons, I don't know, for comfort or for warmth, I don't know what. The old one is obvious that there's no other reason to go.

Speaker 1: Yes.

Retiyah – Bandage

Further, retiyah, retiyah means like a bandage, a gauze pad, such a thing. **If it fell off onto a vessel**, if one removed it from the wound, yes, one removed it from the wound, and it fell, or one placed it down on a vessel, one placed it down on the table, one placed it down on the bench, one may replace it.

There's a version, ah, **if it fell onto the ground**, if however it fell on the floor, it looks like a new thing, it doesn't look like it was already lying there, it's not as obvious that it was already lying there.

Discussion: Appearance to Others or Similar to Medicine?

Speaker 2: It's interesting that from these things one looks at people, one doesn't look at the... how do people come in? Okay. Yes yes. That the topic is whether it's not mar'it ayin (appearance), or then is it more similar to medicine or more... But here we're talking about all medicines if one does it in a way that doesn't look like he's doing medicine. Or one knows, it looks, one sees that the person knows that this is the retiyah that just fell off, but for another person it looks like he's now picking it up from the floor. I don't know, one needs to think how all these things work.

Speaker 1: I don't believe that... One needs to know that all these things are exactly like... because in such a way he began

to make a retiyah and put it back together, but it's something like a decree that one doesn't make a retiyah on Shabbat. As long as one can make it inconspicuous, by the way, I'm not now making a retiyah, I'm putting it back, but the moment it becomes a whole thing, I'm now making a retiyah, there's a prohibition of retiyah on Shabbat. Okay.

Retiyah in the Temple

And one may place a retiyah on a wound initially in the Temple. On a... in the Beit HaMikdash one may place a retiyah.

Speaker 2: One places it the first time. One may place it initially, yes. Not just if it fell off. Yes.

Speaker 1: And everywhere... yes. Because **there's no prohibition of shevut in the Temple.** In the Beit HaMikdash one is lenient.

Discussion: Why Specifically Retiyah?

It's interesting that he says it specifically for retiyah. Does he mean to say that this has a general law on all these medicines, or only on retiyah specifically? Interesting. There one may, because they didn't decree, and there's a prohibition of shevut in the Beit HaMikdash. The way... that there's no prohibition of shevut in the Temple is a very general thing. It wasn't done specifically with retiyah.

Speaker 2: Aha. Good question. Perhaps that's the reasoning. Eh, in the Beit HaMikdash... it's interesting. One doesn't bring there any leniency, I don't know what. The other medicines, exactly one, one who is ill in one of his limbs, what comes into the Beit HaMikdash, one who is ill in one of his limbs. But a retiyah is, as you said, it happened that someone got hurt, so they placed a retiyah.

Speaker 1: The Ra'avad doesn't agree with the reasoning that the Kohanim paid more attention to place a retiyah, so they shouldn't become a baal mum. They had to quickly fix if they get a wound, I don't know.

Speaker 2: What do you say about the Ra'avad?

Speaker 1: The Ra'avad disagrees with the whole thing. He says, even on the ground one may replace it.

Speaker 2: Ah. So there's a question what is the... not clear.

Wiping with a Sheet – Erasing

And everywhere, says the Rambam further, one may wipe the wound, one may wash the wound. **But one may not wipe with a sheet**, he doesn't see our sheet the way we're accustomed to paper or cloth, a sheet is more something soft, let's think perhaps like an aloe vera leaf, which if one goes to smear, if one goes to smooth something out is erasing.

Speaker 2: Ah, the sheet comes already with something... smeared with creams, yes. Usually. Ah, wiping with a sheet means what? Means wiping the sheet? Wiping from the cream?

Speaker 1: Ahh, cutting or wiping, yes. Okay, erasing is relevant, on a sheet erasing can be relevant, that means besides the law of medicine on Shabbat there's a law that one needs to be careful about erasing. Right, we already learned this, that erasing a sheet, it was stated explicitly in... on the Rambam on erasing, that one goes to learn it, yes. Yes, I mean we learned erasing, yes. Okay.

Anointing and Massaging

Um, further, another thing that one may not do because of medicine on Shabbat is... anointing, ah sorry, that one may do, **anointing and massaging**, I mean massaging is a better term, one may smear oil and then massage on it.

Speaker 2: You mean that it's a better term is the correct version, the less good term, because the printer fixed terms as he could, but the Rambam didn't speak our language exactly, anyway.

Speaker 1: Yes, memamshesin is a known word in lashon kodesh, and mesamsesin is also presumably a word. It's the same word, just the correct way written. Understand? Mesamsesin.

Speaker 2: According to the Rambam they hold that one goes to be mesamsesin. Ahh, mesamsesin means that a second person does it for you for what?

Speaker 1: No, no, okay, I didn't mean to say, okay. There's an answer memamshesin in such and such, above generally the... what does memamshesin mean in the way in such context? I haven't seen the whole topic, I don't know. Memamshesin in such, what is the term memamshesin in such? I'll tell you what it comes to. Okay. Memamshesin means to feel, yes, if our fathers changed, one feels. Yes, here it also means to feel, also to interpret.

Yes, it means one simply very simply makes a massage for a baby many times, the baby is constipated, smear a bit of oil and rub a bit the belly, a massage. That one may do on Shabbat, because that's not really a way of medicine, that one can do just so for pleasure, or what. But that one should anoint and massage at once, but one shouldn't do extra, again, one shouldn't first anoint and then massage, rather one should do it at once. So that he shouldn't do as he does on weekdays, you see that on weekdays one does it extra, that's exactly the order of things, but one shouldn't do it in the way one does it during the week, one may. Very simple.

It's interesting, he doesn't say it's not because it looks less like medicine, rather it looks less like weekday. All medicines are weekday. Shabbat he says, a change from the way one does on weekdays means that one shouldn't do like the usual way of medicine. Because this anointing and massaging is a thing in itself that one does. No, again, because it's medicine one doesn't do it just in the world, and medicines one doesn't do on Shabbat, one needs to do it differently.

The Law: One May Not Exercise on Shabbat

Speaker 1: And one may not exercise on Shabbat. A new law. One may not do exercise on Shabbat. Exercising is from the language of toil. Exercising doesn't mean exercise but let's see what it means. Exercising means toil, from the language of toil. He's going to say what exercising is.

What is exercising? This is one who treads on the body with force until he becomes tired and sweats. Ah, that's a strong massage type of exercising, that one treads on a person, one pounds on a person until he becomes tired, he becomes exhausted from it and he sweats. **Or that he should walk until he becomes tired and sweats**, that the person himself goes walking until he becomes tired and sweats, until he becomes exhausted and he sweats.

These things one may not do, **because it's forbidden to tire oneself in order to sweat on Shabbat.** One may not exhaust oneself and exert oneself in order to sweat to achieve healing, because the sweating is a medicine.

Precision: "To Tire in Order to Sweat"

Speaker 1: He puts in the words "to tire in order to sweat". He says that exercise that doesn't bring any sweat, does that mean that a person knows that exercise is healthy, and seemingly it's not a medicine thing, it's a lifestyle thing. This is something more, this is something in order to sweat, the sweat should... perhaps not what we know as exercise which is simply healthy. One may not do exercise on Shabbat. A whole week also not in a Hasidic way.

Speaker 2: No, it's not a matter of...

Speaker 1: He doesn't say clearly. Simply, things that are medicine one may not do.

Tosefta: One May Not Run on Shabbat to Exercise

Speaker 1: He brings in the Tosefta: "One may not run on Shabbat in order to exercise, but one may walk in his way and need not worry even the whole day." Later we're going to say another law of "that he shouldn't run on Shabbat", that one may not run on Shabbat, that's an extra law that has nothing to do with medicine. Here we're talking about medicine.

Discussion: What's the Connection to Grinding Spices?

Speaker 1: And so it's forbidden to stand in muddy ground. What is this "muddy ground"? What's the meaning? Ground from which hot water comes, like the hot springs of Tiberias, so he brings from the Aruch. It's a certain place where the ground is muddy, and one needs... in short, also some way from back then.

Speaker 2: No, no, no, it's not from back then. It's a place where one stands, and there it's, as you say, hot and dry, and therefore it heals for a medicine.

Speaker 1: In short, one doesn't go there only for medicine, one doesn't go there for a Shabbat day ever.

And so it's forbidden to exercise - to be exercised, i.e. like exercising where one pushes on him.

Speaker 2: Exercising doesn't mean doing exercise as you say, exercising means making that a person should sweat or something like that, in order to be healed. One can push him, he can go himself, or he can go in the muddy ground, it's a warm ground that makes him sweat.

Speaker 1: All these things are interesting about anointing and exercising, because these aren't things that are very different from medicine. It's a different type of thing, it's basically perhaps a bit more expanded, but this was also forbidden. And this is something that one doesn't do only because of medicine. I say, but it's already a bit further from the concern of grinding spices which is on medicine.

I remember that someone argued that this is simply because one needs to rest on Shabbat. It could be that this is indeed the Rambam, but not according to the Rambam's way. But I say, the Rambam also holds that one needs to rest on Shabbat, he has another ruling for that. But these things of resting the Rambam explains later, end of... in the later sections.

I say, I add here because you touched on the topic. It's certain that it has a topic of medicine, I just pose it, I just pose it, because it could be that some things also fell to answer your question. You say what does this come in with grinding spices? It could be that this is medicine that's forbidden for other reasons also, which is simply exertion and the like.

Or it could be a lav plug, once they forbade medicine they forbade not only when it's directly connected with grinding

spices. It's true, the question is only how far it goes. Okay, and these things, but look, it states explicitly, the next law states explicitly from what you thought.

The Law: Bathing in Harmful Waters – Regarding Oneg Shabbat

Speaker 1: Another thing one may not do on Shabbat. One may not wash with water that causes diarrhea, it seems that it's when one goes in a sufficiently dirty mikveh that will immediately make you have diarrhea, or water that has insects, whatever, it's a type of water. And not in mud that one sinks into, a mud, muddy water. And not in water of soaking that they make, water in which one has soaked leather for what. And not in the Dead Sea, the Dead Sea means the Salt Sea. And not in the harmful waters of the Great Sea, **because all these are suffering, and the matter is close to being bathing of oneg Shabbat.**

That means, this thing isn't forbidden as medicine, this is forbidden as oneg Shabbat. I say, this is seemingly also things that no one does for medicine, but the prohibition is more not because it's suffering. Suffering. I mean to say so, it's basically just washing, what does it matter to you this water or that water? It's not so clear. He adds, it's also because of medicine still there regarding oneg Shabbat.

Permission: If One Didn't Stay There But a Little

Speaker 1: Therefore, look, but because of this there's a permission. **Therefore, if one didn't stay there but a little**, even wasn't there long, **even the measure to dip his head**, and that's the reason why he went there, **it's permitted**. Because the thing is so, it's not such great suffering, he goes to wait for a minute. There's waiting, but what happens with the medicine part? It seems so, perhaps the matter of staying should indeed be like the other things, like on the air, because then it's not so obvious that he's doing medicine.

Discussion: Suffering vs. Medicine – What's the Main Reason?

Speaker 2: It seems almost it states so. It should be the two things, like medicine and the matter of suffering. It should be things, because he goes there because the other suffering is greater.

Speaker 1: Yes, I mean, why does he go there even though it's suffering? Because his stomach hurts him more.

Speaker 2: What's the problem with regarding oneg Shabbat? He does it after Shabbat. It looks like something, yes, but he's a sick person without danger, true. He may do even rabbinic prohibitions on Shabbat. How can you say that there's a prohibition? The whole prohibition of medicine is when it's even not a sick person without danger. Right?

Speaker 1: I say that it must be that the main reason here is medicine, not the regarding oneg Shabbat. Because if the regarding oneg Shabbat alone, the person is deciding what's greater pleasure. He goes there because his stomach hurts him very much. No one seeks, everyone seeks pleasure, also in the middle of the week a person seeks pleasure. And one goes there because it's more important.

Speaker 2: First of all, this is according to your approach, because you support the foolishness of today's times that everything is subjective. It's not true. Pleasure (oneg) is objective. The fact that a person wants to do something that isn't pleasure doesn't make it pleasure, it makes it something

he wants to do. And even a person, when he does certain exercises or certain things that are for healing, he doesn't do it at a time when he wants to enjoy himself. He does it at a time when he needs to do it, when he has to do it. Shabbos is a time when one needs to enjoy oneself, so he doesn't do such things.

Innovation: Perhaps the Entire Prohibition of Medicine is Connected to "V'karasa LaShabbos Oneg"

Speaker 1: But I mean yes, it could be that the entire topic of medicine is not so far from the topic of calling Shabbos a pleasure. I'll tell you the decree, why because of grinding medicines, if you want a conspiracy, such things that we sometimes love. To say that it could be in a general way that medicines, the simple explanation that one reason for all medicines could be "v'asisa l'Shabboscha oneg." From the principle that one may not request one's needs on Shabbos, because he shouldn't think now about what he's lacking, he shouldn't think about his pain, he should focus on what is good. That's what I mean.

Speaker 2: Yes, Shabbos is anyway like that. If someone is sick, he needs to take care, but if you have a choice, that's what I hold - things where you have a choice, you can do it motzai Shabbos, do you need to exercise specifically on Shabbos? Do it motzai Shabbos. Shabbos is calm.

Speaker 1: Makes sense, because if he can't hold out anymore, he'll already become in the category of a sick person without danger where it's permitted. We're talking the whole time about as long as he can actually do it Sunday calmly.

Law: Scraping with a Scraper

Speaker 1: True, scraping with a scraper. You're not allowed to scratch yourself with a scratcher. **But if there was dirt or filth on him**, then it's **permitted**, because we don't think he's doing the scratching for healing. He's doing it, then he may **scrape in his usual way**. Even if he also has pleasure from it, if he also has the scraper that opens up.

Law: Massaging and Pounding a Person for Pleasure but Not an Animal

Speaker 1: Massaging and pounding a person for his pleasure, one may massage and pound oneself, meaning like simply hitting, making a strong massage. But unlike what we learned earlier about trampling on hides so they should sweat, that's a different thing, **for a person for his pleasure**, to pleasure a person. **But not for an animal**, because it says right after "v'karasa LaShabbos oneg," if it's for pleasure, but not for an animal, there's no concept of making pleasure, there is a concept of resting one's animal, but there's no concept of pleasing one's animal.

The point is that a person had to work, a person doesn't work on Shabbos so that the animal should be comfortable. But removing pain he may do. Like removing pain. Simply the animal got a scratch like that?

Speaker 2: No, scratch after Shabbos.

Speaker 1: But if the animal's pain, **it's permitted to remove its pain through rubbing and pounding**, because the healing isn't so great it seems. It's not healing. Also, for pleasure is forbidden, which isn't a need of Shabbos, but to remove pain is a need.

An animal that ate many vetch seeds, and this animal became bloated. They make it run in the courtyard so it should run, they run around with it, they make it run

around in the courtyard so what it ate should go down. They make it run, the people run with it.

Medicine on Shabbos: Animals, Vomiting, Scraping

Medicine for Animals - Continued

Speaker 1: That means also a part in the medicine, that the medicine isn't so great, it seems. It's not medicine. But also for pleasure there's exertion, because it's a need of Shabbos, but to remove pain is a need.

An animal that ate many vetch seeds, an animal that unfortunately overate, they make it run in the courtyard. What is this? They run around with it, they make it run around in the courtyard, so what it ate should go down a bit.

Making it run means that the person may run along? I don't know. Perhaps making it run means they make it a race, he runs along with it. They make it run, and what's the healing?

Speaker 2: No, he said that the innovation that it's permitted isn't simply to tell the animal to run, one may oneself run along to what? I don't know. Why do you need to come to this? Why shouldn't one be allowed to make the animal run?

Speaker 1: And as you asked, it's a healing, one doesn't do healings for animals, you just said now.

Speaker 2: Okay.

Speaker 1: And similarly one seized with blood. What is seized with blood? Seized with blood means what, she has too much blood? Or seized with blood?

Speaker 2: No, it's something another problem, she has too much blood, some sort of illness or something.

Speaker 1: Yes, so through this what they used to do bloodletting, when they held that one has too much blood. **They stand it in water so it should cool down, one may put it in water so it should cool down, and we don't worry lest he grind medicines for it.**

Yes, for an animal... Here he says very directly, **and we don't worry lest he grind medicines for it.** He doesn't simply say because that doesn't mean really medicine. No, it seems it is indeed a healing, but for animals, a person can't be suspected of grinding medicines for an animal on Shabbos, we're not concerned to that extent.

Speaker 2: No, that's not a rule for everything. He didn't say that one may do a healing for an animal. He only says these specific things, one may. He doesn't say that one may give for an animal... What do you see that this is already something different? He doesn't say that one may give for an animal actual medicine.

Speaker 1: Because that's already closer to grinding medicines.

Speaker 2: I don't agree with you. That's two levels further from grinding medicines. There hasn't yet been any one thing that wasn't allowed for an animal. And so he brings here.

Speaker 1: But he hasn't yet said an actual healing for an animal. He only said like giving a scratch and making it run. A person isn't allowed to run in order that he should be healed.

Discussion: Why Are Animals Different?

Speaker 2: Yes, but there are things that are directly connected to grinding medicines, like applying medicine or giving medicine. That's directly connected. The distinction is rabbinic.

Speaker 1: Okay, in the law there isn't this distinction. The distinction is something else, because "if not that they called it an ox." That's the law, that's the reality. It says "as it sounds," not true. "As it sounds," not true. "As it sounds."

So the question is, as one says that grinding medicines is a general law on all medicines, or it only goes on the thing that I'm dealing with?

Speaker 2: No, because a person could also go into water even for pleasure.

Speaker 1: For pleasure wouldn't be any... It's cool, unlike grinding medicines for animals. It doesn't go like that. If it's not Shabbos perhaps, during the week perhaps yes, but Shabbos no. So say almost all commentators. But also, if not, one doesn't need to come to this answer, it remains. Simply that he says it's a permission, that he says a claim here.

What it says here is that for animals one may do healing on Shabbos. That's how it looks here. Why? Because for an animal there isn't the decree of pain to living creatures. But an animal is... Something like that.

Speaker 2: Yes. He learns another answer, but something like that. A person, a very good answer. Like a person, like if it's a dangerously sick person one may do everything, there's a concern that when he's not sick... That's the law. When he's not sick, yes, it makes sense. Since you were lenient with him in the end, you'll be strict with him in the beginning. So when it's not a sick person, then there's the concern of grinding medicines. Unlike an animal where one may never do any permission, the person already has a boundary. It's not a bad reasoning.

Speaker 1: In any case, people care. Why does it need to come to this? Could be he cares less about his animal than about himself? I care for another Jew, but not about... Unless if it's from the money of a sick epidemic, yes.

Vomiting One's Food on Shabbos

Speaker 1: Okay, further. More things that one may not do. Why did they learn from the person animal and money? Something else there is that could have been learned. Ah, human dignity, keeping Shabbos, that could be. Ah, more things that one may not do that are similar to medicine.

One may not vomit one's food on Shabbos. A person overate, he wants to vomit, one may not. What also here, because usually one only does this for healing?

Speaker 2: Yes.

Speaker 1: Also we're speaking of vomiting through medicine. When he vomits the food through inserting medicine, through taking something a sharp medicine that will make him vomit. What then the decree is directly "lest he grind medicines."

So here you see what I said, **but if he wants to vomit without medicine it's permitted.** That this isn't vomiting with the hands, for example. One sees that this is not medicine at all. But with medicine is similar to "lest he grind medicines." He doesn't say if it's forbidden because of medicine.

Pressing a Baby's Belly

Speaker 1: Okay. **And it's forbidden to press the belly of a baby to expel his excrement.** One may not press on a child who has, the smallest child, press on the belly to expel his excrement, **lest he come to grinding laxative medicines.**

These are all distinctions that the Sages looked at - this brings yes and this doesn't bring. I can't tell you the reality. In general, learning law is very much learning reality. It's not learning any reasonings, laws, theories. It's looking around in the world. And the Sages, when they made the laws, or received them, I don't know exactly who made it once or it became over time, it's built on very much experience. It's more a topic of experience than a topic of theory.

I imagine, I can have opinions like this. Yes, when a person does like this, he doesn't come to grinding medicines. He drinks a bit, whatever, what's it called, laxative, then he makes medicines. He presses a baby though, so it's already similar.

I don't believe that we should sit at home, that means this "armchair," and we'll figure out the reason for all these laws. One needs to sit, not sit at home, but work in a clinic for a few days, in an urgent care. Like Trump did, he went away, I don't know how long, for a visit of days, eighteen months. Yes.

Cupping on the Navel

Speaker 1: And it's permitted to place a cup on the navel on Shabbos to raise it. There's such a thing as placing an overturned cup, to apply pressure. It's similar to today's cupping, which is called bankes, yes, which draws out. One places an overturned cup, perhaps a hot cup, and that draws up.

On the navel means not specifically the navel, it means on the belly. It could be it means specifically the navel. He says that sometimes the belly is something stuck, and this brings it up, similar to "pressing the belly of a baby," some massage for the belly. An opposite, it's not to push down, but to push up, it's something stuck in two. The suction, seemingly yes, seemingly the suction. This one may do.

Swaddling a Baby, Raising Ears, Raising Ankles

Speaker 1: Why may one do this? Similar to what one may do from... Look, says the Rambam, **one must swaddle and wrap the baby.** One may choke, like... Yes, not choke, but well bind, swaddle the baby. **To raise ears,** what does raising ears mean? Sometimes the ear, something falls down, and you need to lift it. **And to raise ankles,** also something back in the... What the ankle says, he didn't know what this means. Some piece. And to raise ankles.

All these and similar to them, these are from craftsmen so they shouldn't come to grinding medicines. And this is when he has pain from them. All these things one never does, he means, that there should be a concern of grinding medicines, **and this is when he has pain from them.** You see, here he does make a clear distinction between things where there is the law of grinding medicines, and things where, I know, sweating is a bit of pain, but sweating is also never to do with medicines.

But it's not "when he has pain," it's a condition here. You see that this wasn't given with a blank permission. He didn't make any condition earlier, for example by... Bathing in waters that loosen, okay, it was the advice of going for a short time.

Discussion: The Principle of Pain on Shabbos

Speaker 2: Yes, there are solutions, one doesn't make that people should suffer on Shabbos. That's a great principle in Torah. The Rabbis don't want to make people suffer. In Torah law one can be stuck sometimes, I'm not saying, because you know, the Torah doesn't allow, doesn't allow, one needs to find a solution. But in rabbinic law there's no such thing as pain. So

if it's such a thing that it's not actual grinding of medicines, if it's simply like that, it's not... That means, other medicines that even if it's not food preparation that one still permits, that's the point.

It's interesting, because with this principle he could have removed many of the laws. Because making certainly, if there's a concept of... For example the sweating, he has no pain. Sweating doesn't come to remove pain.

Speaker 1: He does it because of pain, no one wants to go in dirty... He says because there's pain regarding the holiness of Shabbos and pleasure, and he has greater pain when he doesn't do it.

Speaker 2: It's not forced with you earlier, it's not true. He has pain, he doesn't speak... He knows he has some chronic problem, he doesn't do this for healing, but it's not that he's sitting now and something is pressing him. If something is pressing him, he needs to find a solution.

Speaker 1: I don't agree. There's never a time when a Jew sits... There's no such thing, we haven't learned in all of Shabbos that one shouldn't swallow vinegar. We learned that one shouldn't swallow vinegar. Is there a way? Is there a way? Certainly, certainly.

The law is practical, certainly a rabbinic law is practical. There isn't any one law, I want to say a clear law, the law stands for us. There's no such thing that a Jew needs to sit on Shabbos and something should hurt him because the Sages don't allow taking medicine.

First of all, if it really hurts him, it's a sick person without danger. But even less than that there's no such thing. The sum total is there's such a thing as don't do things that will make you even more pain or simply exertion on Shabbos, that you can do it motzaei Shabbos. But every time there's actually a problem, there's a solution how one can do it. Not the convenient way, not the proper way, but yes. Makes a distinction that it shouldn't be weekday-like. On Shabbos one doesn't do like during the week, it's nothing like the week.

Merakeid - Sifting

Speaker 1: Now we're going to learn a bit about the labor of merakeid, the rabbinics of merakeid. Merakeid means sifting the flour from the dirt. And now we're going to learn what's similar to this.

He says, **Merakeid is from the primary labors, therefore one may not sift the straw in a sieve,** one may not sift the straw in a sort of sieve for straw, **and one may not place a sieve that has straw in it,** one also may not even hang up the sieve so that the chaff should fall out from there afterward, **because it's like merakeid.** Even if he doesn't do it with his hands, but the hanging is similar to merakeid.

And what is this from the Torah? Seemingly.

Speaker 2: No, it's not from the Torah. Merakeid is from the Torah, and this is rabbinic. This is in an unusual manner. And he doesn't want it is already rabbinic, aha.

Speaker 1: But what may one do? **One takes straw in a sieve and brings it to the feeding trough.** One may on the way to the feeding trough to give to eat for the animals, one may carry it with a sieve, even on the way the chaff will fall out during walking.

Laws of Shabbos - Rabbinic Kneading and Feeding Animals on Shabbos

Continuation: Intent in the Labor of Threshing

Speaker 1: Seemingly it means to say that his main intent isn't the sifting, his main intent is that it should arrive. He does use specifically a sieve because he wants the chaff to fall out, but he doesn't intend specifically for this, yes? That's how I would interpret it.

Speaker 2: Aha.

Law: Kneading - Kneading Roasted Flour

Speaker 1: Further. We're going to learn the labor of rabbinic kneading.

Kneading, says the Rambam, kneading, when one kneads, is liable for kneading. Therefore, one may not knead much roasted flour.

Roasted flour, on this there isn't real kneading, because it doesn't become hard dough, it doesn't become really any dough, it becomes simply such, I don't know, something else. Yes, but one may not in order to knead unroasted flour, like it's known the proper kneading.

And it's permitted to knead the roasted flour little by little. A bit one may, a small amount, it doesn't go to similar to kneading, it's not similar to kneading.

Grain That Hasn't Reached a Third, Roasted

But grain that hasn't reached a third, roasted, a grain that's premature, **that was roasted after its coarse grinding,** afterward one made from it such a coarse flour, **that is like sand,** that it's like sand, **and it's not called shesos,** this is called shesos or shuss, **it's permitted to knead from it with vinegar and the like, much at once,** with this one may knead.

Translation

It seems that lash (kneading) is a specific thing, something where from flour becomes dough, where dough is a completely new type of material. Things don't happen that way, it becomes a bit more dense, from flour it becomes a bit more, it becomes a bit different, but it's not such a change as from flour to dough.

On the other hand, if it's hard, it's forbidden, if there is grain that hasn't brought forth a third, if it's hard, then it does look like lash.

Then one needs to change, even those who hold that one may use a vessel, one must also do it with a change. One never uses a pestle, one certainly doesn't use vinegar. People put vinegar first, then the pestle, the pestle is a Passover candy that one eats after Passover, it's a type of food that one can buy in the stores.

Mursan - Bran from Grain

Hamursan, bran from grain, **which one doesn't normally knead,** even though it's also not like regular flour that one can make into dough, but one doesn't knead it, one doesn't make dough from it, **lest one come to knead earth and the like,** because it seems mursan is mixed with earth, or it's such a dirty thing, one uses it for all kinds of things, but one also uses it to make earth, and it seems making clay or making cement is indeed similar to actual kneading.

And one puts water on top of the mursan, one may put water on top of mursan, **and moves through it the spoon**

lengthwise and widthwise, and then take a spoon and mix it a bit, not really mixing it this way or that way, one may make lines, lines this way and that way, because that's not a manner of kneading.

But one doesn't rub it with one's hand, but one doesn't do, this one may do with a spoon, but not mix with the hand, because if one does it with the hand, it does look like lash.

And if it didn't mix, if the water and the mursan didn't become mixed, one doesn't take the hand and mix it, because that's also the manner of lash, but what should one do? **One pours from vessel to vessel until it mixes,** one may pour it from one vessel to another vessel, so it should become mixed.

And this permission is only for children and for those who feed the sick, this permission is for what hasn't yet become...

Speaker 2: Okay, that's the point.

Discussion: Amount of Mursan - One Vessel

Speaker 1: And it's permitted to mix mursan in the manner of ah, that's the point. One doesn't do too much, but we see. Why? Because it's a burden? Not clear. Perhaps the opposite, earlier we saw that one may not do too much, for example by... where did we see that one may not do too much?

Speaker 2: "Like filling many vessels."

Speaker 1: Here one may indeed, even if it's a lot.

Speaker 2: Even if it's a lot.

Speaker 1: Even if it's one large plate. Even if it's one vessel. But in several vessels one may not. Where do you see that?

Speaker 2: No, no, it doesn't say the opposite. He says that one may even if it's one vessel and you have here a large amount, like "filling many vessels." And even though afterwards you'll anyway need to divide it into small vessels to give to eat for each animal, for each beast to give another vessel, you may nevertheless mix it beforehand in a large vessel.

Speaker 1: That's what I mean, no?

Speaker 2: I see, I see that what you're thinking isn't clear. What would be the problem with more vessels?

Speaker 1: It's correct, seemingly one vessel is more of a problem, because it's more like... it looks more like he's kneading a big business, a big thing.

Speaker 2: I don't know.

Speaker 1: Okay, in any case, the way one should do it, says the Rambam, one should put in one vessel, and then divide. That's what the Rambam says. Why exactly because it would be in two vessels, or the opposite, isn't properly stated. Okay.

"And one mixes in one vessel even a kor even korim" - even a large amount, that is, as long as he doesn't put away for the day after tomorrow, but simply he gives it today because he has many animals, even if it's one large plate beforehand, one may.

Law: Feeding Animals, Beasts and Birds on Shabbat

Speaker 1: Further. **"One doesn't feed animals, beasts and birds on Shabbat the way one feeds them on weekdays."** Now that we're already talking about giving food to animals, one needs to know how one gives food to animals, but also all concerns of lash. Yes.

"One doesn't feed animals, beasts and birds on Shabbat the way one feeds them on weekdays." One doesn't do the same way as during the week. **"Because of the concern of grinding legumes and kneading flour and the like, so that they shouldn't come"** - during the week when one gives food to an animal, it seems there's a way to give that it should be tastier for the animal, one makes dough or one makes... one grinds things. One shouldn't do it the same way as during the week, because it will bring him.

Measure of Feeding Animals

How so? "One shouldn't feed a camel on Shabbat food for three or four days." A camel eats once for a long time. Yes. One shouldn't give on Shabbat food... give it to eat now for three or four days.

"And one shouldn't lay down a calf and the like and open its mouth" open the mouth and push in large amounts **into their stomach and intestines, and so too to put into the mouths of doves and chickens to a place where they cannot return.** Feeding and forcing animals to eat.

But one feeds more than what the animal eats, he may stand there and hold the plate and show it, give it to eat, **and gives it to drink a little.** But if he stands, it won't want to eat so much. If he stands, that's also a measure that one may give to eat. Right?

Speaker 2: Yes.

Speaker 1: Or gives it to drink a little, puts into its mouth water by itself, and straw by itself, to a place where it can return. That is, in the place of the mouth where the animal can still spit it out. That's still normal. But you stuff it into its throat, it can no longer spit out. You force it in a manner not in its way.

Beasts and domesticated birds, to a place where it can return. Then it stands, **"before it and it eats them."** That is, he may even put it in its mouth. But kal vachomer that you can put it in front of it and it eats by itself.

Whose Sustenance is Upon Him

When are these things said? All these permissions that one may indeed feed animals, this is only **if its sustenance is upon him.** Someone where the person has an obligation for his animal, he is responsible. **"His animal and his beast and house doves,"** birds that fly around in the house, **"geese and chickens,"** house animals, domesticated animals.

But one whose sustenance is not upon him, such as pigs and dovecote doves and bees, the Gemara actually says, what is "dovecote doves"? He has dovecotes, the dove-cotes belong to him. Yes, but the arrangement is that they gather food themselves, or bees find flowers themselves from where to suck. Right, and not that they're such animals that depend on you and you give them to eat every day. They turn around and they come back at night. Even if, let's say, for some reason he wants to indeed hand feed, because their sustenance is not upon him, **one doesn't put before them. One doesn't put before them.**

Why? Because it's a burden, or because there's always the concern of "lest one come to stumbling"? I don't know. The Ramban brings burden that's not necessary. Not clear. I don't know. I need to know if it's simply not necessary. I understand that when there's a bit of need one was permitted. But if it's

simply, simply come to something holy or to lash, as we learned earlier. Okay.

Muktzeh Grass for Animals

And it's permitted for him to stand his animal on top of grass and it eats, he may place his animal on grass so the animal should eat from the grass.

But if they were on top of something that was set aside, but if he has grass that he set aside for merchandise, which is muktzeh, he may not give it to the animal. Why? Because the animal pushes aside shevut for his animal?

Speaker 2: No, may not.

Speaker 1: He says because the person himself took the muktzeh.

Speaker 2: Ah, the person becomes involved in it.

Speaker 1: Not clear. The Rambam doesn't give reasons, one doesn't need to know it.

And stands before it so that it should eat. What one may indeed, he may stand there and encourage the animal to eat, so that it should eat from the muktzeh. That is, he may not put the animal directly on the muktzeh, but he directs it, he stands, he pushes it, he makes it so it shouldn't be able to eat from the other side, only from the muktzeh. This one may, because the question is only the putting. What you put is more like a... it's a type of moving, because he moves it, he moves it, it's literally an action with the thing. But simply standing there and encouraging the animal to eat from this, that one may indeed.

And so too on Yom Tov, where there it's stricter on Yom Tov, one may do the last thing, one may not do the previous thing. This one may do even on Yom Tov, where Yom Tov is stricter regarding muktzeh, there are things that are muktzeh on Yom Tov, one may do on Yom Tov.

Digression: Custom of Shabbat Shirah - Putting Food for Birds

Speaker 1: He brings that the Magen Avraham and other Acharonim spoke about the question, that there's a custom on Shabbat Shirah to put food for the birds. The truth is that "their sustenance is not upon you." There's someone who argued that no, this is indeed, it's indeed a custom.

A custom is not a proof. It's indeed a custom, and it's indeed also the whole thing, I mean, other things, that one needs to bring plates of food, it's a burden. But this is indeed a fun thing, the children bring crumbs. No one has any burden from giving food to the birds on Shabbat. I just want to understand.

Okay, our custom is, I mean, one puts it Friday before Shabbat, I don't remember. I mean there are other types of reasons also. Could be.

Speaker 2: "Your righteousness is like the mountains of God."

Speaker 1: And the children do afterwards and tell. Okay, and the birds, I have a...

Speaker 2: Ah, yes? I have a...

Speaker 1: Also, and in general, one doesn't do it for the birds.

End of Chapter 21: The Custom of Giving Food to Birds on Shabbat Shirah

Speaker 1:

But here it's indeed a fun thing, the children bring in crumbs, no one has any burden from giving food to the birds on Shabbat. If yes, one shouldn't do it.

Okay, our custom is, I mean, with this he puts it before Shabbat.

Speaker 2:

Thank you.

Speaker 1:

For the others there are other reasons also. Children, teshuvah me'ahavah always has good answers. Who does it? The children do this custom.

End of the Lesson

Speaker 1:

Okay, until here chapter 21. Ah, yes? 21 we said.

Also in general, one doesn't do it for the animal at all. The animal doesn't need to be food. You do it because you have a custom. You do a custom. Did you ask the animal? Did you ask the animal if it's okay that one Shabbat one should suddenly remember that it exists? I mean that it's embarrassed. I mean that our holy forefathers are embarrassed. Yes.

Okay, enough.