

# Laws of Shabbat Chapter 22 (Auto Translated)

English

Auto Translated

## Shiur Overview

### Summary of Shiur – Laws of Shabbos, Chapters 22-23 (Rambam, Sefer Zemanim)

---

#### General Introduction to Chapter 22

The Rambam goes through **shevusim** (rabbinic prohibitions) of the 39 melachos. In chapters 8-12 he enumerated all the Torah-level melachos (avos and toldos), and in chapters 21-23 he enumerates the shevusim.

#### Insights about the Rambam's structure:

- The Rambam divided the Torah-level melachos into 5 chapters (8-12): ten, ten, eight, eight, three — apparently he originally planned 4 chapters (approximately  $40 \div 4 = 10$ ), but because the last melachos (boneh, sofer, mechabeh) have very many laws, he divided them into 5. For shevusim there are only 3 chapters, because not every melachah has an extra shevus. The Rambam wanted to be concise with a total of 7-8 chapters (5+3) for all 39 melachos with their shevusim, which is why the chapters are longer than usual.

- **Important point:** The organization of shevusim with their melachos is **the Rambam's own work** — in the Gemara it doesn't always explicitly state which shevus belongs to which melachah.

---

#### Redias HaPas (Removing Bread from the Oven)

**Rambam: Redias hapas is not a melachah, but the Sages prohibited it lest one come to bake. One who attached bread to the oven while it was still day and Shabbos arrived — he may save from it food for three meals, and may tell others to come and save for themselves. If it came down in a basket — it came down, but with a knife, in order to make a change.**

**Explanation:** Removing bread from the oven (redias hapas) is not a Torah-level melachah — only putting in (ofeh) is the melachah. But the Sages prohibited it, lest one come to bake. When one put in bread on erev Shabbos and Shabbos arrived, one may save food for three meals, and may ask others to also save for themselves. But one should do it with a shinui — with a knife instead of with the mardeh (special utensil).

#### Insights:

- **Why shinui by a rabbinic prohibition:** When it's a Torah-level melachah and it was permitted, we say do it with a shinui. But here redias hapas is not a melachah at all — why do we need a shinui? However, because the Sages prohibited it, and even when they permit it in a case of great need, they still require a shinui.

- **Connection to Chapter 3:** The permission of redias hapas only applies when he put it in **inadvertently** (or permissibly — so that its surface would harden while it was still day). If he put it in **intentionally** too early (close to dark, when its surface didn't harden), he violated the rabbinic prohibition of

shehiyah/hadbakah, and then there isn't even the permission of rediyah. This is stated in Chapter 3, not here.

---

#### Washing on Shabbos / Decree Regarding Bathhouses

##### A. The Foundation of the Decree

**Rambam: What did the Sages prohibit — to enter a bathhouse on Shabbos, because of the bathhouse attendants who would heat on Shabbos and say they heated before Shabbos. Therefore the Sages decreed that a person should not enter a bathhouse on Shabbos even to perspire.**

**Explanation:** The Sages prohibited entering a bathhouse on Shabbos, even just to sweat. The reason: the bathhouse attendants would heat water **on Shabbos** and then lie that it was from before Shabbos.

#### Insights:

- **Why can't we simply ask/trust?** Normally we would say: let one ask the attendant if it was heated before Shabbos, and if yes, let it be permitted. But the Sages saw that **in practice** the attendants lie — they heat on Shabbos and say it's from before Shabbos. We can't trust them.

- **The main reason:** It's not just a question of trust — **going to the bathhouse on Shabbos causes** the attendants to cook water on Shabbos. This is the foundation of the decree: an action that causes other Jews to do a Torah-level melachah (cooking).

- **The attendant is a Jew** — we're not talking about a non-Jew, but about a Jewish attendant who commits a transgression. Nevertheless, the Sages prohibited it, because it's a real danger that going to the bathhouse causes a Torah-level melachah.

##### B. Details of the Decree — What is Prohibited

**Rambam: And they decreed even to perspire, and not in hot water. And they decreed that one should not wash his entire body in hot water even in water that was heated before Shabbos. But his face, hands and feet are permitted.**

**Explanation:** Two levels of decree:

1. **The bathhouse itself** — one may not enter at all, even just to perspire, even just face, hands and feet.
2. **At home** — one may not wash **his entire body** with hot water (even if heated before Shabbos), but face, hands and feet are permitted.

**Insight:** The distinction between bathhouse and home: in the bathhouse even face, hands and feet are prohibited (because the going itself causes cooking), but at home — where the person isn't fooling around — only the entire body is prohibited.

##### C. Hot Water from Fire vs. Hot Springs of Tiberias

**Rambam: In hot water from fire — prohibited. In hot springs of Tiberias and the like — it is permitted to bathe one's entire body in them.**

**Explanation:** Water that was heated by fire — prohibited. Water that is naturally hot (hot springs) — permitted.

#### D. Hot Caves

**Rambam: Hot water of caves — prohibited, because the chambers that have vapor in them lead to perspiration and are thus like a bathhouse.**

**Explanation:** Although hot cave water is also not heated by fire, it is prohibited for a different reason.

**Insight:** The reason for the prohibition of hot cave water is not because the water was warmed by fire, but because the vapor (steamy hot air) in the cave makes it feel like a bathhouse — one sweats, one comes out as from a bathhouse. This is a separate reason — it's "within the category of the bathhouse decree" from the perspective of appearance, not from the perspective of the source of the heat.

#### E. Warming Oneself by the Fire

**Rambam: A person may warm himself by the fire and go out and bathe his entire body in cold water — permitted. But one may not bathe his entire body in cold water and warm himself by the fire, because he melts the water on him.**

**Explanation:** Warming oneself by the fire and then washing with cold water — permitted. But the reverse — first getting wet with cold water and then standing by the fire — prohibited.

**Insight:** The prohibition of the reverse order is because in practice he becomes covered with hot water — the water on his body is warmed by the fire, and this has "the same effect as a bathhouse" — he is with his entire body in hot water.

#### F. Pipe of Cold Water Through Hot Water

**Rambam: One who passes a pipe of cold water through hot water (even hot springs of Tiberias) — these are like water heated on Shabbos, and are prohibited for washing and drinking.**

**Explanation:** A pipe with cold water that runs through hot water (even hot springs of Tiberias) — the water that comes out is considered like water heated on Shabbos.

#### Insights:

1. **The Rambam's language** — "these are like water heated on Shabbos" — he doesn't say it's actually cooking, but it's **viewed as** water heated on Shabbos. This is part of the broader decree against water heated on Shabbos — people won't make a distinction between pipe-water and regular cooked water.

2. **Other Rishonim** say that the prohibition is from **hatmanah in something that adds heat** — because one puts cold water into hot, it's like hatmanah.

3. **Question on the Rambam:** Why is this prohibited also **for drinking**? Water heated before Shabbos is not prohibited for drinking — only water heated on Shabbos. This remains without a clear answer.

4. **Distinction between Shabbos/Yom Tov:** On Shabbos — prohibited for washing and drinking. On Yom Tov — prohibited for washing but permitted for drinking (because on Yom Tov one may cook for the purpose of eating/drinking).

#### G. Measure of Heating — The Belly of an Infant

**Rambam: It is permitted to place a vessel with water or oil by the fire — only so that its coldness is removed, not that it should be heated. And so a person may anoint his hand with water or oil and warm it by the fire — so long as the water on him is not heated to the point that the belly of an infant would be scalded by it.**

**Insight — Is this Torah-level cooking:** When the Rambam says "the belly of an infant would be scalded by it" — are we talking here about actual **cooking** (the melachah of cooking)? The conclusion is that **this doesn't mean cooking:** anointing oneself with water/oil and standing near a fire is "no way of cooking." The proof: if a person stands in the hot sun his body also becomes hot — does that also mean cooking? "It doesn't work that way." This is not the manner of cooking, although the measure of the belly of an infant is used.

---

#### Cooking in the Sun and Derivatives of the Sun

**Rambam: It is permitted to heat cold water in the sun so that it will be heated... but it is prohibited in derivatives of the sun.**

**Explanation:** One may put water in the sun so it will warm up, but not in sand that was heated by the sun.

#### Insights:

- Derivatives of the sun (hot sand) looks like one is cooking in an oven — a person who sees that one is cooking in hot sand might think that the sand was heated in an oven. But **a person will not come to confuse sun with fire** — no one will think that cooking under the sun is like cooking with fire.

- **Therefore it is permitted to place cold water in the sun so that it will be heated.**

---

#### Warming a Garment

**Explanation:** One may warm a garment in order to place it on the body (e.g., on the stomach). This is not a way of cooking. "Warming" doesn't mean to a high level of heat, but just warming, and a garment has no concept of cooking.

---

#### Kli Rishon and Kli Sheni — Foundations

##### A. Pouring Hot into Cold or Vice Versa

**Rambam: One may pour hot water into cold water or vice versa, if it is not in a kli rishon.** But in a **bathtub**, which is a kli rishon, one may not pour cold water into hot, because that would be cooking.

**Insight:** The Toras Shabbos wondered that today's bathhouses are never as hot as in the past. In the past the bath would be yad soledes bo, and it was a danger — there is a blessing when one exits a bathhouse safely.

##### B. A Pot from Which One Has Poured

**Rambam: A pot from which one has already poured out the water, one may pour in cold water** — so that the cold water will warm up a bit from the residual heat. This is not hot enough to cook.

##### C. A Boiling Pot — Spices and Salt

**Rambam: And so a boiling pot, even though it was removed from the fire, one should not put spices into it** — because the spices will be cooked from the heat of a kli

rishon. **But salt one may put in, for salt is not cooked except on a large fire** — salt needs actual fire to be cooked.

**Insight:** It is noted that in other places salt is specifically **easy to cook** — a contradiction that is not resolved.

#### D. Kli Sheni Does Not Cook

**Rambam: And if he poured the cooked food from the pot into a bowl, even though it is boiling in the bowl, one may put spices into it — for a kli sheni does not cook.**

**Insight/Dispute:** There is a discussion whether the principle "kli sheni does not cook" is based on temperature or on a rule. One side argues that with today's thermometers one can find a kli sheni that is hotter than a kli rishon (e.g., if the kli rishon has been off the fire for a long time). The other side answers that this is not possible — a kli sheni always gets colder, there is no standing heat, and this is the logic why kli sheni does not cook. The Rambam's language "**even though it is boiling**" clearly shows that it's a rule — even when it's still very hot.

#### E. Pouring from a Kli Rishon

It is discussed whether **pouring from a kli rishon is like a kli rishon** — this is one opinion, but the Rambam doesn't state this explicitly. It is brought up that the Rambam says one may not soak **even in a kli sheni** — which is difficult, because kli sheni does not cook. Tosafos answers that with spices it's different, **not the manner of cooking** but nevertheless prohibited.

---

#### Chiltis — Soaking Spices

**Rambam: Chiltis — one may not soak it, whether in hot water or in cold.**

**Explanation:** Even with cold water it is prohibited.

**Insight:** Why is cold water prohibited? One can't cook with cold water! This is not a matter of actual cooking, but it's a way of **preparing food** (tikun ochel/similar to tikun), or it's a matter of **medicine** (chiltis is for medicine).

**Rambam: But one may soak it in vinegar** — in vinegar one may, because this is not the normal way.

#### Chiltis — When One is Already in the Middle of Treatment

**Rambam: And it is permitted to drink on Thursday and Friday... he may soak it on Shabbos in cold water, and place it in the sun until it warms.**

**Explanation:** If one has already started drinking chiltis before Shabbos (Thursday/Friday), one may soak it in cold water on Shabbos and even place it in the sun, **so that it will not cease if he stops drinking** — because stopping in the middle is not healthy. This is not actual danger (which would be permitted as pikuach nefesh), but because it's important enough they were lenient.

---

#### There is No Cooking After Cooking

**Rambam: Something that was cooked before Shabbos or soaked in hot water before Shabbos, even if it cooled, it is permitted to soak it in hot water on Shabbos** — because there is no cooking after cooking.

**Rambam: But something that is cold from the outset and never came into hot water — one may rinse it in hot water** (one may rinse it with hot water), **if this rinsing is not the completion of its preparation** — only when

this rinsing is not the final step in preparing the food. **But one may not soak it in hot water** — soaking in hot water one may not, because this is already a bit of cooking.

**Insight:** The Rambam says simply "in hot water" without specifying kli rishon or kli sheni. "To soak" is prohibited even in a kli sheni, because soaking for a longer time in hot water is different from just rinsing.

---

#### Cooling Cooked Food

**Rambam: One may put good water into bad water in order to cool it. And so one may put cooked food into a pit in order that it will be cooling.**

**Explanation:** One may put good water into bad warm water so that it will cool. One may put cooked food into a pit (cellar/hole) where it is cool.

**Insight:** Why does the Rambam need to say that one may cool? Based on the **Perush HaMishnayos** the innovation is that we are not concerned about the shevus of pits — one should not think that it's prohibited to deal with a hole/pit.

---

#### Mixing Water, Salt and Oil

**Rambam: A person may mix water, salt and oil and dip his bread in it and put it into cooked food, provided that he does not make a lot.**

**Explanation:** One may make a mixture of salt, water and oil as a dip for bread or to put in cooked food, but only small amounts.

**Insight:** If one makes a large portion, **it appears as doing the work of cooking** — it looks like he is engaged in cooking. Such a sauce is usually something one cooks with (for seeds for cholent and the like), so a large portion looks like cooking.

---

#### Mei Melach Azin

**Rambam: And one should not make strong salt water — two or three parts salt to three parts water — as it appears as making pickled fish.**

**Explanation:** One should not make strong salt water (two or three parts salt to three parts water), because this is the way one makes pickled fish (fish preserved in salt water).

**Insight:** Here we see that **pickling is a rabbinic form of cooking**. When one makes pickled fish — one soaks fish in strong salt water — this is a form of cooking that the Rabbis prohibited. And they prohibited even just the salt water itself (without the fish), because it looks like one is preparing to pickle.

---

#### Salting an Egg and Radish

**Rambam: It is permitted to salt an egg. But a radish and the like — prohibited because it appears as pickling pickles on Shabbos. And pickling is prohibited as similar to cooking.**

**Explanation:** One may salt an egg. But a radish or other sharp things that salt makes better/completely edible — prohibited because it looks like pickling pickles.

**Insight — What may one do with radish:** One may **dip** (immerse) in salt while eating — **it is permitted to put food**

**into salt while eating it.** The distinction:

- **Salting** (putting salt on the radish) = prohibited, because it looks like pickling pickles

- **Dipping** (immersing the radish in salt) = permitted

The distinction is between **salting** (putting salt on a whole plate of radish, which looks like pickling) and **dipping** (immersing individual pieces, which is just the manner of eating). **Salting is like cooking** is explicitly distinguished from **pickling is like cooking**.

---

### Wine, Honey and Pepper

**Rambam: It is permitted to mix wine, honey and pepper on Shabbos to eat. But Persian wine (balsam oil) is prohibited, for it is not the manner to eat it except for healthy people.**

**Explanation:** One may mix wine, honey and pepper for eating. But balsam oil is prohibited because only healthy people eat it — it's for medicine.

**Insight:** Why is this here and not in the laws of medicine on Shabbos? Because it's not actually medicine — it's an expensive thing (the Gemara says rivers of balsam oil are a hair for the righteous) that normally one only indulges in for medicine, so **it looks** like medicine even when the person makes it for eating. Therefore it fits here by "appears as" prohibitions, not by actual medicine.

---

### Mustard, Cress, Garlic — Preparing Foods on Shabbos

**Rambam: Mustard that was kneaded before Shabbos — the next day one may grind it by hand and in a vessel, and put honey and spices into it, but one should not beat it vigorously but only mix gently. Cress that was ground before Shabbos — one may put oil and vinegar and spices into it, but one should not beat it vigorously but only mix gently. Garlic that was crushed before Shabbos — one may put grits into it, but one should not grind.**

**Explanation:** For all three — mustard, cress, garlic — the foundation is that what one started before Shabbos one may finish on Shabbos, but only with a change — not in the professional way as on a weekday. The distinction between "beating vigorously" (strong mixing) and "mixing gently" (weak mixing) is the same distinction as earlier between "warp and woof" and simple mixing.

#### Insights:

- **All these prohibitions** — mustard, cress, garlic, and the previous laws — stem from the same foundation that the Rambam said earlier: **"as it appears as doing work for the work of cooking"**. This means, one may work in the kitchen on Shabbos, but not too much — it should not look like one is doing one of the **melachos of the bread-making process** (kneading, threshing, grinding, baking). This is all rabbinic — a "rabbinic leniency" where they permit with a change.

- **"The work of cooking"** doesn't mean cooking/baking itself, but **the entire category of melachos** that lead to baking — kneading, threshing, grinding, etc. The prohibitions are because it "looks like" such melachos, or it "will lead to" them.

---

### Gozez — Cutting Hair from a Human Body (Chapter 10, Laws 17-18)

**Rambam: "One who removes hair from a human body is also liable for gozez."**

**Explanation:** The av melachah of gozez is cutting wool from an animal, but also cutting hair from a person's body is liable for gozez.

**Insight:** By gozez in the Mishkan the order is that one cuts wool from sheep in order to make garments/curtains. Cutting hair from a person doesn't have the same purpose, but it's also liable — it's a **Torah-level toldah**.

---

### Washing with Something That Removes Hair — Pesik Reishei by Gozez

**Rambam: "Therefore it is prohibited to wash one's hands with something that definitely removes hair, such as natron and the like." But "it is permitted to rub with ashes of frankincense, ashes of pepper, ashes of jasmine and the like, and one need not be concerned lest hair from his hand be removed, for he does not intend this."**

**Explanation:** Washing hands with a material that **definitely** removes hair is prohibited (pesik reishei). But rubbing with dust of frankincense, pepper, jasmine — which **might** remove hair but not definitely — is permitted, because it's a **davar she'eino miskavein** without pesik reishei.

#### Insights:

- By a **mixture** of sharp material (which definitely removes hair) with non-sharp, the Rambam says **we follow the majority**: if the majority is from the non-sharp, it's permitted; if not, prohibited.

- **Strong question:** Why do we follow the majority? One should check **in practice** whether the mixture tears out hair or not! If the sharp material is so strong that even in the minority it makes the entire mixture tear out, the majority shouldn't help. Nullification by majority is not relevant here — it's a factual question!

- **Answer:** Majority here doesn't mean nullification by majority, but a **measure of doubt** — when the majority is from the non-sharp, one can rely that it's **not a pesik reishei**, because most of the time it won't tear out. It remains a **davar she'eino miskavein**. If one knows **clearly** that it tears out (100% pesik reishei), one doesn't need any law — it's simply prohibited.

- **Distinction between "washing" and "rubbing"**: For what is prohibited the Rambam says "to wash", and for what is permitted he says "to rub". It remains a question whether this is an actual distinction or just a change in language. "Rubbing" usually means washing with something (as by rubbing for immersion).

---

### Metal Mirror — Decree Because of Gozez

**Rambam: "It is prohibited to look in a metal mirror on Shabbos, a decree lest one pluck with it loose hairs. And even if it is fixed to the wall. But a mirror that is not of metal, it is permitted to look in it, even if it is not fixed."**

**Explanation:** A metal mirror — which has a sharp edge that one can use to cut hair — is prohibited to look at on Shabbos, because one might pull out hair (from beard etc.). Even if it hangs on the wall. But a non-metal mirror is permitted, even if it is not fixed.

#### Insights:

- **This is not a simple decree** that "one should not look in a mirror because one will go get scissors". The mirror itself is a **double-function utensil** — it serves both as a mirror and as a cutting instrument. Therefore the decree is stronger — one can **use it immediately** for cutting.

- By **fixed to the wall** — ostensibly one doesn't use it for cutting when it hangs on the wall? One can **take it down** — but still it's not entirely clear, because it requires a step.

---

### The Melachah of Melaben (Laundering) — Squeezing

#### A. Foundation: Squeezing is Part of Laundering

**Rambam: One who launders — is liable for melaben. And one who squeezes out laundry — is liable for laundering.**

**Explanation:** One who washes out a garment is liable for melaben. And one who squeezes out the wet garment after washing is also liable for laundering, because this is part of the washing process.

**Insight:** Squeezing by a garment is not a separate melachah, but part of laundering/melaben. The garment that is wet is as if it's not yet ready — it's still "dirty" in a certain sense — and the squeezing prepares the garment. The squeezing out of dirty water is the final step of laundering.

#### B. Stuffing a Cloth in the Mouth of a Bottle

**Rambam: Therefore it is prohibited to push a cloth or cotton and the like into the mouth of a bottle to seal it, lest one come to squeezing.**

**Explanation:** One may not squeeze a rag or cotton into a bottle opening as a stopper, because every time one removes and replaces the stopper, one will come to squeezing.

**Insight:** This is a **rabbinic decree** — the cloth is not even wet yet (one puts in a dry rag), but it will become wet from the liquid in the bottle, and later when one takes it out one will squeeze. This is **not Torah-level squeezing** because the squeezing is not part of laundering — one doesn't squeeze in order to clean the cloth, but for other purposes.

#### C. Sponge — One Does Not Wipe with a Sponge

**Rambam: And one does not wipe with a sponge unless it has a handle, so that one will not squeeze.**

**Explanation:** One may not wipe oneself with a sponge, unless it has a handle, so that one will not come to squeeze.

#### Insights:

- **The Rambam's explanation:** When one uses a sponge without a handle, one puts the hands directly on the sponge and squeezes it out. With a handle one doesn't hold directly on the sponge, so it's not likely that one will squeeze.

- **The Raavad's dispute:** The Raavad understands that a sponge is soaked with water, and one uses it like a towel. The Raavad says a **great innovation:** when the sponge has a handle, we view it as a **utensil** (a vessel that holds water), not like a garment. Squeezing is only prohibited because it's part of laundering — if it's not a garment but a utensil, there's no

concept of squeezing. The handle makes clear that this is a sponge-utensil, not a garment.

- **The Rambam versus the Raavad:** By the Rambam the handle is a practical thing — one doesn't squeeze when one holds through the handle. By the Raavad it's an **essential** distinction — the handle defines the sponge as a utensil, not a garment.

#### D. Two Types of Squeezing — Squeezing of Melaben vs. Squeezing of Dash

**Insight:** Why shouldn't squeezing a sponge be a toldah of **dash** (threshing)? By dash one squeezes out juice from fruits (olives, grapes, berries, pomegranates). A sponge that is full of water — when one squeezes it out, one removes the liquid that is absorbed, just like one removes wine from grapes.

**The distinction:** By dash one makes a **new thing** — from grapes one makes wine. By a sponge one only takes back the same water that went in. It remains a question whether this is enough of a distinction.

A story is brought how people on ships would cook salt water, place a sponge on top to catch the pure steam, and then squeeze it out — this would be actual squeezing of dash.

#### E. Covering a Barrel of Oil with a Cloth

**Rambam: One does not cover a barrel of oil and the like with a cloth that is not designated for it, a decree lest one squeeze.**

**Explanation:** One may not cover a barrel of oil with a cloth that is not specifically designated for this, because he will later want to use the cloth for other things and will squeeze it out.

**Insight:** By stuffing a cloth in the mouth of a bottle the cloth becomes wet from inside. **Here** one places the cloth from above, but when one takes it off it's wet, and he will squeeze it — this is already actual laundering.

#### F. A Barrel Broke on Shabbos — Saving Wine

**Rambam: If a barrel broke on Shabbos — one may save from it food for three meals for him and his guests, but one should not absorb the wine with sponges or soak up the oil.**

**Explanation:** When a barrel of wine breaks on Shabbos, one may save enough for three meals for him and his guests. But one may not absorb the wine with sponges/cloths and then squeeze them out, or fill the hands with oil and scrape it off.

**Insight:** Here we see that a sponge can also be related to squeezing — but not squeezing of laundering/melaben, but **another type of squeezing**. It remains a question whether this is squeezing of dash (wine press) or a separate decree. The prohibition is **lest one come to squeezing** — we are concerned he will make a squeezing system (wine press).

#### G. Vessel Placed Under It — Catching / Directing

**Rambam: It is permitted to place a vessel under it. But one should not catch or direct with another vessel.**

**Explanation:** One may place a vessel under the broken barrel. But one may not (1) stand and hold a vessel under the flowing wine (catching), and (2) not place a second vessel to direct the stream of wine in a particular direction (directing).

#### Insights:

- **Catching** = he actively holds the vessel under the barrel and catches the wine while it's flowing.

- **Directing** = he makes a "waterfall system" — places a vessel so the wine will flow a certain way and land where he wants.

- **The distinction between permitted (placing a vessel) and prohibited (catching/directing):** When one simply places a vessel underneath, one is not active in the operation of saving. But when one stands and holds the vessel, or one builds a system, one is **very active** — and then there is a decree **lest one bring vessels through the public domain** (he will want to bring more vessels to save more).

#### H. Distinction Between Bread and Wine Regarding Inviting Guests

**Explanation:** By bread one may invite strangers and say "come save for yourselves" — everyone can come take loaves for Shabbos. But by wine one may only save for oneself and for one's own guests — one cannot bring strangers.

#### Insights:

- Wine is more expensive, one doesn't give it away so easily. Bread — everyone takes as much as he needs, it doesn't look like a big saving operation. But by wine, when one person stands and saves for everyone, it looks like a baker/merchant.

- By bread each person takes a roll for himself — it's not noticeable. By wine one person saves for everyone — this is more conspicuous.

- Practical logic: bread one eats alone, but an extra bottle of wine — one can't drink it all alone, one needs guests

#### I. "They Gathered for Guests" — Saving for Guests

**Rambam:** When he is alone, he may only place one vessel underneath. But when he has guests, he may bring more vessels according to how many guests he has.

**Insight — Order of Events:** One may not first catch the wine and then call guests ("and one should not catch and then invite"). The opposite — he may first call guests, and then save ("he invites and then catches").

#### J. Deception in This Matter — Permitted

**Rambam:** "And if he was deceptive in this matter" — even if he didn't really mean it for the guests, but he wanted to save more wine, it's permitted.

#### Insights:

- This is an exception — in many places one may not be deceptive, but here one may.

- **The foundation (according to commentators on the Rambam):** It's only a decree that he should not bring vessels through the public domain. But if he does it in the permitted manner — for guests — it's permitted, because this reminds him that he's not on an operation to save wine, but to have wine for Shabbos.

- Deception doesn't mean that he invites guests and doesn't give them — "inviting and not giving doesn't mean invited." He must actually give to the guests. Only the deception is that his main intention is to save more wine, even if in practice he saved more than he needed for the guests.

- **Rabbi David's innovation:** The matter of deception is that he uses the guests for his own interests — he means himself, not the guests.

---

#### Mud That Fell on His Garment — Laundering Laws

##### A. Rubbing from Inside

**Rambam:** If mud fell on a garment, one may rub it from inside (from within), but not directly on the mud from outside.

**Insight:** When he goes directly on the mud, he is more "engaged" with the dirt, and we are concerned he will also use water and wash it properly — close to laundering.

##### B. Scraping with the Nail

**Rambam:** One may scrape off with the nail, "and one need not be concerned lest he whiten it."

**Insight — Distinction between rubbing and scraping:** "Scraping" means scraping off a hard piece — a quick action. "Rubbing" means rubbing a wet/crushed thing — this requires more work and is closer to laundering.

##### C. One Who Shakes Out a Scarf — Distinction Between Scarf and Robe

**Rambam:** A scarf (outer garment/shirt) — prohibited to shake/smooth out because of whitening. But a robe (linen garment/undergarment) — permitted.

**Insight:** Outer garments (coat) one wants them to be nice — this is related to whitening/laundry. But undergarments — when one shakes them off, it's only because one wants the texture to be soft, not for beauty. Therefore it has no connection to whitening.

##### D. Shoe or Sandal — Shoe That Became Dirty

**Rambam:** A shoe that became soiled with mud and filth — it is permitted to rub it with water, but to launder it one may not.

**Insight — Distinction between garment and shoe:** By a garment one may only rub from inside. By shoes one may rub even from outside with water, because shoes (leather) are water-resistant — water removes the dirt but doesn't clean the inside of leather.

**Another law:** One may not scrape "from the glue on sandals" — this gives a shine, a way of beautifying.

##### E. Old Shoes — Oiling and Wiping the Old Ones

**Rambam:** Old shoes that are dried out — one may oil (anoint) and wipe, because this has nothing to do with laundering. Leather shoes — one oils them so they won't be hard.

##### F. Pillow and Cushion — Bedding

**Rambam:** One can wipe them with a rag, but one may not put water.

##### G. One Whose Hands Became Soiled with Mud — Dirty Hands

**Rambam:** One may wash them in a horse's tail or cow's tail, or in a hard cloth that is made to catch thorns. But not in a cloth with which one wipes (a towel that one uses to wipe hands).

**Insight — Reason for the prohibition:** "Lest his friend say to him, wring out this cloth for me" — on a weekday, when one soils a towel, one washes it immediately. We are concerned that he will come to launder the towel. But a hard cloth for thorns, or a horse's tail — this is not a manner of laundering, one doesn't wash it.

---

##### Wiping After Washing — Carrying a Wet Towel

**Rambam:** One who washed in water may wipe with a towel and bring it in his hand, and we are not concerned lest he squeeze.

**Explanation:** One may wipe oneself with a towel after washing, and one may carry the wet towel in the hand. We are not concerned that he will squeeze it.

**Insight:** The reason why we are not concerned lest he squeeze: a towel is normally wet — it's its nature to be wet. It's not like a garment that becomes wet unintentionally, where one would want to squeeze. By a towel the wetness doesn't bother, so there's no concern of squeezing.

---

### Walking with Wet Garments — Prohibition of Spreading Out

**Rambam:** One whose garments became wet on the road — one may walk in wet garments, and we are not concerned lest he squeeze. But it is prohibited to spread them out, even inside his house, a decree lest those who see say this person laundered his garment on Shabbos and spread it to dry.

**Explanation:** One may walk in wet clothes, but one may not spread them out to dry — even at home — because people will think that he washed his clothes on Shabbos.

#### Insights:

1. **On what things does the prohibition of spreading apply?** It is discussed whether the prohibition applies to a towel or to garments. The logic: a coat is usually not wet on Shabbos, and when one sees it spread out it looks like after washing. A towel however is normal that it should be wet, and one understands that it's not from laundering. But there's no clear proof for this distinction.

2. **Practical question — towels in camp:** In camp boys would hang wet towels on the front of the room after the mikveh on Shabbos, and there was debate whether the prohibition of spreading also applies to towels. The Rosh Yeshiva ruled stringently.

3. **Rema's principle — appearance of wrongdoing even in the innermost chambers:** The Rema brings the principle: **Wherever the Sages prohibited because of appearance of wrongdoing, even in the innermost chambers it is prohibited.** Appearance of wrongdoing doesn't mean specifically that someone sees — it means what it **looks like**, the action itself is prohibited because it has an appearance of prohibition.

---

### Two Mikvaos One on Top of the Other — Removing a Plug Between Two Mikvaos

**Rambam:** Two mikvaos one on top of the other — one removes the plug, and afterwards returns it to its place. And in the Temple — one returns it.

**Explanation:** By two mikvaos one above the other, one may on Shabbos remove the stopper to make a connection between them, and afterwards one may replace the plug.

#### Insights:

1. **Concern of squeezing when replacing the plug:** The Beis Yosef brings an opinion that we are concerned that he will press the plug in too hard, which is similar to squeezing. The answer: because he wants water to pass through, he won't put the plug in so tight that it will squeeze.

2. **Why does he need to replace the plug but not tightly?** Because he's not making the connection because of

drawn water (where one-time connection is enough), but because there isn't enough measure in the smaller mikvah — it needs to be **constantly** connected to the larger mikvah. Therefore he doesn't put the plug in tightly, because he wants there to remain a connection.

---

### Stopping Up the Pipe — Blocking a Water Distribution

**Rambam:** One may stop up the pipe with anything that is movable so that the water will not overflow onto the food and vessels. But one may not stop up the pipe so that the water will descend to the cistern.

**Explanation:** One may block a distribution pipe with any non-muktzeh thing, in order to save food and vessels. But one may not block it in order to direct water into a cistern.

#### Insights:

1. **Reason for the distinction:** When one is saving food/vessels, there's no concern of squeezing — because he's going to leave the plug there until after Shabbos. But when he wants to control water flow to the cistern, there is a concern **lest he squeeze and make a tight seal with a plug soaked in water** — he will squeeze out the rags that he uses as a plug.

2. When one only wants water not to come out, he is less pressing (he presses less hard) because it bothers him less. But when he needs to empty out water, he is more particular and will squeeze more.

---

### Folding Garments — Arranging Sleeves of Garments

**Rambam:** It is prohibited to arrange the sleeves of garments to crease them... And so one does not fold on Shabbos in the manner that one does on weekdays garments when one desires them. If he had no other garment to change into, it is permitted to fold it and spread it so that it will be nice on Shabbos. And this is only a new white garment that doesn't hold creases. And when he folds, only one person should fold.

**Explanation:** One may not fold/arrange the sleeves of garments in a nice way as one does on weekdays — it's like part of laundering. **Exception:** When he has no other garment to change into, he may fold it so it will be nice **for Shabbos itself** — only by a new white garment where the fold doesn't hold (that doesn't hold creases), and only one person alone (not two).

#### Insights:

1. **What does "to arrange" and "to crease them" mean?** To arrange means to display/fold in a nice way. To crease them means to make a nice fold — like by an iron collar or sleeve that one needs to fix. It's part of the laundering process.

2. **What kind of folding are we talking about?** The folding of the Sages is not simply putting away a garment in a drawer. Ancient garments were not "tailored" like today — they were like large tallises/togas, and one had to fold them in a special way so they would look human when one wears them. **It's compared to Roman soldiers** who had an entire craft of how to fold their togas, and the folds would hold for weeks. **It's compared to curtains with folds.** This means that the folding was an actual repair of the garment, not just tidying.

3. **Practical application — tallis:** Folding a tallis on Shabbos doesn't seem to be in this category at all — one just

needs to put it away, it's not the sort of "folding" that the Sages prohibited.

4. **Two people:** When two people fold together, it looks like a bigger "operation" of laundering, therefore prohibited.

---

#### Tzovei'a — Dyeing / Makeup

**Rambam: One who dyes — is an av melachah. A woman who puts paint/makeup on her face is prohibited "like dyeing."**

**Explanation:** Dyeing is one of the avos melachos. The Rambam's language "like dyeing" by makeup on a face means that it's **rabbinic** (similar to dyeing), not Torah-level.

#### Insights:

1. **Language "like dyeing" = rabbinic:** When the Rambam says "like" (as in "like dyeing"), he means that it's **similar to the melachah** — rabbinic because it's similar to the av, but not the av itself.

2. **Why is makeup not Torah-level?** The av of dyeing is usually dyeing **merchandise** (wool that was cut) — it holds. But dyeing a face is not the same sort of dyeing, because it doesn't hold in the same way. Therefore it's only rabbinic.

3. **Distinction between av and toldah by dyeing:** By most melachos the Rambam also brings toldos (which are Torah-level). Here by dyeing there's no toldah mentioned — the rabbinic is directly connected with the av itself, because the distinction is that the av applies to merchandise (where it holds), and the rabbinic applies to a face (where it doesn't hold as well).

---

#### The Melachah of Tofer (Sewing)

**Rambam: And one who sews — sewing together two pieces of merchandise is from the avos melachos. Therefore it is prohibited to fill new pillows and cushions with stuffing. But stuffing that fell out from pillows and cushions — one may return it.**

**Explanation:** The rabbinic prohibition of sewing is that one may not fill new pillows/blankets with feathers/cotton, because usually afterwards one sews it closed — a decree lest one sew. But if the filling fell out from already-existing pillows, one may put it back.

#### Insights:

- Here we see that the rabbinic is of the type "lest" (decree lest one sew), not because it's similar to the av. This is different from dyeing, where the rabbinic is more directly connected with the melachah itself. By different melachos the Rambam has different types of rabbinics — sometimes "similar to the av" and sometimes "lest one come to do the av."

- The distinction between new and old: by new pillows this is the first time one is making it, and the normal order is that after filling one sews it closed. By old ones where the filling fell out, this is just a fix — the sewing is already there, one just puts back through the existing opening.

---

#### The Melachah of Korei'a (Tearing)

**Rambam: Tearing is from the avos melachos. Therefore one whose garment was caught on thorns — one should separate it quietly and close one's eyes so as not to tear. And if it tore — he is not liable, for he**

**does not intend. And it is permitted to wear new clothes. One may crack a nut in a cloth and need not be concerned lest it tear.**

**Explanation:** If a garment gets caught on thorns, one should remove it quietly and carefully not to tear. If it tears however — exempt, because he does not intend. One may put on new clothes (even though they might tear), and one may crack a nut with a cloth even though the cloth might tear.

#### Insights:

1. **Destructive vs. unintentional:** The Rambam's language "for he does not intend" shows that the permission is *davar she'eino miskavein*, not destructive. By the thorns one could argue that it's even a repair (he frees the garment), not destructive.

2. **By new clothes** — in the past one had to make "breaks" (crease/break) the first time wearing, especially by the sleeves. Ancient clothes were more complicated and could tear the first time wearing. The permission is because it's unintentional, and perhaps even when it tears it's a repair (it fits better).

3. **Why does the Rambam bring specific cases instead of principles?** Laws of Shabbos are generally very practically-oriented, not principle-oriented.

4. **"Quietly" — what does it mean?** A strong question is asked: earlier the Rambam ruled that "anything prohibited because of appearance of wrongdoing even in the innermost chambers is prohibited" — if so, what does "quietly" help? Two answers:

- **First answer:** "Quietly" doesn't mean in the innermost chambers (privately), but it means **in a refined and calm manner** — one should not stand and pull and tear in the street, but calmly give a tug. This is not appearance of wrongdoing at all, but practical advice how to minimize the tearing.

- **Second answer:** In general, the less one can do publicly things that look un-Shabbos-like, the better — even when it's technically permitted.

- It's also suggested that "quietly" means: he should not actively tear out the thorns (which would be a melachah), but quietly free himself.

- **Desecration of God's name aspect:** It's a desecration of God's name when a Jew stands on Shabbos in the street and tears his clothes from a nail. "Quietly" means one should not make it into a spectacle.

---

#### The Melachah of Boneh — Foundation

**Rambam: One who inserts is liable for building.**

**Explanation:** Building generally means inserting something into something — like putting pillars into sockets, brick on brick, inserting. If one inserts a door into the holders, or a pole into its place — liable for building.

**Insight:** The Rambam's language here is different from other melachos — he doesn't begin with "one who builds is an av melachah" but immediately with "one who inserts is liable for building." He already explained earlier what building means, and here he only brings a toldah/law that is liable for building.

---

#### Doors Connected to the Ground

**Rambam: All doors that are connected to the ground — one may not remove them nor return them, a decree lest one insert.**

**Explanation:** Doors that are connected to the ground one may not remove and not replace. Even when one replaces it in a manner that it doesn't become strongly connected — prohibited, a decree lest one insert.

**Insights:**

- We're not talking about a door that hangs on hinges (like modern doors), but about a large piece of wood that one moved away from the opening, and when one wants to close the opening one puts it back there — without any hinge. This itself is not building, but it's prohibited rabbinically — a decree lest one insert, perhaps he will connect it to the wall.

- "One may not remove" is a decree of demolishing, "one may not return" is a decree of building. By connected to the ground, building is primarily Torah-level, therefore one is stringent even on actions that are not actual insertion.

---

**Doors of Chest, Box and Tower (Doors of Utensils)**

**Rambam: Doors of chest, box and tower and other doors of utensils — one may remove but may not return.**

**Explanation:** Doors of utensils — one may remove, but not replace.

**Insights:**

- Why should replacing be stricter than removing? Removing one may because one wants to use the door for something else — it's not muktzeh, one uses the piece. But replacing looks similar to building — replacing a door in its place.

- The foundation: by utensils it's always easier than by connected to the ground, because there is no Torah-level building by utensils (or it's different laws). Therefore by utensils they permit removing, but replacing remains rabbinically prohibited.

---

**The Lower Hinge That Slipped Out**

**Rambam: And if the lower hinge slipped out — one may push it into its place. And in the Temple — one may return it.**

**Explanation:** If the lower hinge has slipped out — one may push it back into its place. In the Temple one may even properly replace it.

**Insights:**

- "Push it into its place" means: the hinge is still there, just not in well — one gives a push. "Return" means: it fell out completely, one must pick it up and put it back in. The distinction is not in the result, but in the problem that one is solving.

- This applies to doors of utensils (chest, box and tower), not to connected to the ground. By connected to the ground one may not do anything with hinges.

---

**The Upper Hinge That Slipped Out**

**Rambam: But the upper hinge that slipped out — it is prohibited to return it anywhere, a decree lest one insert.**

**Explanation:** When the upper hinge has slipped out — one may not replace it in any manner, even in the Temple.

**Insights:**

- "Anywhere" means even in the Temple, and "to return it" means in any manner — even not pushing.

- The upper hinge primarily holds the door (it's more important than the lower one), therefore there is a greater concern lest one insert — one will fasten it strongly.

**Discussion About "Lest One Insert" — What Does It Mean Practically**

- A "hinge" is a nail/peg that sticks out from the door and goes into a hole in the doorpost. The door turns on this. This is not like modern hinges at all.

- "Lest one insert" means: one will insert the hinge — i.e. one will fasten the hinge in its hole in a strong manner, which is building. By connected to the ground one doesn't play around with any hinges at all — even just placing a piece of wood by an empty opening is prohibited, a decree that one will bring a hinge and insert it.

- **Question of the Ya'avetz** and other Acharonim (page 33) say different explanations what **insertion** means, and no one knows exactly. It's suggested that **fastening** (insertion) perhaps means screwing the hinge into the door — a completely different melachah, not the placing of the door itself.

- A **door is made to turn** (open and close), not to be stuck/fastened. If "fastening" means to fasten, it doesn't fit by a door that needs to be able to open. Therefore **inserting** must mean some other step, not the placing itself.

---

**One Does Not Braid the Hair of the Head and Does Not Style It**

**Rambam: "One does not braid the hair of the head and does not style it, because it appears as building."**

**Explanation:** One may not braid the hair of the head, and not make twisted/nice hair (braid etc.), because it looks like building. Gathering all the hair in one direction/form looks similar to building — one assembles a structure from pieces.

**Insights:**

- "**Appears as building**" — **not actual building:** No building was said on hair/people. Building is only connected to the ground (or utensils). This is only **rabbinic** because it **looks like** building.

- **Question from building by utensils:** But we learned that **the final hammer blow on living things** is building — so there is building on living things? This remains a difficult question.

**[Digression: Making Peyos on Shabbos]**

**Some poskim have said** one may not make curly the peyos on Shabbos, because this is braiding or styling. **But the custom of almost all Jews is to make the peyos on Shabbos**, which shows that the prohibition must be on a **bigger situation** — something that one does once in a while (like a braid), not something that one does every day.

---

**One Does Not Return a Lamp of Segments**

**Rambam: "And one does not return a lamp of segments, nor a folding chair or folding table,**

**because it appears as building. And if he returned — he is exempt."**

**Explanation:** A lamp, bench, or table that is made of pieces (segments) that one can take apart and assemble — one may not assemble on Shabbos. But if one did do it, he is exempt (only rabbinic), because **there is no building by utensils and no demolishing by utensils.**

**Insights:**

1. **Distinction between completely taken apart vs. weakly built:** The prohibition is only when the utensil is **completely taken apart** and one assembles it. But if it's **already built but weak**, and one only wants to **tighten/strengthen** it, this is permitted. The language **"returns"** (reassemble) supports this — he doesn't say "to build it" but "to return it", which means it's already there, one just puts it back.

2. **Segments of chest, box and tower — weak:** By things that are **always weak** (never strongly assembled), it's less building, and therefore one may.

3. **Building that is not permanent:** It's asked whether there's a concept of **building that is not permanent** (like a knot that is not permanent). **A temporary tent** is also rabbinically prohibited, which shows that there is such a concept by building.

4. **Folding table on Shabbos:** A folding table is already held together — this is different from **segments** which means extra pieces that one assembles (like Lego). **Some poskim say** that things that are made regularly to take apart and assemble is not building.

---

**Segments of the Spine of a Child**

**Rambam: Segments of the spine of a child one next to the other** — one may not fix/realign the vertebrae of a small child's back, because **it appears as building.**

**Insights:**

1. **Not just massage:** This means **actually moving the bones into place** (like a chiropractor), not just tapping on the back or a massage. A massage or tapping **doesn't look like building** — it must look like one is taking pieces and assembling them.

2. **Not actual medicine:** This is not a case of a broken spine (which would be danger), but something that one does **for beauty/comfort** — a child who bent his back.

3. **The criterion of "appears as building":** It must **look like building** — one takes pieces and assembles them.

[Digression: Lego on Shabbos]

There is a great dispute among contemporary rabbis whether one may play Lego on Shabbos. If one can easily take it apart, it's less problematic. It's certainly not Torah-level, but rabbinically is a question.

---

**A Permanent Tent — Torah-Level Obligation**

**Rambam: One who makes a permanent tent is liable for building.**

**Explanation:** Not only a building of stone/wood is building — also making a permanent tent is a *toldah* of building. This stems from the fact that the Mishkan itself was a tent, not a building.

**Insights:**

- Dispute in the Rishonim about the Mishkan: whether they built the Mishkan every time even during a short encampment. The verse says "at the word of God they camped" and "they would camp there a day or two days" — when it was only a day, did they also build the entire Mishkan?

- **Important distinction:** The distinction between a permanent tent and a temporary tent is not just a decision of the person whether he wants to leave it long — it must be a different kind of construction, a different sort of tent. A "permanent" means a strong, important construction (like the Mishkan, even when it stands only a day), and "temporary" means a light, pop-up sort of thing.

---

**A Temporary Tent — Rabbinic Prohibition**

**Rambam: Therefore one does not make a temporary tent initially, and one does not demolish a temporary tent, a decree lest one make a permanent tent.**

**Explanation:** Making or taking down a temporary tent is rabbinically prohibited — a decree lest one come to make a permanent tent.

**Insight:** The Rambam doesn't call the temporary-tent-maker "builder" — he only says "they made a prohibition." But by demolishing he does call it demolishing. This is a curious asymmetry in language.

---

**Adding to a Temporary Tent — Permitted**

**Rambam: It is permitted to add to a temporary tent on Shabbos. A cloth that is spread over pillars... and it was rolled up before Shabbos, but there is a tefach in it — he may spread it on Shabbos until he makes a large tent.**

**Explanation:** One may enlarge an existing temporary tent. If a cloth is spread over pillars, rolled up before Shabbos, but there is a tefach open — one may on Shabbos pull out the rest until it becomes a large tent, because one is only adding to an existing tent.

**Insight — Umbrella (rain cover):** This is the foundation for the permission to open an umbrella on Shabbos — one must make sure that there is already a tefach before Shabbos, then this opening is only "adding to a temporary tent." If one makes a new umbrella on Shabbos without a tefach beforehand, this is problematic.

---

**Canopy (Bed Canopy) — Temporary Tent**

**Rambam: One does not hang a canopy... for a temporary tent is made under it.**

**Explanation:** One may not hang a canopy (canopy over a bed) that is made for shade, because under it becomes a temporary tent.

**Insight:** The language "for a temporary tent is made under it" is precise — he doesn't say that this is building a tent, but that under it arises something that is similar to a tent. A canopy is made for underneath it — to use the space under it — therefore it's a temporary tent.

---

**Bed, Chair, Bench — Not a Tent**

**Rambam: It is permitted to place a bed, chair and bench even though a tent is made under them, for this is not the manner of making a tent, neither permanent nor temporary.**

**Explanation:** One may put down a bed, bench, or table, even though underneath arises a space like a tent — because this is not a manner of making a tent, neither permanent nor temporary.

**Insights:**

- **The foundation:** A tent is a thing that is made to use from underneath. A bench/bed is made to use from above (one sits on it). Therefore putting down a bench is never "making a tent."

- **Limitation of this permission:** The permission only speaks when one puts down the bench normally on the floor. If one takes a bench and lifts it up high in order to make a tent from it — this permission doesn't apply.

- **Magen Avraham / Rashba:** By a bed that one also uses the underneath (e.g. a bed with holes without a mattress), one may not cover it because one makes a tent from underneath.

---

**A Sloped Tent — Without a Tefach on Top**

**Rambam: Any sloped tent that doesn't have a tefach in its roof, or doesn't have within three close to the roof a width of a tefach — this is a temporary tent.**

**Explanation:** A tent that goes sloped (like a roof without a flat top), where there isn't a tefach wide at the roof, or even within three tefachim from the roof there isn't a tefach wide — this is a temporary tent (rabbinically prohibited, not Torah-level).

**Insights:**

- This is parallel to the laws of sukkah where the walls extend from the roof when it goes sloped down.

- If at the roof there is a tefach wide — it's already a permanent tent (Torah-level obligation). The measure of a tefach at the roof is the distinction between permanent and temporary by such a sloped tent.

---

**A Doubled Cloth with Strings**

**Rambam:** A doubled cloth (folded) that one hangs like a partition (wall), not like a roof. When the cloth has **strings that were hung on it before Shabbos** — strings that are already attached from before Shabbos — **it is permitted to spread it. And so curtains it is permitted to spread them and permitted to take them down.**

**Explanation:** The strings make it like a utensil that is already prepared for setting up and taking down.

**Insight:** Perhaps the strings make it as if the tent is already made — it's already there permanently, and this spreading is only **adding to the tent**, not making a new tent. This remains not entirely clear.

---

**Canopy of Grooms**

**Rambam: A canopy of grooms that doesn't have a tefach in its roof, and doesn't have within less than three close to the roof a width of a tefach — since it is**

**prepared for this, one may move it and it is permitted to spread it and take it down.**

**Explanation:** A wedding canopy for grooms, where the roof doesn't have a tefach wide, and also not within three close to the roof a tefach — because it's **prepared for this** (made for opening and closing), one may set it up and take it down.

**Insight:** Even by a thing that is prepared for this, the permission is **specifically** when there isn't a tefach in the roof. The condition of a tefach remains even by utensils that are specially made for setting up.

---

**A Hat (Hat with a Brim)**

**Rambam: A hat that one places on the head that has a brim around it that makes shade like a tent — it is permitted to wear it, for it is not a tent but a garment.**

**Explanation:** A hat with a wide brim that makes shade around the head — permitted, because it's a garment, not a tent.

**Rambam (continuation):** \*\*If he extended from the garments around his head or opposite his face like a tent, and pressed it on his head, and made around

it a very hard brim like a roof — it is prohibited because he makes a temporary tent.\*\*

**Insight:** The distinction between permitted and prohibited: a normal garment falls down (soft), this is a garment. But when one makes it **hard** so that it stands like a roof — then it's a temporary tent rabbinically. The key is that a normal garment doesn't have the character of a tent, but when one builds it differently than a normal garment, it becomes a tent.

---

**Hanging a Curtain**

**Rabbeinu Avraham (son of the Rambam): One who spreads a curtain — must be careful not to make a tent while spreading it. Therefore if it was a large curtain — two people should hang it, but one is prohibited.**

**Explanation:** When one hangs a curtain (wall hanging), one must be careful that in the process of hanging there should not be made a tent. A large curtain should be hung by two people, because one person must hold it spread with one hand, which creates a tent.

**Insight:** From here we see that **temporary tent** means even **very temporary** — even for one minute that it becomes a tent, one must be careful rabbinically.

**A canopy that has a roof: One should not pull it even ten people** — by a canopy with a roof, even ten people don't help, because the spreading itself automatically creates a temporary tent (unlike a curtain which is only a wall).

---

**A Cloth on a Barrel**

**Rambam: A cloth with which one covers the mouth of the barrel — one should not cover all of it because of making a tent, but one may cover part of it.**

**Explanation:** One may not cover an entire barrel with a cloth, because this creates a temporary tent over the hollow of the barrel. But covering part is permitted.

**Insights:**

- Why is this called a tent? **A tent doesn't need to be large enough for a person** — a measure of a tefach is enough. Perhaps it's therefore only a temporary tent (rabbinic), not Torah-level.

- In **Orach Chaim siman 301** it states that this is specifically by **barrels of wine**, because wine needs air, and therefore this covering is exactly like making a tent (it's a functional roof over a hollow that needs to remain open).

---

### Plug of the Window

**Rambam:** When there is a **plug** that is **prepared for this** — prepared for the window — one may put it in the hole even if it's not **tied and attached**, because it's not called building.

---

### Egyptian Basket (Egyptian Basket)

**Rambam:** **One who strains with an Egyptian basket — one should not raise the bottom of the basket from the vessel a tefach, so as not to make a temporary tent.**

**Explanation:** When one uses a woven basket for filtering, one should not lift it a tefach higher than the vessel, because then the basket becomes a roof — a temporary tent.

**Insight — Distinction from bench:** A **bench is made to use on top** (for sitting), not underneath. But a **basket is made to use underneath** — the benefit is what is under the basket (the filtering in the vessel), and therefore it's called a temporary tent.

---

### Cover on Utensils — Conclusion of Discussion on Temporary Tent

**Insight:** The distinction between a **cover** on a utensil versus a **bench**: a **bench** is made to use **on top** of it (one sits on it), not under the bench. But a **cover** on a utensil is made **for underneath** — the purpose is to protect/cover what is **under** the cover. Therefore when one lifts up the utensil a tefach and covers it from above, this is a matter of temporary tent.

---

### Piskei Teshuvos — Tallis by a Utensil (Stand)

The **Piskei Teshuvos** rules that one may place a tallis by a stand (utensil for children), because one doesn't make a partition, but something else around the stand.

---

### Question: Holding Something in the Hands — Is This a Tent?

**Question:** Was there any discussion in the laws about a case where a person **holds something in the hands** (not fixed on something)?

**Insight:** By **curtain** the Rambam said one must not hold it — but the distinction is: by a curtain he holds it **while** he is fixing it on the side — that is, he holds it only temporarily but he's about to fix it. But when the **entire matter** is only holding in the hands (without fixing), we are **not certain** whether this is a tent. **Conclusion: Requires study.**

---

### General Question on Laws of Temporary Tent

**Question:** Why shouldn't one make a general definition — that **everything that has a similarity to a tent** is

rabbinically prohibited? A bench with a tefach is **very far from a tent** — why should this be a rabbinic tent? The boundaries are so broad that it's "very interesting."

---

### Umbrella on Shabbos — Temporary Tent

**Insight from Acharonim:** One may not **open an umbrella** on Shabbos because one makes a tent.

**Question:** When the umbrella is **already open** — is just **holding** it above the head **also** a tent? This remains an open question, connected with the previous question whether holding something in the hands (without fixing) is a tent. **Requires study.**

---

### The Melachah of Makeh B'Patish (Final Hammer Blow)

**Rambam:** **One who makes a utensil, or completes it, or fixes it — is liable for the final hammer blow.**

**Explanation:** Making a new utensil, or completing an incomplete one, or fixing a broken one — all are liable for makeh b'patish.

**Insight:** This melachah is unique — it's not about a specific action, but about **completing** something. Any action that brings something to completion can be makeh b'patish.

---

### Smoothing a Stone

**Rambam:** **One who smooths a stone to sit on it, or a piece of wood — is liable for the final hammer blow.**

**Explanation:** Smoothing a stone or wood to make it suitable for sitting — liable for makeh b'patish.

**Insight:** Even though the stone/wood was already usable before, making it **better** for its purpose is considered completion.

---

### Piercing a Hole in a Chicken Coop

**Rambam:** **One who makes a hole in a chicken coop to let in light — is liable for the final hammer blow.**

**Explanation:** Making a hole for light in a chicken coop — liable for makeh b'patish.

**Insight:** This is completion because the coop now functions better — the chickens have light.

---

### Making a Utensil Usable

**Rambam:** **Anyone who does something that makes a utensil fit for use — is liable for the final hammer blow.**

**Explanation:** Any action that makes a utensil ready for its intended use is makeh b'patish.

**Insight:** This is the general principle of makeh b'patish — bringing something to its functional completion.

---

### Tuning a Musical Instrument

**Rambam:** **One who tunes a musical instrument — is liable for the final hammer blow.**

**Explanation:** Adjusting/tuning an instrument so it plays properly — liable for makeh b'patish.

**Insight:** Even though the instrument existed before, making it function properly is considered completion.

---

### Rabbinic Extensions of Makeh B'Patish

**Rambam: Therefore one may not clap hands, slap thighs, or dance on Shabbos, a decree lest one come to fix musical instruments.**

**Explanation:** Clapping, slapping thighs, and dancing are rabbinically prohibited, lest one come to fix musical instruments.

#### Insights:

- This is a **gezeirah** (decree) — the actions themselves are not makeh b'patish, but they might lead to it.
- The concern is that during celebration with music, if an instrument breaks, one will fix it.
- This is one of the most widely not-observed rabbinic prohibitions in contemporary Orthodox practice, with various justifications given.

---

### Summary and Conclusion

These chapters (22-23) of Hilchos Shabbos in the Rambam cover the **shevusim** — rabbinic prohibitions related to the 39 melachos. The Rambam's organization shows:

1. **Practical focus** — Rather than abstract principles, the Rambam brings specific cases and situations
  2. **Different types of rabbinic prohibitions** — Some are "similar to" the Torah prohibition, others are "lest one come to" do the Torah prohibition
  3. **Appearance matters** — Many prohibitions are because something "appears as" doing a melachah
  4. **Context-dependent** — The same action can be permitted or prohibited depending on circumstances
- The laws demonstrate the Sages' concern for both:
- **Preventing Torah violations** (gezeiros)
  - **Maintaining the character of Shabbos** (shevus, uvdin d'chol)
  - **Avoiding confusion** (maris ayin, lo plug)

The complexity and detail of these laws reflect the delicate balance between preserving Shabbos and allowing necessary activities, showing the depth of the rabbinic tradition in applying Torah principles to practical life.

## Full Transcript

### Laws of Shabbat Chapter 22: Shevutim from Baking to Demolishing

#### Introduction: Structure of the Chapters on Shevutim

Good, we are learning Hilchos Shabbat in the Rambam, Sefer Zemanim. We are holding at the twenty-second chapter, chapter 22. We are holding in the middle, the Rambam goes through the 39 melachot, but the rabbinic prohibitions thereof.

In the previous chapters he enumerated all the Torah prohibitions, all the avot and tolados of the 39 melachot. Here he enumerates the shevutim, what the Sages added, either because it resembles a melacha, or because it causes a melacha to be done, or it looks similar to a melacha.

#### Announcement Regarding Sponsors

Before we continue, we must praise the supporters, "im ein kemach ein Torah" - if there is no flour there is no Torah, those who support our shiur, and those who publicize our shiur. And at their head our main sponsor, our friend, the rabbinic dignitary Rabbi Yoel Halevi Wetzberger, may the merit of Torah assist him in everything.

#### How the Rambam Divided the Torah Melachot

So, I want to tell you, there is in Hilchos chapters 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, the Rambam enumerated all thirty-nine Torah melachot, he divided them:

- Chapter 8: ten melachot
- Chapter 9: ten melachot
- Chapter 10: only eight melachot
- Chapter 11: another eight melachot
- Chapter 12: the last three melachot, and kotzer gorger omer, which has very many laws, therefore it was a small chapter of only three melachot

But overall, it appears essentially the Rambam thought thirty-nine melachot, it divides approximately by four, yes, almost forty, almost forty is four. Afterwards he saw that the last one has very much, so he divided it into five chapters instead of four chapters. So it appears in my humble opinion.

#### How the Rambam Divided the Shevutim

Now, in the shevutim there isn't a shevut for every melacha. First one must know, one can look at the list, you will see, not every melacha has a shevut. That is, almost every melacha has patur aval asur, which means there is a shevut, but actual extra shevutim that he enumerates here, Chazal didn't enumerate specifically.

The question is, when something becomes domeh l'melacha, the question is when the Rambam says that they prohibited things that are domeh l'melacha, is the meaning that even when it's not written explicitly, or is it only the things that are written explicitly? Certainly only the things that are written explicitly.

He only says that not every time it says patur aval asur, almost in every melacha, not literally every melacha, except for shevat na'arah, for example, I remember I said that even patur, but almost every melacha also has rabbinic prohibitions that were truly enumerated earlier. But shevutim that are extra that he enumerates here, not every melacha has.

So he began essentially the Rambam, and the extra shevutim is another three chapters. It appears from five chapters on the Torah prohibitions there are three chapters, 21, 22, 23, that is all the shevutim of the 39 melachot.

By the way, the connection of the shevutim with the melachot is less explicit in the Gemara, not every shevut states regarding which melacha it was prohibited. The Rambam, many times, when one learns more in depth one sees many times that the Rambam himself assembled that this is presumably about this melacha, this belongs to this melacha. This is for your

knowledge even though it's not clear that it states that it's about ofeh, he understands that it's related to the sugya, but the Rambam incorporated the shevutim according to the order of the melachot truly. There is no Mishna that states all these things.

Anyway, he divides here also more or less the same, just a bit differently. Why? Because we learned that the practical difference is to divide in a general way, so the Rambam made three chapters on shevutim. The first two are exactly like the first two chapters of Torah prohibitions, there are ten melachot each, just not every one of the ten melachot has a shevut.

In the first chapter almost every one has a shevut I remember, but in the second chapter there are only I think six melachot that have a shevut. So out of the ten melachot that he enumerates here there are only six. There are things that are a shevut because of two things, like because of medicine and because of concern for dosh or memachek. Even if... even one to... yes.

As I'm telling you, the shevutim are not entirely according to the melachot, but the Rambam incorporated them. There are also larger categories, like rechitza on Shabbat is a decree because of cooking, but it's still a whole sugya by itself. Yes, like medicine, that's also a whole sugya by itself.

Afterwards it comes out the last chapter, the third chapter, he wrote all the rest of the melachot that have shevutim, because there is less, therefore it fits into three chapters. But when one looks one sees that the three chapters are very long chapters, simply because of this. You see that he specifically wanted to be concise, he wanted it to be ten chapters of shevitot, and also according to the length, it's longer than typical chapters in the Rambam, both the chapters of the melachot and the chapters here, you see that he strongly wanted that it should end up in total seven chapters containing all 39 melachot with their shevitot, or eight chapters, right? Five plus three, so therefore they are longer chapters.

### Halacha 1: Rediyat HaPat

Very good. The Rambam says, **rediyat hapat**, rediyat hapat means scraping the bread. The bread used to be stuck onto the walls of the oven, and one must afterwards scrape it off with a utensil.

The Rambam says, **ofeh eino melacha**, this is not a melacha, it's taking out from the oven, putting in is the melacha, taking out is not a melacha. **But the Sages prohibited it, lest he come to bake.** He's going to let him be busy with the bread, be busy with the bread, he will also do baking. I don't know if perhaps really not be busy with the bread, because rediyat hapat is a specific thing, taking out a baked thing from the oven is not rediyat hapat. It's only rediyat hapat is an important action, it's a serious action, lest he come to bake.

### Permission to Save Bread

But what may one do? If one put in bread and wants to save it before Shabbat, it's like this, **one who sticks bread in the oven while it is still day, and the day became holy upon him**, and it became Shabbat, **he may save from it food for three meals**, one may, yes, one may not take out all the bread, but one may save as much as one needs for the three meals of Shabbat.

And not only that, but one may also ask other people to save their three meals, and thus all will be saved. **And he says to others, come and save for yourselves**, one can say to people, come and what you will save will be for your Shabbat. This one may do.

### Condition of Shinui

What is the permission? Because it's only rabbinic, the Rabbis permitted it in a case of great need. He says, and ofeh is only not a melacha, therefore perhaps one wouldn't need to make any other shinui, because the whole thing is not a melacha. When it's when a melacha, one says, when you may do it with a shinui. It's not a melacha.

But still, when there is a permission to be rodeh, in order to save bread for the three Shabbat meals, one should also not do it the usual way. **"He should scrape with a skewer"**, he should not take out the bread from the oven with a mardeh, with the special utensil, **"but with a knife"**, but with a regular knife, **"in order to make a change"**, it should look different. Even when they permitted, it's still with a condition, it should be with a shinui.

### Connection with Chapter 3

One must remember here what we learned in chapter 3, you see that essentially there is a rabbinic prohibition to place pat, to stick pat in the oven during bein hashemashot, because "food lest he stir it," because he will bake it on Shabbat. But if it's "enough that its surface should crust while it is still day," then he may.

And therefore, what it says here that he may be rodeh the pat, speaks specifically if what? If he placed it inadvertently, it says. If he placed it intentionally, he transgressed the prohibition of shehiya etc., then he may not. Then there isn't even this permission. So it says in chapter 3.

Here he doesn't say so, there he says so. In chapter 3. "And if he placed it close to dark and it became dark and its surface still hasn't crusted," perhaps he will say only if it hasn't crusted its surface, "nevertheless they are permitted even intentionally," because that is permitted. But if he transgressed the rabbinic prohibition of placing too early, then there isn't this permission.

### Discussion: Where Does the Law of Sodek Appear?

And normally there is a permission of being rodeh so it shouldn't bake, so that one shouldn't stumble with ofeh. Yes, what was stated there in the law? Another law.

What does it say here? He placed it on Shabbat, sodek on Shabbat, and thus he saves it before it starts to be baked.

Yes, it says where? Another place, another topic. It wasn't stated in ofeh? It was stated in the matters of erev Shabbat, of preparing for Shabbat, not by melachat ofeh.

What I just told you is stated there. Okay, further.

### Halacha 2: Merchatz on Shabbat

Okay, the Rambam says further, **"And what did the Sages prohibit"**. He begins interestingly. It's basically until here the language of the Rambam. Now he says like this, we're going to learn about washing on Shabbat, about going to a bathhouse or washing on Shabbat.

The Rambam begins with such a question: **"And what did the Sages prohibit to enter a bathhouse on Shabbat?"** Why may one not enter a bathhouse on Shabbat? Isn't it earlier we learned about a sick person, about sweating. But

going to a bathhouse is a different kind of thing, it's not sweating from the fire, and why is this forbidden?

#### The Reason for the Decree

He says like this, "**Because of the bathhouse attendants who would heat on Shabbat and say they heated before Shabbat**". The bathhouse people, those who take care of the bathhouse, they did heat water on Shabbat, and they said to people, "they were heated before Shabbat," it came from before Shabbat. **"Therefore the Sages decreed that a person should not enter a bathhouse on Shabbat even to sweat"**. So in honor of this the Sages prohibited that one may not go to a bathhouse on Shabbat at all.

#### Why Can't We Trust the Bathhouse Attendants?

Normally a person would say, one must ask. Okay, before one goes to a bathhouse, one should at least ask, because if it became hot on Shabbat, one may not benefit from it on Shabbat, one should ask.

But the Sages say that one cannot trust, because they say "they were heated before Shabbat," but in practice one must fear in all bathhouses that they also heat on Shabbat. Now, whether it's a great temptation or it's easier this way...

He says further, he said not only that one cannot trust them. That is, every thing, we learned, every thing that causes that when one does the thing people do melachot on Shabbat, the Sages prohibited that. They say lies, there is there a...

What he says is that here one saw that it's a problem. Essentially, this is the point, "hot water that was heated," one doesn't cook on Shabbat, that's not a doubt. If one cooked water before Shabbat and it's warm, one may wash in it on Shabbat, it's not a question.

The problem is that when people go to a bathhouse on Shabbat, the bathhouse attendants will heat it on Shabbat. And apparently they indeed did so, they said lies afterwards. But the question is not only that one cannot trust the bathhouse attendants, it's truly a problem, it causes the bathhouse attendants to cook water on Shabbat. Therefore, going to a bathhouse on Shabbat causes that one should cook on Shabbat, and that is forbidden.

Why doesn't one do? A mirror that you added, but yes, it's simply not the decree, one could trust if the attendant says it's from before Shabbat, one would know that then one may.

In any case, the attendant is a Jew, he doesn't just do so, he's not speaking of a non-Jew that one fears, he's speaking of a Jew. One may not go on Shabbat, it's just a thing that causes people to cook on Shabbat.

#### The Decree of Bathhouses – Details of the Laws and Stringencies

##### Halacha 2: Foundation of the Decree – Indirect Causation of Cooking on Shabbat

###### Speaker 1:

So here he also says, they should say lies, so there there a... What he says is, here one saw that it's a problem. And essentially, this is the point, **hot water that was heated before Shabbat**, one may not cook on Shabbat, yes? It's not a doubt. If one cooked water before Shabbat, it's warm, one may wash in it on Shabbat, it's not a question.

The problem is, that when people will go to a bathhouse on Shabbat, the bathhouse attendants will heat on Shabbat. And because of this they indeed did so, they said lies and denials.

But the question is not only that one cannot trust the bathhouse attendants, it's truly a problem, it causes the bathhouse attendants to cook water on Shabbat. Therefore, this going to a bathhouse on Shabbat causes that one should cook water on Shabbat, so one may not. A mirror added this, but yes, one may not go on Shabbat to a thing that causes people to cook on Shabbat.

#### Halacha 2: Details of the Decree – Bathhouse and at Home

##### Speaker 1:

Very nice, let's continue. **"And they decreed even to sweat"**, even, no difference whether one goes to a bathhouse to completely wash or just to get from the heat, **"and not in hot water"**, even if it would be a higher amount then it's easier.

**"And they decreed"**, they also decreed, **"that one should not wash his entire body in hot water"**, even if one doesn't go to the bathhouse, even if a person has at home hot water, one may not wash his entire body with hot water, **"even in hot water that was heated before Shabbat"**. Also for the same decree of bathhouses.

Once the decree was made, it was already spread even for a person at home, he's not fooling himself. He says the decree is not against fooling oneself, but against that it causes that one should cook on Shabbat.

**"But his face, hands and feet are permitted"**. But this, the prohibition was specifically his entire body. His face, hands and feet are permitted.

That is, going to a bathhouse means entering one may not, even to wash, even just to sweat, or even just face, hands and feet. But by the decree of bathhouses that was also said that it's by a person's own hot water, this was only said about literally washing the entire body.

#### Halacha 2: Hot Water from Fire versus Hot Springs of Tiberias

##### Speaker 1:

However, the Rambam says, **by hot water from fire**, things that one heats through fire, for oneself at home, even if one has hot water that was heated with fire, **it is forbidden by the decree of bathhouses. But in the hot springs of Tiberias and the like**, things that are not hot from fire at all, it's hot from other things, from nature, it comes from hot springs, **it is permitted to wash in them**, one may wash the entire body, on this there is not the decree of bathhouses.

#### Halacha 2: Hot Water of Caves

##### Speaker 1:

Yes, this is hot springs of Tiberias which is not in a cave. But what is the law with hot water of caves? **In caves**, hot water that is in a cave, **one may not wash, because the chambers that have steam in them lead to sweating and are found to be like a bathhouse**.

Because water that is hot but there isn't such a great amount of sweat, it's not like a sweat, one may. But hot water of caves, even though it's also not hot water from fire, one would be able to be permitted, but it's for another reason it looks more like a bathhouse, it's more connected to the decree of bathhouses, because there the place where the entire place has much hot air and there is steam in them, and it looks like one is sweating, it looks like one is coming out of a bathhouse, or it

feels like a bathhouse, so it's within the category of the decree of bathhouses.

### Halacha 3: Warming Oneself Opposite a Fire

#### Speaker 1:

Further, more stringencies, more details that come out from this. **A person may warm himself opposite a fire**, a person may warm himself opposite a fire, **and go out and wash his entire body in cold water**, he may wash himself with cold water, even though when the cold water touches him the water becomes warm, but this one may do, this is not part of the decree of bathhouses.

**But one may not wash his entire body in cold water**, one may not come wet from cold water, **and warm himself opposite the fire**, and warm himself by the fire, **because he melts the water that is on him**, because with this he makes the water that he is already wet with become hot, and he has the same effect as a bathhouse, and he has the same effect as a bathhouse, he takes out his entire body in hot water, because in practice it comes out that he becomes covered with hot water, even if it comes to him in a reverse way, to be stringent.

### Halacha 3: A Pipe of Cold Water in Hot Water

#### Speaker 1:

Further, **one who passes a pipe of cold water through hot water**, one manages to take a pipe, make a pipe of cold water should run through hot water, it's no difference whether the hot water is hot from fire, or even when it's colder, when it's hot from hot springs of Tiberias, which hot springs of Tiberias one doesn't have the... hot springs of Tiberias itself one may wash, but a pipe of cold water that becomes hot through hot springs of Tiberias, **these are like hot water that was heated on Shabbat, and are forbidden for washing and drinking**.

Why indeed is the pipe more stringent than hot springs of Tiberias itself? The answer is because hot springs of Tiberias, the water when one goes there one doesn't go into hot water, but the water when it comes out of the pipe it's hot, and perhaps people won't know or one won't make a distinction, and water that became hot on Shabbat.

**Discussion: Reason for the Prohibition – Hatmana or Decree of Water Heated on Shabbat**

#### Speaker 2:

#### Translation

And other Jews say in the Rishonim that it's a question of hatmanah (insulation) in something that adds heat.

#### Speaker 1:

Ah, could be. As if it's also hatmanah, when you put in the water.

#### Speaker 2:

But isn't hatmanah a matter of where there are coals or where there is...

#### Speaker 1:

No, hatmanah one may not... ah...

But the Rambam doesn't say so, he says "**these are like hot water that was heated on Shabbos**".

#### Speaker 2:

He only says that it's forbidden.

#### Speaker 1:

Just like...

#### Speaker 2:

No, he says that one views the water that comes out from the pipe like hot water that was heated on Shabbos, very simple. He doesn't say what prohibition hot water that was heated on Shabbos is. We discussed earlier that they forbade bathhouses because of hot water that was heated on Shabbos, because they would heat on Shabbos. So here the Gemara found a way that it would be through a leniency through the hot springs of Tiberias, so only cooking remained, so they applied a prohibition of hot water that was heated on Shabbos, so the decree of bathhouses is still stringent in this matter that one shouldn't stumble with hot water that was heated on Shabbos. The Sages made stringencies on hot water that was heated on Shabbos, also this matter on the cold water pipe.

#### Speaker 2:

Yes.

#### Speaker 1:

Could be the Ramban only means that it has a law like hot water that was heated on Shabbos, but apparently it looks more like regular hot water, it's part of the decree of hot water that was heated on Shabbos.

#### Speaker 2:

There's no decree on hot water that was heated on Shabbos, rather the decree is on erev Shabbos.

#### Speaker 1:

No, there is a decree on hot water that was heated on Shabbos.

#### Speaker 2:

The prohibition is on that which was heated on Shabbos. They were stringent even on erev Shabbos. The decree is on that which was heated on Shabbos, the problem is that which was heated on Shabbos, not that which was heated on erev Shabbos. Because they don't trust, and they're afraid, and therefore they forbade everything.

#### Speaker 1:

Again, hot water that was heated on Shabbos is forbidden, there's no question. One may not.

#### Speaker 2:

Yes, but here it shouldn't need to be forbidden, because it wasn't heated in the hot springs of Tiberias.

#### Speaker 1:

Very good.

#### Speaker 2:

What prohibition?

#### Speaker 1:

The prohibition that they're stringent even when there isn't a prohibition of it not being a bathhouse.

#### Speaker 2:

That's a new thing, that has almost nothing to do with bathhouses.

#### Speaker 1:

True, the thing is apparently forbidden.

**Discussion: Why Forbidden for Drinking?**

#### Speaker 2:

Because look in the Mishnah it says, if it's on Shabbos it's forbidden for bathing and drinking, if it's Yom Tov it's also forbidden for bathing but permitted for drinking. Because on Yom Tov one may indeed cook for drinking, but not for bathing. But it doesn't say why it's forbidden, and he doesn't say why, he says it's another decree, it was simply another decree, just as the Kohanim learned, let's say cooking in the hot springs of Tiberias is permitted, but in such a manner one may not, why not? Because the pipe doesn't pour, because it says, it doesn't say anything about a bathhouse, what does it have to do with a bathhouse? One also may not, why may one not drink? Usually hot water that was heated on erev Shabbos one may not drink, it's simple. The thing is like hot water that was heated on Shabbos, one may not drink, but he doesn't see clearly enough why. One doesn't need to think at all why, not be concerned why, but... no hot water, means very forbidden to drink, but he doesn't say why.

#### **Halacha 4: The Measure of Heating – Until Its Coldness Is Removed**

##### **Speaker 1:**

Yes, further, "**from when may a person place a jug of water**", what one may indeed do, you shouldn't think that the decree of hot water that was heated on Shabbos goes very far, I'll tell you what one may indeed do. "**From when may a person place a jug of water and place it opposite the fire**", if it's "**not in order that it should be heated**", he doesn't place it so close or in such a way that it should become really hot, rather "**so that its coldness should be removed**", it should become less, it should go down from the cold, the cold should subside.

**And similarly**, the same thing one may do with **a jug of oil opposite the fire so that it should soften**, it should become a bit warm, **and not that it should be heated**, not that it should become really warm.

**And similarly a person may anoint his hand with water or oil**, one may anoint oneself with water or oil, **and warm opposite the fire**, one may warm oneself opposite the fire, also the same way, how? **So that the water on him shouldn't be heated**, it shouldn't become, the water that lies on him shouldn't become so hot **until a baby's belly would be burned by it**, such heat that when you place there a child's belly it will be scalded.

#### **Discussion: Is This Cooking Biblically?**

##### **Speaker 2:**

Isn't this what was stated earlier, the law of cooking, one who stands with his whole body in cold water, we're also presumably speaking when it becomes really hot. I don't know, is there a difference between hands and the whole body?

##### **Speaker 1:**

No, that is more similar to a bathhouse. One needs to know, now we're speaking forbidden about cooking, right?

##### **Speaker 2:**

No, we're not speaking about actual cooking, it's...

##### **Speaker 1:**

But further, a baby's belly would be burned by it, he says he's cooking, what is the Shabbos, what then is he doing? Now we're speaking properly about cooking. Is it perhaps cooking rabbinically?

##### **Speaker 2:**

No, I don't know, I said it's not cooking biblically, it's certainly not liable.

##### **Speaker 1:**

Yes, he's cooking, he's cooking. I don't understand, really.

##### **Speaker 2:**

It's certainly not, it doesn't mean cooking, it's only warming the water that lies on him, the bit of water that lies on his body, that doesn't mean cooking.

##### **Speaker 1:**

Not a measure? What does not cooking mean? Why doesn't it mean cooking? He went out under the hot sun, is he also cooking, because his body is being cooked? It doesn't work that way.

##### **Speaker 2:**

In the sun he won't cook? If only in the sun one could cook.

##### **Speaker 1:**

Why doesn't it mean cooking? And when he sits in a hot sauna, may one not go near a fire, just the person, because his body is being cooked, when cork is cooked. With water... that cooks itself, anointing oneself with things and standing near a fire. That's no way of cooking, that doesn't mean cooking.

#### **Laws of Cooking on Shabbos – First Vessel and Second Vessel**

##### **Cooking in the Sun**

**Speaker 1:** Hello, hello, in the sun one may cook. Why doesn't it mean cooking? And when the room is very hot, may one not go near a fire just the person, because they became cooked.

With water... why doesn't it mean cooked with water? This is a decree, it's a bit similar to cooking. Because what doesn't mean a way of cooking? Look, they bring to explain... because... ask people what cooking is. No one has cooked a soup, and anointing oneself with things, and standing near a fire. Why is... it's no way of cooking! That doesn't mean cooking!

He cooks, he places a pot near a fire, he says an hour, it cooks! He cooks the saliva of his mouth, the drop of water that must be poison. He has contempt for the Rabbis! Here it indeed becomes cooked!

##### **Warming a Garment**

Further, more things that one may do! "**One may warm a garment**" near a fire on Shabbos! One may warm a garment to place on the baby's belly to calm pains, or what? We have, we're not speaking about healing. In any case you don't have any problem with healing. But warming a garment doesn't mean any form of cooking.

You're right. Why? I already, it's a thing that healthy people sometimes do, or what?

**Speaker 2:** No, I'm speaking there about the garment.

**Speaker 1:** Perhaps warming a garment, there's no matter of washing with a garment. And it's another thing.

**Speaker 2:** Okay.

**Speaker 1:** It's also warming, we don't mean on a high level of heat. Warming.

**Speaker 2:** No difference, but even if one doesn't burn the garment, it becomes warm.

**Speaker 1:** It's already warmed and so on.

### Bathtub – First Vessel

When he pours in the cold water, the cold water becomes hot... further consequences! He sees that he pours in that... can we say that it becomes a form of cooking?! Just. It shouldn't be the level of cooking, he's going to go into it, it's not so dangerously hot! That... well, but it's a new peace of rulers. Yet it stood to cook.

Conversely one may indeed, **one may take hot water and pour into a tub of cold water**, because the tub of cold water will indeed be affected by it. All you're going to do is that the cold water will become a bit less cold, just as earlier it was **"so that it should soften, not that it should be heated"**.

Okay.

### A Pot That Was Emptied

Further. **"A pot that was emptied"**, a pot from which the water was already poured out, **one may pour into it cold water**. Why are you pouring in the cold water? Because he wants the cold water to warm up a bit from the heat that's still there in the pot. But this is also not a way of cooking like that, and it's not hot enough to cook like that.

**"And it's permitted to pour hot water into cold water, or cold into hot"**, one may pour hot water into cold water or vice versa, **"if it's not in a first vessel"**.

#### Discussion: What Is a Bathtub?

One needs to know what a bathtub is. A bathtub isn't hot enough? A bathtub is a first vessel.

**Speaker 2:** No, it was stated "one places on cold water".

**Speaker 1:** Here he says that if it's not a first vessel one may.

**Speaker 2:** Ah, if it's very hot.

**Speaker 1:** The difference is how hot it is. A bathtub is very hot, so one may not. But regular hot water isn't as hot as a bathtub?

**Speaker 2:** Yes, a second vessel isn't as hot as a bathtub.

**Speaker 1:** A bathtub is a first vessel. Sometimes there used to be fire actually under the bathtub.

He brings that bathtub means like a first vessel, what is the word? Or is a bathtub something more of a decree of bathhouses, one is somewhat more stringent on this?

**Speaker 2:** No, he doesn't come into bathhouses anymore. I think we're done with the bathhouses. Indeed it's a bathhouse, actually, but I mean that this is...

**Speaker 1:** You said a bathtub of a bathhouse.

**Speaker 2:** Yes, I'm saying it was a practical thing because this is very hot.

**Speaker 1:** I wanted to say that the bathtub is a first vessel. He brings that the holy Toras Shabbos indeed wondered, he says that today's bathhouse is never hot enough. He says that in the past it used to actually be hotter, they used to heat it more.

The Gemara says that it was dangerous, there's a blessing when one leaves a bathhouse in peace. It was yad soledes bo.

Perhaps one doesn't need to go directly into this, it was to make the illusion, whatever.

Um... yes. Hot enough for bathing, yes? Hot... in short, one may not place in a first vessel, because a first vessel does indeed make very hot. But a second vessel one may already.

### A Boiling Pot – Spices and Salt

**And similarly a boiling pot, even though it was removed from the fire**, it was already taken down from the fire, **one may not place into it spices**, because the spices will become a bit cooked from the heat of the pot. **But salt one may indeed place salt, for salt isn't cooked except on a large fire**, to cook salt it's not enough that the pot is hot, you need to have actually on fire, therefore the salt won't be cooked.

It's interesting, because I remember that salt is among the things easily cooked.

**Speaker 2:** Salt? Spices it says here.

**Speaker 1:** I don't know, they learned earlier. This is mainly the laws of cooking that one needs to learn together with the laws of cooking from earlier.

### A Second Vessel Doesn't Cook

**"And if the cooked food was poured from the pot to a bowl"**, if one pours over the cooked food from one pot to the other, **"even though it's boiling in the bowl"**, even if it's still boiling, even the pot is still... again, he pours over the cooked food from the pot to the bowl, **"even though it's boiling in the bowl"**, even if it's still hot in the plate, in the plate one may already place spices, **one may indeed place spices, for a second vessel doesn't cook**. Even if it's still hot, but it's already in the bowl, in the plate, it's already a second vessel, and regarding a second vessel there's a rule it doesn't cook.

Interesting, yes, it says here **"even though it's boiling"**, here one sees clearly that a second vessel doesn't cook even when it's very hot. Yes.

#### Discussion: Bathtub and Second Vessel

Further, one must indeed argue about the bathtub, which he brings earlier, that there are those who say that perhaps a bathtub is indeed. In short, we don't know. But here it's also difficult, if it's very boiling, if there's a level, today when one can measure every level of heat one can test precisely how many degrees it is, what does first vessel and second vessel have to do with it? He says here also **"even though it's boiling"**, even if it's boiling. Here is a rule, a second vessel doesn't cook. Because it's going to become cold in a second, no standing heat remains. Do I have time for this? Perhaps it's not enough to be cooking. I understand this already, that's how I understand this. Do you also understand this way?

**Speaker 2:** No.

**Speaker 1:** What don't you understand?

**Speaker 2:** On the fire it cooks constantly.

**Speaker 1:** But he's speaking even if it's not on the fire.

**Speaker 2:** That's even if it's not on the fire one may not. Even if one removed it from the fire one may not.

**Speaker 1:** But in the bowl one may.

**Speaker 2:** It became colder. There's no such thing.

**Speaker 1:** But it doesn't depend on it becoming colder, that's what I'm saying. It's a rule that a second vessel doesn't cook.

Because if someone pours out from a very very hot pot, it can be much hotter in the second vessel than in the first pot from which you less hot. Because in modern times one can use temperature on everything, and one can set temperature, and one can check that there are many times when the second or

third or fifth plate is hotter than the first plate. It will depend on a million details, how long it cooked on the fire, and so on.

Do you understand what I'm saying? Do you understand what I'm saying? A second vessel doesn't cook, that's a rule. I don't understand what you're saying such a thing. You can measure, take a meter and see, if you find me a second vessel that's hotter than a first vessel, I'll give you a prize. There's no such thing. The fact is that it becomes colder. There's no such thing.

**Speaker 2:** I don't agree with you. Someone should take a meter, you can actually measure, and see that the second vessel is colder.

### Asafoetida – Soaking Spices

**Speaker 1:** And we learned earlier, asafoetida is spices that one mixes with water.

And we learned by healing that asafoetida is spices that one kneads with water. One may not do this, **one may not soak it, whether in hot or in cold.**

Why?

Because this is a way of cooking it, preparing food.

**Speaker 2:** Cold water? With cold water one can't cook anything.

**Speaker 1:** Asafoetida. Ah, where am I here?

Could be it's a topic of healing? We learned earlier that asafoetida one makes for healing. And it says that it's in the manner that they do in everything. Not clear.

**Speaker 2:** It can't be cooking in cold water, that one certainly can't say.

**Speaker 1:** Cooking, perhaps this is a way of preparing the food.

**Speaker 2:** Ah, it could be that it's something similar to fixing.

**Speaker 1:** But a regular thing that isn't, it's not a Shabbos thing, by crushed and by ground, **"but one may soak it in vinegar"**, one may indeed soak it in vinegar.

### Asafoetida – When One Is Already in the Middle of Treatment

The Rambam says a law, interesting, why would they have learned not with the exact same words, **"and it's permitted to drink Thursday and Friday"**, if one has already started drinking from the asafoetida, one is already in the middle of the regimen of the treatment, **"one may soak it on Shabbos in cold water"**, one may indeed soak it, they permitted that one should indeed soak it in cold water, **and one may even place it in the sun until it warms**, one can place it in the sun so it should become a bit warm while eating, why? **"So that it shouldn't cease if he stops drinking"**, because if one is already in the middle of drinking something, one started a treatment and one stops, it's a danger. Not an actual danger, a danger would have been permitted as danger, it's not healthy, it's a problem, therefore they were more lenient that although one may not generally even in cold water, they indeed permitted if one already started eating it before Shabbos. Not a matter of deadly poison, but because it's already more important they were lenient, just as we learned earlier that this is the reason. Very good.

### There Is No Cooking After Cooking – Already Cooked Things

**"Something that was cooked before Shabbos"**, a thing that was already cooked before Shabbos, **"or soaked in hot water before Shabbos"**, or soaked in hot water before Shabbos, **"even if it cooled"**, even if it cooled afterward, **"it's permitted to soak it in hot water on Shabbos"**, one may place it back to soak with hot water on Shabbos, because once it was already cooked, it doesn't become cooked again.

### Laws of Shabbat - Cooking on Shabbat: Pouring from a Kli Rishon, Sun and Derivatives of Sun, Salting and Pickling

**But something that is cold from the outset and has never been in hot water**, something that is cold and has never yet been heated, one may not soak it in hot water, **but one may rinse it with hot water**, one may indeed rinse it with hot water, **if this rinsing is not the completion of its preparation**, something where the rinsing doesn't make it finally edible, it's already food as is, but he wants to wash it because it's better when it's a little less cold, when it's a bit warm, that one may do, because it doesn't become cooked from washing, from giving it a rinse, from pouring hot water on it once. **But one may not soak it in hot water**, soaking in hot water, that one may not do. But here there is indeed some concern, a bit of cooking, rabbinic cooking, or it looks like cooking.

Why? Kli rishon, kli sheni, the Rambam doesn't say. He says "b'chamin", in a pot. So obviously one may not, right? When he says "lishrot", he apparently means even in a kli sheni. Makes sense?

### Laws of Shabbat - Cooking on Shabbat: Pouring from a Kli Rishon, Sun and Derivatives of Sun, Salting and Pickling

#### Pouring from a Kli Rishon and Kli Sheni

**Speaker 1:** Because kli sheni doesn't cook? I don't know. Perhaps chamin is kli rishon? Why does he say chamin? In a kli rishon one may... What does washing mean? Washing is already... Wait, washing is not a kli rishon, true. Because he pours it. Because one pours it.

In short, the one who says that pouring from a kli rishon is like a kli rishon, that's one thing. But the Rambam doesn't explicitly state that. Does he say that one may indeed not soak even in a kli sheni? What is it, does kli sheni cook? A spice? He asks on this. The person, the Tosafot says that it's different, not the way of cooking.

#### Law 9: Sun and Derivatives of Sun

**Speaker 1:** Further, **it is permitted to warm cold water in the sun so they will warm.** One may put out water so it will become warm. Even though this is the law, one may not warm in derivatives of the sun. One may not warm in sand that has become hot from the sun. Derivatives of the sun looks more like... That is, a person who sees that one is cooking in hot sand, will think that the sand was heated in an oven.

So, even though one may not do it in derivatives of the sun, but in the sun itself one may. **Because a person will not come to err from sun to fire.** No one will make a mistake, one sees someone cooking something under the heat of the sun, and think it doesn't look like fire. But the derivatives can indeed look like it.

**Therefore, it is permitted to place cold water in the sun so they will warm.** One may put out water so it will

become warm. **And likewise, one places good water into bad water so they will cool.** One may take a bottle of good water, water that is suitable, and place it in warm water that is not good water, so the water will stay cool.

**And likewise one places a cooked dish into a pit so it will cool.** One may place a cooked dish in a well, in a basement under the ground it's cool. One may place a cooked dish in a place where it keeps the temperature cool, or even warm, if the pit is warmer than outside, for example it's winter and you know...

**Discussion: Why is it a novelty that one needs to cool it?**

**Speaker 2:** Why is it a novelty that one needs to cool it? Why shouldn't one be able to cool it?

**Speaker 1:** Okay.

**Speaker 2:** Why shouldn't one be allowed to place a cooked dish into a pit? One may, so... Why does he need to say it?

**Speaker 1:** I don't know.

Ah, he brings that in the Commentary on the Mishnah the Rambam says that there's no fear of shevut gumot, that he's now going to busy himself with a pit. In the well.

**Speaker 2:** In the well, yes.

**Speaker 1:** Aha. By a freezer there's also no question.

**Speaker 2:** Yes.

**Speaker 1:** Okay. Um... yes.

#### **Law 10: One Mixes Water and Salt and Oil**

**Speaker 1:** Further, **one mixes water...** More things that have to do with rabbinic cooking, what one may and what one may not. **One mixes water and salt and oil,** he may make such a mixture of salt-water with oil, **and dips his bread in it,** to dip his bread, make such a dip, **and puts it into the cooked dish. As long as he doesn't make a lot,** one can only make smaller amounts of this. **But a lot is forbidden because it looks like doing the work of cooking.**

It looks like he's engaged in cooking, we know that he's not engaged in cooking, he's preparing a simple thing that doesn't need to be cooked. But if one makes things for a large gathering, it looks like there's cooking going on. That is, apparently this sort of sauce is usually something that one cooks with. He says "noseh melachta tavshil", if one makes a large amount of this, it looks like he's busy in the kitchen, he's busy with making.

**Speaker 2:** Not busy in the kitchen, he may be busy in the kitchen.

**Speaker 1:** This indicates that this sort of thing usually isn't just for dipping bread, usually one makes it for cooking the vegetables for the cholent, I don't know what.

#### **Mei Melach Azin**

**Speaker 1:** **"And one should not make mei melach azin"** - one should not make strong salt water. What is strong salt water? **"Two or three parts salt to three parts water"**, such water that is salted, **"and it looks like making pickles"**. Because that's the way one makes pickles. Pickles is when one takes salt water with fish.

Here even though the fish part isn't there, and wait, when one makes pickles that would be cooking. Ah, we're already seeing that pickling is a rabbinic form of cooking. So when one makes pickles and soaks it in salt water, one would thereby prepare the fish. That's the way, fish one can either cook with fire or

with salt water. That's a form of cooking that the rabbis forbade, but they even forbade the salt water for it.

#### **Salting an Egg and Radish**

**Speaker 1:** **"And it is permitted to salt an egg"** - one may salt an egg, a whole one. It also does, it affects the egg, it makes it better. But what may one not? He comes to take, what may one not? **"But a radish and the like"**, a radish or a sharp thing where the salt makes it so it will become better, it will become fully edible, one may not salt, **"because it looks like pickling pickles on Shabbat"**. Because with this it looks like someone who is soaking, or someone making pickles, someone soaking vegetables in salt water.

**"And pickling is forbidden because it's like cooking"**. Pickling, since this is the way, this is its way of cooking, things that couldn't be cooked, so this is the way of cooking them. Therefore it's called kevush kemevushal, and it was forbidden rabbinically. But salted like cooked is not the same thing.

#### **Discussion: What may one indeed do with radish?**

**Speaker 2:** What may one indeed do with the radish? One may not soak, but pouring a bit of salt or dipping a bit in salt one may.

**Speaker 1:** **"It is permitted to place into salt, food during one's meal"**, one may dip into salt. But we're talking here about having more radish and salting it for a larger gathering, not what he needs now for eating, one may not.

**Speaker 2:** Tell me something that one may not do because of this law. Making, taking a bunch of cucumbers and making pickles, placing in a jar. That's proper pickling, that's certainly forbidden. But what is the law?

**Speaker 1:** "Lo yochal", taking a whole bowl of radish and salting them, one may not. But **"the like in salt"**, dipping a bit in salt, one may. So if one serves a large salad, I don't know what is a thing with a lot... Okay, here it becomes the details, what happens for several people, "during one's meal".

He says that one may not salt radish. It is permitted **"the like in salt and eat"**. The distinction is not between salting or dipping, the distinction is the thing because he's going to eat now.

**Speaker 2:** What occurs to you? Because one puts the salt on it, one puts it on the salt. Yes, the distinction. Yes, because... Not the salt to the ingredients.

You make it for yourself alone? Okay, no problem. It says that one may not salt, even we're not talking ever.

**Speaker 1:** No, the word is there "the food". One may. While eating one may.

**Speaker 2:** I remember that it says but not. It says that it's forbidden. There's a special permission that an egg, one may put salt in the eggs with onion, whatever, and the salt, one needs to have a permission for this. But to put on other things, it says that one may not because it's noticeable.

If it's kevush kevushim actually, that it says, I mean that it's also forbidden rabbinically, but that's certain. But here it says another level, that one may not salt. I don't know what is the meaning of radish, radish is a retach, he said. One may not salt, not salt like one actually makes pickles, that's actually pickling, but even a thing that is just salted, that looks like pickling pickles. It sounds like one may not salt vegetables basically.

The distinction is not between whether one puts the salt on the thing, because one may indeed spread salt and put on the thing no.

**Speaker 1:** No, that's the same thing. The distinction is not between salting and dipping, but the distinction is between just salting and for food. Salting for eating.

**Speaker 2:** No, he doesn't say the permission. No, it doesn't say that. The distinction is with salting one, or with salting and with dipping. Dipping means with dipping.

Because it's hard I say that you what there's no distinction from which one puts on. Dipping means dipping. But if one takes a bowl and puts on salt, understand one puts it from above on the prints, that's forbidden, that's the meaning.

**Speaker 1:** Very good.

#### **Law 11: Wine and Honey and Peppers**

**Speaker 1: It is permitted to mix wine and honey and peppers on Shabbat to eat.** One may mix together wine, honey and peppers, wine, honey and spices, white pepper, on Shabbat to eat. Because that's a way of eating, that is perhaps it's not the usual way of eating, but this one may.

**But Persian wine is forbidden, because its way is not to eat it except for the sick.** This is not something that healthy people eat, one eats it for healing. So it's forbidden.

**Discussion: Why does it say this here and not by healing?**

**Speaker 2:** Interesting why he says it here, why he doesn't say it by healing? But here it looks with the word because it's a healing, therefore it's already not a thing that one may do. If it's not actually healing it should indeed say earlier. If it's something else... Okay.

Perhaps it's the benefit because of the... Perhaps he says, he explains that even when the person makes it indeed to eat, but usually balsam oil, he says that it's an expensive thing. The Gemara says that this is rare for the righteous, I don't know what... Rivers of balsam, because it's an expensive thing that normally a person only indulges in for healing, therefore it looks like it's indeed a healing. Okay, but it's a...

**Speaker 1:** Yes, true, it could have said in the law of healing, yes. Okay.

#### **Law 12: Mustard**

**Speaker 1:** And the next thing is, **mustard that was kneaded on erev Shabbat.** Ah, mustard, a type of vegetable. I don't know, is this what we call mustard? I don't know. But what we have already is something, it's made from a...

**Speaker 2:** No, because it is... Mustard is a thing, small things that you buy, and one makes from it such a paste like that.

**Speaker 1:** Okay, that was kneaded on erev Shabbat is like this,

#### **Laws of Shabbat: Shevutim from Baking, Shearing, and Whitening**

##### **Mustard, Cress, Garlic – Preparation of Foods on Shabbat (continued)**

**Speaker 1:** Okay, but this is a true law of healing, yes. Okay. And the next?

Good. **"Mustard that was kneaded on erev Shabbat."** Mustard, a type of vegetable, is this what we call mustard? I don't know. Yes, but what we have already is already a fine

thing, it's already made from a new thing. But this is a type of thing that one makes from it such a paste. Okay. **"That was kneaded on erev Shabbat"**, is like this, **"for tomorrow"**, if one has already left it, one may finish. One may the next day on Shabbat one may crush it a bit by hand, with a utensil, and add the water, because that's not called a preparation of food that is similar to cooking. We already said certain things that one may not. But what does one not do? **"And one should not beat it"**, but he may not shake it up in a professional way like one shakes up things during the week, **"but rather mix"**, one should mix it in a weaker way. Like earlier we had sheti v'erev versus just mixing.

**"Cress"**, some sort of sharp plant, I saw it doesn't say, **"that was crushed on erev Shabbat"**, one already crushed it, another similar thing, yes, everything that one already crushed on erev Shabbat, also **"tomorrow one places in it oil and vinegar and spices"**, one may finish making from it a salad on Shabbat, but also the same thing, one may not strongly mix it, **"and one should not beat it but rather mix"**, one should not do what is called terifa, which is a stronger mixing, **"but rather mix"**.

**"Garlic that was crushed on erev Shabbat"**, garlic that one already crushed on erev Shabbat, **"tomorrow one places in it groats"**, one may, they had a food of some bundles with crushed garlic, one may do it on Shabbat, **"and one should not grind"**, but he should not grind the garlic, even when it's already a bit crushed, one may not grind it, which already has a Gemara, apparently the grinding wouldn't simply be actual grinding, this is all rabbinic, **"but rather mix"**, he should only mix it in such a weaker way. It's very funny, this whole group of laws. And preparing food that is not cooking.

#### **The Principle: "It Looks Like Doing Work for the Work of Cooking"**

It could be that it's all still part of the rabbis understood that it's all still part of the "looks like cooking". Like he said the first, by the, what's it called, the first thing that we learned, that it's not things that one puts into the fire. But it could be that it has perhaps to do with too much, too much work that it looks like one is making for a cooked dish. Like, no, before that, what did he say? I forgot. **"That it looks like doing work for the work of cooking"**. That. Yes, the **"one mixes water, what looks like doing work for the work of cooking"**. So there is such language by the laws of Yom Tov, right?

It could be that it's not very funny, a bit is kneading, a bit is healing. Perhaps all these things the rabbis understood that it's perhaps so, one may work in the kitchen but not too much. If one works too much, it shouldn't look like one is doing one of the labors of cooking. **"Labor of cooking"** essentially means cooking. This is a preparation for cooking. It looks like he's doing either kneading, or threshing, or one of the labors of cooking, one of the labors of the order of bread. And this is all under the rabbis is a question of freedom. That's what I think.

But they say **"labor for the labor of cooking"** means the category of labors that is for baking. It's not baking itself or one of the steps. It will come to baking, or it's perhaps so to... Like the Rambam says, it looks, it's rabbinic prohibitions that it looks or that it will bring. There are things that it will look, here what it will bring.

Good. We've done the Torah labors, I mean the rabbinic labors that are from the family of cooking. Now we're going to learn, we're holding by shearing. We begin with this the labors of preparing the wool of an animal until it becomes parchment. Now we'll see the rabbis' of it.

### Gozez – Cutting Hair from the Human Body

#### Law 13: Shearing Human Hair

**Speaker 1:** The Rambam says like this, gozez usually means cutting off the wool from the animal. What? Until it becomes clothing, yes. Parchment is tzad tzvi, you're right. Good, the Rambam says like this: **"One who removes hair from the human body is also liable for shearing."** That is, the essence, the primary labor, the explanation is cutting hair from a living being, but also cutting hair from the human body is also liable for shearing. This is also a bit of a novelty, because when one thinks of shearing the order is that one cuts off to make a product, but this is also under the same category that it's shearing, a toladah, it's Torah law.

#### Washing with Something that Removes Hair – Psik Reisha by Shearing

**Speaker 1:** **"Therefore"**, the Rambam says like this, **"therefore"**, because of this, is like this, let's remember that there's something called "davar she'eino mitkaven", which the Rambam explained at the beginning of the Laws of Shabbat, something that one has no intention, for example one drags a bench, one doesn't intend to make a groove, so davar she'eino mitkaven is permitted. But if it's a psik reisha, it will certainly bring the result of making a groove, one doesn't do it.

The Rambam says like this: **"Therefore it is forbidden to wash one's hands with something that certainly removes hair, such as aloe and the like."** Because of this one doesn't do it, because cutting off hair is shearing, washing the hands with a sharp thing that will certainly remove the hair is also the same thing forbidden, because even if he won't intend it, it's however like a psik reisha.

#### Translation

But one may wash one's hair, one may - washing one's hair is the same thing as washing, bathing - but one may rub one's hands or something **"with frankincense ash and with pepper ash and with spice ash"**, with types of dust from the types of frankincense, peppers, and types of spices, **"and the like"**. By the way, they can also sometimes remove hair from the hands, they are also sharp, but **"and he need not be concerned lest he remove the hair of his hand"**, he doesn't need to be concerned that perhaps it will remove it, **"since this is not his intention"**, he is not intending it, he only does it to clean his hands. So even if it will indeed come out, it will be a davar she'eino mitkaven (unintentional act) without a psik reisha (inevitable consequence), so it's permitted.

#### Discussion: Mixture of Hair-Removing Substance – Law of Majority

**Speaker 1:** What happens if one mixed two types? One mixed the material that is sharp that definitely removes hair with that which doesn't? **"If one mixed something that definitely removes hair with something that definitely doesn't remove"**, says the Rambam one must follow the majority. **"If the majority is from that which doesn't definitely remove and it was mixed in, it's permitted. And if not, it's forbidden."** He says, it appears that one follows the

majority, because one would have had to say that one must check the mixture whether it tears out. It doesn't matter to me what it comes from. Is that what he means?

**Speaker 2:** No, because then it wouldn't be nullified.

**Speaker 1:** If it were tested every Shabbos, every Shabbos it came out, and he knows that it becomes a psik reisha, it's interesting that one follows the majority. He doesn't mean actual majority, he means that one checks whether it's torn out. I would have thought that this makes it even a psik reisha. I mean that if it's one hundred percent a psik reisha, the question doesn't even begin, one doesn't even need the law. I hold that it's a thing because it's almost every time, so majority.

If the ingredient is very powerful and it causes the entire mixture to tear out hair, or it's not so powerful, it's a doubt. But if he knows, let's say clearly, majority is a question of doubt. If he knows that it's anyway forbidden, if he knows the fact that it's not a psik reisha, one doesn't need to have any law for this. But it's very interesting, because such a thing I wouldn't go with majority, it doesn't go with nullification by majority. One must go to whether it will indeed tear out or not. But he doesn't know, just like people who don't know. If it's a very sharp material, it won't help that it will be in the majority. I see that for people it's the same that one can rely. Not a psik reisha, yes. It's most of the time, one can rely. But with most labors there's no question.

#### Discussion: Distinction Between "Washing" and "Hair-Washing"

**Speaker 1:** Further, another rabbinic prohibition that is from the family of shearing. Says the Rambam, **"It is forbidden to wash in dye water on Shabbos"**. Yes, yes. The first is, why is it rabbinic for example? It should be a psik reisha, it becomes biblical. It removes the leniency of davar she'eino mitkaven. I don't know, I see that it says "lest". It appears that it's not biblical, not actual. Perhaps because of this the majority helps. I don't know what to say. It says here "lest". Ah, "lest". No, "therefore it is forbidden to wash this blood, and not lest". It's a decree because of shearing. The second is "he suspects". "Forbidden" doesn't mean liable, right? Forbidden rabbinically, it's not a prohibition. Why is it rabbinic? It's not the normal way of shearing, that the leniency would be for other reasons. Perhaps with the second it says oil. Ah, oil with soap in mixture. Perhaps it's a causative. It doesn't need to be a direct action. It's causative. Perhaps the rule doesn't fall out at the time of the action. It's a sharp thing that will bring out hair. I don't know. Not clear.

You also see, **"it is forbidden to wash"** means even to wash oneself, and **"it is permitted"** he says **"to wash one's hair"**, which presumably means more than. When it's a thing that this one may even rub one's hands. Yes, I mean that it's a similar thing. Okay. But let's go further.

**Speaker 2:** Perhaps he switches the word "to wash hair" to "to wash"? I don't know if there's a distinction, but...

**Speaker 1:** Okay, further.

**Speaker 2:** I mean "to wash hair" is a word that's used a lot, like hair-washing. Yes, hair-washing means washing with two. Yes, washing with two is called hair-washing. Perhaps it means rubbing or something like that, but in practice it's the same thing, no?

**Speaker 1:** Yes, further.

**Law 14: Metal Mirror – Decree Because of Shearing**

**Speaker 1:** Another thing that the Sages forbade because of shearing. Says the Rambam thus: **"It is forbidden to look in a metal mirror on Shabbos."** One may not look at a mirror that is made of metal. It appears that in ancient times they used to have a mirror that has a sharp edge, so that while one looks in the mirror one can fix oneself, cut hair or such sorts of things with the sharpness of the metal mirror. Because **"it is a decree lest he pluck with it fine hairs from the sparse hair"**, he will tear out small pieces of his hair, of his beard, with the mirror. Because the mirror can be used, it's a metal mirror. **"And even if it's attached to the wall"**, even if it hangs on the wall, but he can give it a take down and use it. **"But a mirror that is not of metal, it is permitted to look in it"**, because there's no way how... The decree doesn't go that he will now go bring a hair and cut. They are stringent when it's a thing that can lead to a melacha (forbidden labor). **"But a mirror that is not of metal it is permitted to look in it, even if it's not attached"**, because one cannot cut with it.

Very good. You see that it was the case. It's not simple that he tells him you may not comb your hair, you may not look in a mirror because he will take a hair. The mirror is already a double-function thing. It's already a mirror that is... Let's say, one can use it, even if it's not exactly the case, but one can use it. Then there is a decree. Yes, I understand, but it's not an ultra-clear thing. Attached to the wall he says yes seemingly that one doesn't use it. It's not exactly so. But still this is not entirely little, one can give it a knock down, it hangs from time to time and a knock.

**Whitening – Cleaning**

**Speaker 1:** Okay, let's learn the law of whitening. Whitening means cleaning. In the 39 melachos (categories of forbidden labor) it is, after shearing was wool, one cleans it so that one can begin making the threads and goods.

**The Labor of Laundering – Wringing, Sponge, and Saving Wine on Shabbos****The Labor of Laundering and One Who Wrings Laundry**

So thus, **one who launders**, when someone washes out a garment, he is liable for whitening. It's the same thing as whitening. Whitening is taking dirty wool and making it clean, and the same thing every time a person washes a garment on Shabbos.

**And one who wrings laundry**, when someone squeezes out the wetness from the laundry, he is also liable for laundering. It's a type of way of washing. That is, when the garment is wet, it's as if dirty, as if it's not ready, and with this one prepares the garment.

This is still, I mean what did they learn that it's still part of the laundering? Still part of the laundering is to squeeze out the dirty water. Okay, further.

**Rabbinic Prohibition – Pushing a Rag into the Mouth of a Tube**

Therefore, what is the rabbinic prohibition? The rabbinic prohibition is even when the biblical prohibition isn't. But what is the rabbinic prohibition? The rabbinic prohibition is that even when one squeezes out a garment, a piece of cloth, not as part of the laundering, because one wants to clean it, but for other reasons, but water comes out, one may not.

**Therefore, it is forbidden to push**, one may not squeeze, **a rag or cotton wool and the like into the mouth of a tube**. What does this squeezing mean? It means he doesn't squeeze in order to remove the water. To push in, in order to be able to put into a bottle. He wants to make a stopper for a bottle, he takes a wet rag and he puts it into the bottle **in order to seal it, lest he come to wringing**.

Because this is even further, it's not even yet wet, but it will lead to squeezing. How does it mean? He puts a cloth into the stopper, aha, yes, so he brings. It will become wet, because there's a bottle full of drink, and afterwards he will need to squeeze it out. He will put it back in, take it in, and every time he will take in and take out the stopper, he will do wringing.

Okay, this is rabbinic. Another thing, yes, it says one may not put in even a dry piece of rag into a bottle, because it will become wet as a bottle stopper, it will become a stopper. Because every time when one will take in and take out the stopper, one will squeeze. So not specifically wringing, it's only rabbinic, because wringing is not a part of laundering, it's another sort of thing, it's only a decree, one will squeeze it.

**Wiping with a Sponge – Dispute of the Rambam and the Raavad**

Says the Rambam further, **"And one may not wipe with a sponge**, one may not wipe oneself with a sponge, **unless it has a handle**, unless the sponge has a handle, **so that he won't wring"**.

The Rambam says indeed, when one grabs the sponge one squeezes, and every time one squeezes it's wringing. But if it has a handle, a handle, one doesn't put the hands directly on the sponge.

**The Position of the Raavad**

But the Raavad argues, the Raavad disputes, he says that simply when you understand wiping with a sponge, one means that a person is wet, yes? He uses it like a towel.

So, the Raavad... One can understand even in the Rambam like the Raavad, we're talking here about a sponge that is not soaked wet, the sponge one uses now to wipe oneself. But if it doesn't have a handle, there where he will put his hand, where he grabs it a bit stronger, there he squeezes.

But the Raavad says no, that a sponge is indeed a sponge that can hold in itself much water, it's soaked with water. One uses it. Says the Raavad a novelty, a great novelty, that when it has a handle, I don't look at it like a garment that is wet and when one squeezes it out one transgresses wringing, because one uses out water. I look at it like a vessel. Here is a way of holding water in a bottle, or here is a way of holding water in a sponge.

The handle makes clear that this is not a garment but it's a sponge. Wringing is only forbidden because it's a type of part of laundering, he says that it's not joining any laundering. It's not a decree of wringing. Wringing is a type of laundering. If it's not a garment, there isn't in this any concept of wringing. So explains the Raavad simply.

**The Position of the Rambam**

Because the Rambam doesn't learn so. The handle makes it out a garment, basically. This is what the Raavad says. But the Rambam understood simply so, that as if the Rambam holds that when one wipes with the sponge without the handle, then you press on the garment, on the sponge, you squeeze. But

when you use it with a handle, not specifically you will squeeze the garment.

This is what the Raavad is very difficult. The Raavad is right, that how can it be? You use it indeed for something.

### Question: Wringing of Threshing with a Sponge

One must know also, why shouldn't it be another type of wringing from threshing? Okay, we haven't yet explained the wringing of threshing. But if it's true that they can soak in and afterwards you take it back out... Wringing of threshing is with fruits, you want to remove the juice.

Right, but you don't want to squeeze this. For example, I just saw exactly how one used to, for example, have water from salt water. People traveled on a ship, and all water is salt water, they boiled the water from the sea, and put a large sponge from above, and the steam should go into the... Only the pure water comes out, and afterwards they drank from the sponge. For example, such a manner, because it was actual wringing. A sponge one can... Because he wants to remove the liquid that is soaked in, just like you want to remove the wine that is soaked in the grapes.

They haven't found such a type of wringing until now. Why not? They found olives and grapes, olives and grapes mulberries and pomegranates, the three levels of wringing. But then it's because you make a new thing. You remove the liquid, you make from grapes you make wine.

When you remove, even in your case, when this is perhaps separating, I already know, even in your case, I don't see that this is the same sort of thing. And in the Rambam we haven't yet seen such a type of wringing. But not in the Rambam, it means, how should we know that there are two types of squeezing? There is squeezing that is a derivative of threshing, and there is squeezing that is a derivative of whitening. How do you see squeezing fruits, but not squeezing a garment? When he squeezes the garment, he doesn't remove the water from the garment.

And let's see further.

### Covering a Barrel with an Unprepared Garment

**One may not cover a barrel of oil and the like with a garment that is not designated for it.** A garment that is not designated for this one may not hang to cover a barrel, **a decree lest he wring.** Because it's indeed not designated for it, he will want to use it afterwards for other things, he will squeeze it out.

It's actually very similar to a wet cloth. But there it's more understandable, because he will take it away and he will want to remove the wine from the squeezed, it will actually be laundering. With a wet cloth the explanation is that it will become wet because it will stick into the bottle. Here he puts it from above, and when one wants to take something one takes it off, but it's wet, and he will take it away he will squeeze it out indeed.

### His Barrel Broke on Shabbos – Saving Wine

**His barrel broke on Shabbos.** Another decree that was made, a further decree of lest he wring. One says thus, **his barrel broke on Shabbos**, a person had his barrel break on Shabbos, a barrel of wine, and he wants to save from this, just like earlier someone wanted to save from bread that lies on the manure, he wants to save wine that spilled from the barrel.

There are in this boundaries, one cannot save the wine simply so, there are in this boundaries and fences.

So thus, **one may save from it food for three meals for him and his guests**, one may save how much one needs for him and for his guests. **But provided that he doesn't soak up with wine or smear with oil.** One cannot take, one cannot soak up the wine with garments and afterwards wash it out, or in a sponge, soak in a sponge and afterwards remove it from it and have from it the wine. Or fill the hands with oil and afterwards scrape the oil from the hands. Because these things are **lest he prepare a vessel that he can wring**, one fears that he will use the sponge.

Here you see that the sponge can be a wringing. Wringing of laundering? No, this is another type of wringing. This cannot be not the sponge. No, he wants the wringing again, soaking up with wine, with a sponge. And afterwards squeeze it out. That itself is not wringing, but later he squeezed out the sponge for another reason.

What does it mean? Again. "Soaking up with wine", what does it mean? He soaks in more wine with the sponge, because he wants to go and afterwards squeeze it out. I fear, but not a wringing of winepress, this is not a wringing of winepress, but I fear he will make a wringing that is indeed there winepress. I mean that what he said earlier is there winepress, it appears. Or perhaps he is engaged in such a thing, during the week he began to do it. I don't know.

### A Vessel Placed Under It – Catching / Directing

Okay, how may one indeed? A way that there isn't any winepress, any wringing, he may place a vessel underneath. He may place underneath a vessel and save what runs out from the barrel.

What should he not do though? Even when he places a vessel, here one added another prohibition. Indeed, one added one decree of not placing sponges or garments, because "lest he come to wring". And afterwards one added another prohibition, that even from the vessel one also may not stand with the vessel and hold it under the barrel that is dripping wine, "and catch" and catch the wine that runs out because he holds the vessel, and afterwards "another vessel and direct", or one may not.

And another thing that one may not do, one also may not place underneath a vessel that it should run "through" the vessel, make the vessel should be the... Earlier was a vessel placed under it, now he speaks of placing a vessel that he should make a little "waterfall" or "whatever", make that the spilled wine should run a certain way that it should land somewhere where he wants it to land. This one may not.

Why? Because if one will permit the thing, it is **a decree "lest he bring vessels through the public domain"**, he will want to have more vessels so that he can save, and he does it indeed more "actively". When he places under a vessel that should save what runs out, he is not there and not so "active" in the "operation" of saving, one doesn't fear. But once he will stand...

### Laws of Shabbos – Saving Wine from Fire and Laundering on Shabbos

#### Saving Wine – One Vessel Versus Many

**Speaker 1:**

No, two things. One, stand under the vessel and catch the wine as it pours out. Or bring a second vessel. What's the difference? What does "koleit" mean? That he holds it? "Yiklot" means he holds the vessel. Yes, he holds the vessel and he catches the wine as it runs out. And "keli acher v'tzoref" means to place a vessel there where it runs, so that it should run in a certain way. He makes a waterfall system so that the wine should then run in the way you want it to run in.

Because the thing is, the simple meaning is, here he is very active in an operation of saving. He came, he brought a tall vessel to the reshus harabim, he placed it underneath, he placed the vessel, he forgot about it, he's not active in saving.

#### **Difference Between Bread and Wine Regarding Inviting Guests**

But we explained the matter, earlier we learned by bread that one may invite guests and say "come save for yourselves." By wine this was not permitted, only when one has guests. Even more so, ah. So, he says, "**nisdabru l'orchim**". You mean to say, he doesn't invite other people here. There he can say to strangers, "save also for yourselves, for yourselves for Shabbos," and they can come take challos for Shabbos. But here it says that only the person may save as much as he needs for himself and for his guests. He cannot bring guests. Perhaps he doesn't want to give it away to other people. Could be.

Further. Let's see further. This is so, "**nisdabru l'orchim**". But if guests came to him, that means when he is a person alone he may only take one vessel, place one vessel for himself because he needs it. But if there are guests, yes, each guest, he may place a vessel according to how many guests he has. He may bring "**keli acher v'koleit**", or he may do "**keli acher u'metzoref l'rishon**", because he's saving for the guests, he's saving for Shabbos. It could be, the point is like when he wants to save the wine because he doesn't want to have a loss, it's a weekday matter. But he's not allowed to save anyway except a little bit.

Right, l'chatchila one is not allowed. The point is something that when he has more guests... or did "**nisdabru l'orchim**" come with the guests? Again, there are two things. One may only save as much as one needs for oneself and for the guests. There was a second condition, the saving may also only be done with one vessel, placing one vessel. He says, when there are guests one may indeed bring more vessels because he needs to save more. Okay.

#### **Order of Events – Saving and Inviting Guests**

But he says, this is only when he actually has guests, but "**v'lo yiklot v'yachzor v'yazmin**" – he may not go catch more wine and then say, "okay, I'll call guests." Rather, the opposite, what may one indeed do? He may go call guests in order to be able to save, "**yazminenu v'achar kach yiklot**".

#### **Deception in This Matter – Permitted**

Says the Rambam, "**v'im herim b'davar zeh**", he made a trick, he didn't really want the guests, he only wanted the guests in order to be able to save, it's permitted. There are many times where one may not be merim, one may not make a trick, one may not outsmart the Torah, but here one may indeed, because I think how certain commentators on the Rambam learn it, it's only a decree that he goes bringing vessels through the reshus harabim, but if he does it in a permitted manner, and this reminds him that he's not here on an operation to save his wine, he's here to have wine for

Shabbos, even if it's taken through a trick, but he does it in a permitted manner, that he does it for guests, it's permitted.

#### **Speaker 2:**

Perhaps trick means that he doesn't give it in the end to the guests, he only invites them in and he doesn't give them?

#### **Speaker 1:**

No, that's indeed a trick, that's indeed a clever... What does it mean he'll invite guests? "Why should I invite guests? I just won't find any guests, I honored them but they didn't drink." What are you saying?

Again, inviting means inviting to drink. Inviting and not giving means not invited, that's just calling out names. A person shouldn't go placing many vessels, or calculating the names of the meals and placing, but inviting guests so that it can be caught, this stands in the frame, it says explicitly, "**yazminenu v'achar kach yiklot**".

So herim is another sort of... that's what herim means! Herim means that even if he didn't really mean it for the guests, he meant to save during the... the guests will drink it. And in practice he saved much more wine than he needed for the guests. What does he say? He says he helps them, that he doesn't have to drink it, that if I give a guest fish and he doesn't eat it, which is also Shabbos preparations, but I mean, what do I do? I mean, it's not clear.

#### **Discussion: Why Is There a Difference Between Bread and Wine?**

#### **Speaker 2:**

What do we hear here, that a Jew has some Shabbos food, that's going to go out and it's going to be lost, what should he do? A shame! And the Chaim allows him to even do a little trick. A shame! Call together the whole community. They should make a big l'chaim in honor of Shabbos. It's a party for the honor of Shabbos. I mean like this, that other places on the contrary, that one is stringent – I'm in the laws of Yom Tov something – one is stringent that if one had more, is placed one should have more stringencies. Here the point is – I already know who takes it – but on their side, that it's still only Hashem's great ones, that Hashem and vessels through the reshus harabim. Once he does it with guests, he does it a bit more carefully. But I still don't understand, this thing I still don't know, why by the oven by bread was it permitted my friend, everyone should come take, and here specifically his guests – perhaps like you said, because one doesn't give away so easily. Wine, wine is more expensive, I mean bread, one gives it away!

#### **Speaker 1:**

No, I know, whoever says that it could be from the poor, this is an easier trick, say why they ate in the camps, and after Shabbos what will he go back to collect from them all from them, this is his practical, I don't know. But know, it doesn't say clearly that one cannot do it. If he gives away in that way, because it's not lo l'orchim. I don't see that there's a difference, I don't see that it says that we may not. He Daytona says that therefore wiser work in the 8th is so, doesn't know. I think that a Jew breaks to save because he needs to call together the community to save quickly the wine because it's going to be lost. It's not clear.

I mean, the novelty is indeed that he needs only for the Shabbos meals, and for after Shabbos meals he may not save. It seems that the point there is that there it's like the point that

he may not stand and scrape down multiple breads. Because everyone will look like someone who stands here a baker. Here, he saves for all the guests. There the point is everyone drags down one loaf drags down one loaf is not any reshush harabim. Everyone takes as much as he needs for now. Here we're talking that he doesn't do it for the guests. And there one says but also may make reshush but for his guests. So perhaps there one would be more related to how much he needs certainly for his guests, but stand with others to be mother.

### Speaker 2:

I think that a woman, the guest should do it himself. Hello, that if a Jew has an extra bottle of wine, he needs to call guests. He can't drink it alone, he'll become a drunkard. But bread, bread one eats alone, for bread one doesn't need to call any guests.

### Speaker 1:

Ah, how can you call a guest for an extra roll? I'll call a guest, but not a second one. An extra bottle of wine, you can call guests. What can you do with a roll? You can throw it away.

### Rabbi David's Novelty – Using Guests for One's Own Interests

The point here though is, what is indeed the point? Did you hear the novelty, Rabbi David says, because the guests think you're not selfish, you're giving away from yourself. But you're using the guests for your interests. You're using the guests.

Like the guest from the letters there in "Emunah U'Bitachon" or not, he makes strength from that person who was angry that he didn't have guests. You mean yourself, not the guests. Again, what is indeed tremendous? Go know if he's talking about the guests or not. For the guests is indeed all surrounding things. It's simple that it's not... Let's go further.

---

## Laws of Laundering on Shabbos

### Mud That Fell on His Garment – Rubbing from Inside

**Tit shenafal al bigdo**, the garment became smeared with mud. **Meshafshfo mibifnim**, he may from inside the garment, he may like from the back of the garment, scrape it, push it off, or do things so that the mud should come off. But one thing is certain, he may not go directly on the mud and scrape it off there. How much more he is concerned, because this is already more directly occupied with the dirt, one is afraid that he'll go and also use water, also use things and wash it properly.

**U'mutar l'gardo b'tziporen**, if one can scrape it off entirely with the fingernails, with the nails, one may also. **V'eino choshesh shema yalbenu**, when he must actually stand and be busy with it, then it's closer to laundering. But when one can scrape it off with fingernails... I think meshafshfo u'ngardo are two types of things. Mgado means he scrapes the whole thing, it's a hard piece, he gives it a scrape off. Meshafshfo means he needs to rub, for example it became crushed or it's a wet thing, he needs to stand and rub, that's closer to laundering.

### One Who Rubs the Handkerchief – Difference Between Handkerchief and Robe

**Hameshafshef es hasudar**, one has a handkerchief and he crumples it, he shakes it up, **is forbidden because of melabno**. This is the beauty of a handkerchief, is when it's very smooth. They knew exactly what types of cleaners did to

their things. But a **chaluk** is a garment of linen, an undergarment. An undergarment **is permitted, nishkasha ela rachi**, washing that one does, the order is always the outer garments, the bekishe, one wants it should be nice. But the undergarment has nothing to do with beauty, only when he shakes it off is only because he wants to have the texture should be soft, not that it should be nice, therefore it has no connection with whitening and with laundering.

### Shoe or Sandal – Shoe That Became Dirty

Further, **minaal o sandal**, shoe, that became **nislachleach b'tit u'v'tzo'ah, mutar l'shafshfo b'mayim**, one may dip it and shake it off with water, **aval l'chabso**, to wash out one may not. That means that minaal o sandal is less the way of laundering, one may indeed be meshafshef, unlike a garment one may only be meshafshef from inside, this one may indeed be meshafshef, but to wash one may not. And to be megareid, to scrape, one may not scrape **min halayim b'sandalin**, one will rub it off, it gives it a shine or what, it's a way of making nice.

**Aval sochin u'mekanechin es hayeshanim**, one may indeed old shoes that have already become dried, one may indeed freshen or wipe, sochin, like oiling, yes, shoes are made of leather, is oiling so it shouldn't be so hard, or wiping, because this has nothing to do with laundering.

### Pillow and Cushion – Bedding

**Kar v'cheses**, a small bed, bedding, **shorin osan**, one can wipe them with a rag, but one may not put water. **Aval minaal shel or**, on leather one doesn't wash off, leather looks is water resistant, it's only, one puts water to remove the dirt, but it doesn't clean, it has no effect on the inside of the leather.

### One Whose Hands Became Dirty with Mud – Dirty Hands

Further, **mi shenislachlechu yadav b'tit**, one whose hands became dirty with mud, **mekanechan b'znav hasus**, I thought it's a typo, ah, yasher koach indeed. One may wipe them in the horse's tail or in the cow's tail, **o b'mapah hakasha she'asah le'echaz bah es hakutzim**, or with the hard piece of merchandise that's made to grab, you see that when cutting grain one has a special thing to grab the thorns not to get poked, one can use that to scrape off, because that's not a way of laundering. **Aval lo b'mapah shemekanechin bah**, one may not use for the mud a handkerchief that one uses to wipe the hands. Why? **Shema yomar lo chaveiro schov li mapah zo**. Because then what would one have done during the week? During the week one would have used a mapah, and then one would have washed it right away, yes, because it got muddy. He wants indeed the mapah should be clean. One is afraid that he'll come to launder. One may only use...

## Laws of Shabbos – Squeezing, Spreading Garments, Closing a Barrel, Folding Garments, Dyeing

### Prohibition of Using a Handkerchief to Wipe Hands by Mud

**Aval lo b'mapah shemekane'ach bo es yadav**. But one may not use for the mud a handkerchief that one uses to wipe the hands. Why? **Shelo ye'asrena**. So that he shouldn't be concerned, **v'yavo l'chabes es hamapah**.

But then, what would one have done during the week? During the week one would have used a mapah, and then one would have washed it right away, yes? Because it's indeed muddy. He wants indeed the mapah should be clean. One is afraid that

he'll come to launder. One may only use things that one doesn't need to keep clean, the branch and dust, the mapah, yes.

### Wiping After Washing – Carrying a Wet Handkerchief

**Mi sherachatz b'mayim**, washed himself, **mekanei'ach b'mitpachas u'mevi'ah b'yado**, one may wipe oneself with a handkerchief, and one may then bring the handkerchief, carry the handkerchief in one's hand, **v'ein chosheshin shema yisshot**, we're not concerned perhaps he'll squeeze it out.

Why? Why aren't we concerned? Why indeed? No, he wants to come when one may not. Okay, very good.

He brings from, I don't know from whom, that because a handkerchief is normal that it should be wet. It's not something a garment that becomes wet, he'll want to squeeze it out. But a handkerchief is normal that it should be wet.

### Walking with Wet Garments – Prohibition of Spreading

**V'chen mi shenishru kelav baderech**, one may walk with wet laundry, **v'ein chosheshin shema yisshot. Aval asur l'shotchan**, but one may not spread out the laundry so it should dry. **Afilu b'soch beiso**, even in the house one may not spread it out, **gezeirah shema yomru haro'im harei zeh kibes kesuso b'Shabbos v'shetachah l'yavshah**, because the one who will look at it will see that he washed his garments on Shabbos and he spread them out to dry them.

### Discussion: On What Things Does the Prohibition of Spreading Apply?

Does this apply to towels or to garments? I would have thought that it makes more sense for the kelav, because a bekishe is usually not wet on Shabbos. Why is the bekishe? Just the person walked in the rain and it became wet. But it looks like it's just coming from the washing machine, whatever, the washing, I know what was once the washing thing. Therefore you don't do that.

A handkerchief, one understands that a handkerchief is a normal thing that it should be wet. But there is someone who thinks it's laundering on Shabbos, understand? Only the garment that got wet on the way is a strange thing. It happened perhaps an incident that it became wet, it went into water, or there was rain. Do you understand what I'm saying?

Yes, I have no proof from my side, but I make sense this way.

### Practical Question – Handkerchiefs in Camp

I remember that in camp the boys used to hang the handkerchiefs like this on the, you know, on the front of the rooms when we slept Shabbos, they came back from the mikvah. And one argued in the halacha whether the prohibition of spreading applies to handkerchiefs. The Rosh Yeshiva ruled stringently, but I don't remember why.

But I don't see that there should be a...

Further. Yes, he says here to the previous, he says so, but I don't see, perhaps the halacha only speaks of the... yes, it's things that is the way, so he brings from other people.

### Rema's Rule – Appearance Even in Private Rooms

He says the Rema that even at home it was forbidden. Why? Shema yomru haro'im, someone who will see it will say, "Ah, he washed his garment on Shabbos." But it's at home? Even if it's at home.

The Rema says a principle, **kol makom she'asru chachamim mishum maris ayin, afilu b'chadrei**

**chadarim asur**. Maris ayin doesn't mean that someone is going to see, maris ayin means what it looks like.

Yes, good.

### Shte Mikva'os Zo Al Gav Zo – Removing a Plug Between Two Mikva'os

**Shte mikva'os zo al gav zo**, there are two mikva'os one above the other. He says, "Should a..." Which mikveh is that? A Lubavitcher mikveh? The Birkas Chaim mikveh? I don't know, a mikveh al gabei mikveh. Ah, just a mikveh al gabei mikveh. Ah, just. Ah, one next to the other.

He wants to make a hashakah between the two. **Notel es hapekek**, may one also on Shabbos remove the stopper between the two to make the hashakah, **v'achar kach machziro limkomo**, and afterwards one may return the plug to its place, the stopper.

### Chashash Sechitah When Returning the Plug

The Beis Yosef brings an opinion that we're concerned that he will stuff it back in. We're talking here when the plug is a... let's say, like the plugs that we have today, there would be a similar concern that he puts in a piece of wood and a... and he's going to also make it tight.

He says that no, he doesn't want sheredaso sheyeitzei hamayim, he wants the water to go through at the... ah, so obviously he won't put it in so tight that it will squeeze out.

Nu, so what? Even after returning the plug to its place he still wants there to be a hashakah, that it should flow between one and the other. He still wants to add a connection when placing the plug so that it should end with the hashakah.

Ah, perhaps he just wants it to be connected. He says he's not making a hashakah because of mayim she'uvim, he's making a hashakah because there isn't a shiur in the small mikveh, it needs to be connected the whole time. It's not enough that mayim she'uvim becomes good at once, you can make it again. That's not a shiur, it needs to be connected the whole time. So he doesn't put it in tight in a manner of sechitah.

### Pokkin Es HaBiv – Stopping Up a Water Pipe

**Pokkin es habiv**, there is a pipe of water, one may stop it up or wrap around the merchandise **b'chol davar hamitaltel**, or with any things that one may move on Shabbos, because one does it **kedei shelo yatzifu hamayim al ha'ochlim**, so that the water shouldn't overflow, so there shouldn't be a flood **al ha'ochlim v'al hakelim**, one may do it.

But what may one not do? **Aval ein pokkin es habiv kedei sheyeirdu hamayim lab'er**. When one stops up the biv because one wants to save food and vessels, then one may. You see that then the Chachamim permitted it. But when it's for another reason, because he wants to control the water, he wants it to flow into the well, then one may not, **shema yisshot v'ya'aseh dechuk sharir b'fekek sharui b'mayim**. Then we're concerned that he will afterwards squeeze out the sudarin.

### The Reason for the Distinction

That means again, when it's for food and vessels there isn't the concern of shema yisshot, and then they permitted it, because obviously he's going to leave it there until after Shabbos.

He says that one may wrap around so the water shouldn't go up on the food and vessels, because then it's for a great reason, that he shouldn't have any damage. He shouldn't have any

damage, but when he does it only because he wants to arrange the well, then one may not.

But the language doesn't look so clear, because he says the concern is because he brings certain distinctions from commentators that perhaps when one wants it shouldn't go out he cares less, he's less mehadek, because it bothers him less, he only wants the surface water to go down. But when he needs to remove the water, he will afterwards also squeeze out the water that is stuck in the cloth, yes, then he's more careful. Not clear.

### **Sikun Beis Yad Shel Begadim – Folding Garments**

Okay, let's take another one. **Asur lesaken beis yad shel begadim.** One may not straighten the sleeves of garments, the sleeves of garments. **Lishbram** – lesaken means here to arrange, to fold in some nice way. **Lishbram** – lishbram is to make a nice way, which is like an iron collar, which once there was no collar, or they didn't have, and one had to fix something in a good way. One may not do it **kedei derech shemesaknin b'chol**, because what does he usually do? It looks like part of laundering.

**V'chein ein mekaplim b'Shabbos kedei derech she'osin b'chol begadim k'shechaftei osam.** It has a special way, not just folding it so it should be straight, but something like that.

### **Heter Kipul Kedei Sheyehei Na'eh B'Shabbos**

**Im lo hayah lo kli acher l'hachlif**, if he doesn't have something else to change into, **mutar lekafla v'lifshto**, one may fold it and spread it out, **kedei sheyehei na'eh b'Shabbos**. If he wants to wear it on Shabbos itself, and the reason why he folds it is so that later on Shabbos when he goes to put it on it should be nice, then one may.

**V'hu sheyehei beged chadash lavan**, a white new garment is important that one should fold it in a certain way. **She'ein mesamchin umlechachin bo**, so even if he makes a tikun on it, it doesn't remain forever, it's a small tikun, the straightness remains for a few minutes. But usually it's a garment where the folding will make it remain folded for a longer time.

He says, **uch'shemekafeil lo yekafeil ela ish echad**, one person alone, but using two people to fold, that already looks more like a bigger operation of laundering.

### **What Kind of Folding Are We Talking About?**

Nu, there are also contemporary questions about this, but I think that the folding that we're talking about, he's not talking about the... it's simply after laundering. The practical thing is, let's compare it to what we do, but to fold a tallis I don't see. One needs to put it away. It's not at all the topic.

You say a folding, but once garments, I think, and that's what Chazal are talking about, weren't as "tailored" as today, which you take out. One had to, in order to be able to wear a garment one had to make a crease here, some crease there. It wasn't just that it should lie in the drawer in order, it was something much more of a tikun of a garment.

That's how it looks. Because they were expensive garments, they were like tallises. Like one can with tallises, one had to fold them in a certain way. I saw that the Roman soldiers had some whole... it should look like it's a... basically a sheet, it's called a toga. But you want it to be human, you can't just have a rag on your head. There was a whole art of how... folds, they even held for several weeks the folds in a certain way. Like a

curtain today for example one makes, yes, like with folds. I think he's talking about such a thing, it's not so hard to understand what the...

Okay.

### **HaTzovei'a – Painting / Make-up**

**Hatzovei'a.** Avos melachos, one of the avos melachos is tzovei'a. Usually tzovei'a means painting wool that was cut. What is the toladah of it? What is also d'Oraisa, but what is similar to tzovei'a? Washing? No. Ah, he says it's d'Rabbanan. Ah, he says it's only d'Rabbanan. Ah, he says only d'Rabbanan. Ah, it's only d'Rabbanan.

Painting is specifically on merchandise or what? A woman putting make-up on her face, putting paint on her face, is forbidden. He says **k'tzovei'a**. Usually when he says "k-" he means to say that it's a toladah. When he says "asur", "asur" he says that it's a... that it's a Rabbinic prohibition.

### **Discussion: The Language "K'Tzovei'a" – D'Oraisa or D'Rabbanan?**

No, by many d'Oraisa's he said... no, toladot. He can't say "k-". The language "k-" means d'Rabbanan. "K'tzovei'a" means it's similar to tzovei'a. As we learned, one of the types of d'Rabbanan are things that are similar to a melachah.

Yes. But here he doesn't need to say. By most melachos he also said a toladah. When the d'Rabbanan is only connected with the toladah. Two, it's a simple thing, the av is clear, when the d'Rabbanan is simply because it's similar to this av. But it's not the av itself, perhaps because it's only on merchandise? That's how they spoke, yes. That's what they bring up.

There's no two, it doesn't hold. That's a distinction, usually when one paints merchandise. I understand that one has now painted merchandise, and it's going to hold.

### **Melachos Tofer, Korei'a, and Boneh: Rabbinic Prohibitions**

#### **Melech Tofer – Shema Yitpor**

##### **Speaker 1:**

But here he doesn't need to say. By most melachos he also said a toladah, and the d'Rabbanan is only connected with the toladah. Two is a simple thing, the av is clear, and the d'Rabbanan is simply because it's similar to this av. But it's not the av itself, perhaps because it's only on merchandise. That's how they spoke, yes. That's what they bring up.

There's no coloring, but the color doesn't hold. That's a distinction. Usually when one paints merchandise, it's simple that when one has now painted merchandise, and it's going to hold, one has changed the merchandise. That's only something that one puts on for a little bit. Could be because of that, could be just so.

Coloring, means, as you say, coloring means part of the process of a garment, whatever you want to call it. Coloring when one is dyeing a garment, and one puts a color on the face of a person, that's not the same. That's the d'Rabbanan. Yes.

##### **Speaker 2:**

Yes.

#### **Halacha 23: V'HaTofer Me'Avos Melachos**

##### **Speaker 1:**

Further. Tofer. Let's go, let's go through a few melachos. We're going to tofer. No. The Rambam says, **v'hatofer**, no, means sewing together two pieces of merchandise, is from avos

melachos. **L'fichach, asur l'malos hakar v'hakeses hachadashim b'muchin.** If one has a pillow, a blanket, a blanket, that one wants to fill with the feathers inside, with the muchin, cotton, inside, it's forbidden. Even though it has nothing to do with tofer, but it's forbidden d'Rabbanan, a decree lest he sew. Because usually the order is that first one fills it with muchin, and afterwards one sews it back so that it should hold inside well. So it's a decree lest he sew.

As you say, here you see that here the d'Rabbanan are short, and there are some that are shema yitpor. That by tzovei'a it's temporary, and here it's shema yitpor. That's putting in new, that means the first time putting muchin into the pillows and blankets. **Aval muchin shenashru min hakarim v'hakesasos,** but it was already inside the filling, the what one puts inside in a pillow and a blanket, and it fell out from the pillows and blankets, then **machzirin osam,** one may return it, because then there isn't the decree. The decree is only the first time, then usually afterwards there is sewing.

**Discussion: Distinction Between New and Old**

**Speaker 2:**

Okay, the second time one is again sewing? I don't understand, what's the distinction?

**Speaker 1:**

It looks like one isn't sewing then? It's not an important thing when one puts it in the first time it's a... nu, the thing is important. Afterwards when one puts it back it's not at all torn, it came out, one needs to fix it back. Perhaps it's not talking about tearing, perhaps the sewing hasn't gone away, perhaps the seam you can back... it's simply like one had to sew it together, it had to be put in, one had to connect it with the sewing. Sometimes it falls out, but that's normal. It's not... I mean, a contemporary pillow, when the stuffing falls out, whatever is inside, I don't know what one puts inside today, the garbage, is... probably that's a bigger problem, it's more broken. It's not talking about there where it was simply a normal thing and it falls out a bit and one puts it back. But making a new one, that's already part of sewing. It's not like after an accident it's broken, where the sign wouldn't have said beforehand that it's broken, but it's certainly fixing. There is a distinction between new and not new, but one needs... I understand, new is when one makes it, but...

**Speaker 2:**

Okay, yes.

**Melech Korei'a — Eino Miskavein**

**Halacha 24: HaKorei'a Me'Avos Melachos**

**Speaker 1:**

Further. **Korei'a is from avos melachos,** tearing. Tearing is avos melachos, l'fichach... the main d'Oraisa of tearing is when one tears something that one can sew back together, but it's part of the melachah of sewing, or it's connected with the melachah of sewing. But what is the d'Rabbanan of it? Okay, **l'fichach, mi shenifpach bigdo b'kotzim,** someone is going along and his garment got caught, entangled in thorns, and if he's going to tear himself away from it his garment will tear, he should not do it, he should be careful not to tear the garment, but **mafrish b'tzinah umesama es einav kedei shelo yikra,** he should remove the thorns that got caught, and he should be still so that it shouldn't tear.

**Discussion: Mekalkel or Eino Miskavein?**

**Speaker 2:**

Note: This is certainly like mekalkel, it's certainly not any... we're talking here that this is such a d'Rabbanan, that one shouldn't even do a... it looks like... mekalkel is also not any... all mekalkels are d'Rabbanan. It could be that he's fixing because the other piece will remain with a strength attached. To think so, perhaps that is yes perhaps a great tikun.

**Speaker 1:**

But he has here the advice of... l'chatchilah this is always the best advice, go slowly, and the slowly won't help. **V'im nikra,** yes, if it did tear even when he tried to go slowly, one is liable for tearing, **she'eino lovesh chaluk.** The second one doesn't say she'eino mekalkel. Right, because I'm telling you, because this is a heter of davar she'eino miskavein. It's a davar she'eino miskavein, it's a heter on the Rabbanan. That means that d'Oraisa it certainly wouldn't be, only because it's mekalkel, because it's not that is the tearing. The Rabbanan don't allow even such an opening. But when it's eino miskavein, when it's b'derech agav, so you try to go quietly, then they allow. That's how it sounds.

**Speaker 2:**

It says that all mekalkel are also forbidden d'Rabbanan, you say.

**Speaker 1:**

I don't know about all, the... I don't make any rules.

**Speaker 2:**

Right.

**New Garments and Potze'in Egoz B'Matlis**

**Speaker 1:**

He says further, **u'mutar l'ilbosh klim chadashim.** One may wear new clothing. New clothing, all concerns that it will tear. It doesn't fit well. Yes, he brings here, yes, metaken. He fixes his clothes. He fixes it from the thorns. Yes. Okay.

And **mutar l'ilbosh begadim chadashim,** what is that? What is that will tear? The place where it's not his size, where it's going to tear. Like we saw last night, when one wears it the first time one needs to make creases with things. Not the first, there are customs, distinctions of new and old. There are those who learn that the first time one needs to make creases. Shevarim shevarim. Earlier it was said about the sleeve, shevarim shevarim. It looks like the old-time clothing was more complicated, and there was the chance that when one wears new clothing the first time it will tear, and one needs to make it better, fit it to the person's size. That's what I think. And one may, because it's also a mekalkel and it's an eino miskavein. Also because of that, right.

**Potze'in egoz b'matlis.** One may crack a nut with a cloth. Instead of... he wants to hit with his hands, but hitting with his hands on a nut is hard for him, he puts a piece of cloth and with that he hits. But in the process it can tear the piece of cloth. Or he hits with a hammer, but next to a cloth. He hits over a cloth to break the door with it, yes, perhaps. Incidentally the cloth, the rag, can break from that, tear. **V'eino choshesh shema yikra,** he doesn't need to be afraid. Again the same thing, because all this tearing will be a mekalkel.

**Discussion: Why Not Generally?**

**Speaker 1:**

It's true that one could have said the thing much more generally, one could have said that the d'Oraisa is tearing in order to fix, and when it's a mekalkel, and the things are... he doesn't say the ideas, he says very specific things.

**Speaker 2:**

Almost all the laws of Shabbos are very specific things.

**Speaker 1:**

No, but here the answers aren't about... it's not so. One sees here that a tearing even not in order to sew one may not do d'Rabbanan. And what one may is such things like shelo niskavein and it's mekalkel.

**Speaker 2:**

Both are einu miskavein. Mekalkel was never mentioned here.

**Speaker 1:**

We thought that apparently it's a mekalkel, and they said that perhaps it's not a mekalkel because it's perhaps a tikun in all these things. Even in the tearing of new garments it could be that even if it's not his goal, he wants it to tear a bit.

**Speaker 2:**

The cloth?

**Speaker 1:**

No, that's actually a heter. It's written nicely that it's written actually that it's permitted. Two things that it's written that one may. Because you could think that one may not, perhaps there is someone who holds that one may not. But the... yes, it's a bit of a small halachah that he brought from the Gemara. It's difficult, why should I think that one may not? One doesn't see what is the reason that I would have thought that one may not.

**Discussion: What Does "B'Tzinah" Mean?**

**Speaker 2:**

He asks a question, what does "b'tzinea" (privately) mean? We learned earlier by the "mi shenashru begadav" (one whose garments got wet), that when the garments became wet, that b'tzinea doesn't help, even kol davar she'asur mishum maras ayin afilu b'chadrei chadarim asur (anything forbidden due to appearances is forbidden even in the innermost chambers). But how does b'tzinea work? Here we saw we learned by the mishna, mi shenispachah begadav b'kotzim, maflishin b'tzinea (one whose garments got caught in thorns, may remove them privately).

**Speaker 1:**

B'tzinea means where people don't see. I don't know, but in any case the halacha of maras ayin is true. It's not maras ayin. B'tzinea means to say he shouldn't stand and tear his clothes. That means that when someone stands and he pulls out pieces of thorns with his clothes, it is indeed a melacha. But when it's caught on the way and he wants to continue walking, he should do it b'tzinea.

**Speaker 2:**

So it's certain. We're talking about when it's caught. Why does the b'tzinea matter in a case when it's clear that it's a mekalkel (destructive act) or that it's itself caught?

**Speaker 1:**

It's not a mekalkel. Okay, it's itself caught. Itself caught? I didn't say that he is indeed intending. He intends to remove the thorns from his garments. He doesn't want them to tear

perhaps, but it seems that it's still such that one can do it b'tzinea. Therefore I say, there are no rules. I wouldn't look for rules on each one of these halachos. It seems to me that it's very practical. It's a chilul Hashem (desecration of God's name) to see a Jew walking on Shabbos in the street, his bekeshe (coat) got caught on some nail which is an awkward situation, and they tell him, "Come here, don't stand there pulling and tearing. Give a pull like this." That's what b'tzinea means. B'tzinea doesn't mean send away the people and don't make a show of it. It means something like this, you are refined and calm. That's how I would translate it. And for each thing, the less one can do publicly, one can do things that are like not Shabbos-like, one does. Kach nireh l'aniyus da'ati (so it seems in my humble opinion).

**Speaker 2:**

Further, very good. So, this is a dispute. But you agree, like every thing one must do with refinement and not do something that people might think or that is actually somewhat of a melacha.

**Speaker 1:**

Very good.

**Melecheth Boneh V'Soser — Beginning**

**Halacha 25: HaToke'a Chayav Mishum Boneh**

**Speaker 1:**

And now, now we're going to learn about the melacha of boneh v'soser (building and demolishing), what are their rabbinic derivatives. The Rambam says, here he says a slightly different language. He doesn't begin "haboneh av melacha, v'hatoke'a chayav mishum boneh" (the builder is a primary category of labor, and one who inserts is liable for building). He begins right away, "**hatoke'a chayav mishum boneh**" (one who inserts is liable for building). From the Torah, liable. Yes, but usually he says the names of the Torah melacha.

**Speaker 2:**

Okay. I mean there was a halacha, it began like that. He already said about for example meraked chitim mishum dash (one who sifts wheat is liable for threshing), a simple thing, understand? What is a toladah (derivative), otherwise it's even the av (primary category), understand what I mean?

**Speaker 1:**

Yes. Yes.

**Speaker 2:**

Hatoke'a chayav mishum boneh, by melechet boneh he already explained that boneh means generally...

**Hilchos Shabbos – Melecheth Boneh: Toke'a, Delasos Mechubaros LaKarka, Delasos Keilim, Tzirim**

**Halacha 25: HaToke'a Chayav Mishum Boneh – Delasos HaMechubaros LaKarka**

**Speaker 1:**

From rabbinic law?

**Speaker 2:**

No, from Torah law. From Torah law.

**Speaker 1:**

Yes, but usually he says the names of the Torah melacha.

**Speaker 2:**

Okay. Ah, I mean that there was a halacha, he began like that. For example, **hameraked chayav mishum dash** (one who sifts is liable for threshing), which is a toladah, or it's even the av, what does that mean?

**Speaker 1:**

Yes.

**Speaker 2:**

Yes. **Hatoke'a chayav mishum boneh**. By melechet boneh one needs to know that boneh generally means inserting something into something. That means, placing the pillars into the sockets, yes? Placing one brick on the other, being toke'a. So if someone inserts, I don't know, a door into the holders of the door, or he inserts a pole where it should lie, chayav mishum boneh (liable for building).

**Lfikach, kol hadelasos hamechubaros lakarka** (therefore, all doors that are attached to the ground), doors that are attached to the ground, **lo notlin osan v'lo machzirin** (we don't remove them and we don't return them), one may not remove it from the place where it's attached, and one may not put it back. Even when he puts it back it's not exactly teki'ah (insertion), but we decree lest he insert.

That means, even when one puts it back in a manner where it doesn't become strongly attached, which would mean, I don't know, what does it mean to be machzir (return) without teki'ah? Anyway, somehow putting back the door without connecting it.

Ah, I mean that we're talking here about a door that doesn't rest on hinges, but like it used to be a large piece of wood, a deles (door), that one moved away from the hole, and when one wanted to close the empty opening one placed the piece there. One didn't insert it. That's not boneh, but in any case one places something there to cover the opening of the door. But it's a gezeira shema yitka (decree lest he insert), perhaps he'll go, that he places it there, perhaps he'll go and also attach it to the wall. Yes?

**Speaker 1:**

Yes, I see it.

**Speaker 2:**

The commentators actually don't know clearly. We learned clearly that inserting a door is indeed boneh.

**Speaker 1:**

Right, if one places it up with the hinges.

**Speaker 2:**

But here he says "lo notlin v'lo machzirin" means removing from the opening which is not attached, a decree that he will do it in a manner when it is indeed attached. That means, the "lo notlin" is a decree of soser (demolishing).

**Speaker 1:**

No, I say machzir is the boneh and notel is the soser of it.

**Speaker 2:**

But what is the difference of doors? What, there's no reason, I don't know.

**Delasos Keilim – Notlin Aval Ein Machzirin**

**Speaker 2:**

Doors are doors that are attached to the ground, because on something that is attached to the ground there is binyan

(building). But vessels have different halachos. Therefore **delasos shida teiva u'migdal** (doors of a chest, box and tower), a door of a closet, **u'she'ar delasos keilim** (and other doors of vessels), or doors of other vessels, **notlin** (we remove), one may remove. Removing one may indeed, it's not soser. **Aval ein machzirin** (but we don't return them), one may not put it back. Putting back is indeed forbidden rabbinically. Why should putting back be stricter than removing?

**Discussion: Why Is Notlin Permitted But Machzirin Forbidden**

**Speaker 2:**

He says, if I remember correctly, that in the Gemara they say, one may remove it because one wants to use the door. One wants to use the door for something else, the piece of door from the closet. One wants to use it for something else, one may remove it to use for something else. But to put it back to the shida teiva u'migdal one may not. Because removing, you take it away for some other reason, you want to use the piece, it's not muktzeh, let's say, and you may use it. But putting back looks similar to putting back a door.

**Tzir HaTachton SheNishmat – Docho LiMkomo**

**Speaker 2:**

**V'im nishmat tzir hatachton shelahem** (and if their lower hinge slipped out), if it moved away, it went from there, the lower hinge slipped, the lowest thing that holds the door, how is that called? The hinges, the lowest hinge, **docho limkomo** (push it back to its place), one may push it back into place. What does that mean to say? He means, when one hasn't yet removed the door. We're not talking about the door, not a continuation, not the door that one removed when one puts it back. Rather the door is lying there, it's just not well connected with the hinge. That one may indeed do, simply push it back into the place where it belongs.

**U'vamikdash machzirin oso** (and in the Temple we return it), in the Beis HaMikdash one may properly put it back, not just docho limkomo. Machzir outside. What is the difference between pushing and returning?

**Discussion: Difference Between Docho and Machzir**

**Speaker 2:**

It seems that this is the proper way of putting back, and this is the way that is put back temporarily, that it doesn't become reattached. No, I mean it seems like this. Pushing is the meaning that it's still there, and you just need to push it into its place. Machzir is the meaning that it completely fell out, and you need to give it a lift up and put it back in. It's not a difference of what the result is, it's a difference of the problem that one solves.

Nishmat in the Mikdash means even if it completely slipped. Pushing means that it didn't completely slip, you just need to give a push, squeeze it in or something like that.

**Tzir HaElyon SheNishmeta – Asur L'Hachzira B'Chol Makom**

**Speaker 2:**

That's when the lower hinge moved away. **Aval tzir ha'elyona shenishmeta** (but the upper hinge that slipped), when the upper hinge of the door moved away, **asur l'hachzira b'chol makom** (it's forbidden to return it in any

place), one may not put it back in any manner, even when it just moved a bit, even when there's just a pushing.

**Speaker 1:**

Yes, l'hachzira means in the manner of... b'chol makom, the meaning is even in the Mikdash, not just in the whole world.

**Speaker 2:**

But pushing also not pushing. Yes, l'hachzira means not specifically l'hachzira, one may not put it back in any manner. B'chol makom there is the decree even in the Mikdash. But l'hachzira I want to suggest... perhaps the top one can't push.

**Speaker 1:**

No, he says, he began "nishmeta tzir hatachtona" etc. "Mah she'ein kein tzir ha'elyona is different". It must be different in both cases, both in the provinces that what one may usually do by the lower hinge one may not, and also in the Mikdash what one may usually do by the lower hinge one may not.

**Speaker 2:**

Well, he says "asur l'hachzira". Asur l'hachzira b'chol makom, there's no difference between the Beis HaMikdash and the provinces. "Gezeira shema yitka" (decree lest he insert). It seems that by the upper hinge there is a greater decree of shema yitka.

**Discussion: What Is a Tzir and What Does Shema Yitka Mean**

**Speaker 1:**

Yes, I want to know a bit the information of what we're talking about, I've never understood it. So, if someone knows how the tzir looks, and why the upper one is yitka, what is the meaning of the yitka? I don't understand plainly about the meaning of the halacha.

**Speaker 2:**

The tzir is a hinge, there are two hinges that connect the door to the wall. Not a hinge and a lower hinge, yes? Approximately.

**Speaker 1:**

No, not approximately at all. Because we don't have that sort of hinges. The tzir is simply on a nail...

**Speaker 2:**

But the upper tzir mainly holds the door. The upper tzir is more important than the lower tzir.

**Speaker 1:**

By us there is, I don't know, I said a difference. So we don't have that sort of hinges. Let's be clear, a tzir... It's hinges, other types of hinges, whatever it is, it's hinges. Other types of hinges.

**Speaker 2:**

I don't have hinges, I'll explain to you.

**Speaker 1:**

I don't have hinges, I'll explain to you what a tzir means. So we're talking about... I can indeed tell you that I know what a tzir is. A tzir is such a nail like a stick that sticks out from the door, and it goes into such a hole in the doorpost on the side. That's the meaning. The door turns on this. It hangs from above and from below. And there are no hinges. We have a hinge that is such a... such a door such a... the hinge that I have in my house at least, is not a tzir at all. It's such a piece that is such a... such a door that one hangs up the door

basically, it opens. That's not at all the same sort of thing that they're talking about.

But in any case, what stands here apparently is that the upper tzir holds the main door, and there is the greater concern of shema yitka. But it's not so hard to place. First of all, what does yitka mean? What does yitka mean? Fixing the tzir, making the tzir go into the hole as it should go in.

**Speaker 2:**

And one can't insert it? Machzir hanoteil.

**Speaker 1:**

True?

**Speaker 2:**

In the Mikdash.

**Speaker 1:**

Yes. So certainly that one is not boneh.

**Speaker 2:**

What do you mean? You're talking that some such sort of yitka is forbidden. I'm talking about delasos hakeilim.

**Speaker 1:**

Okay, and what is the yitka?

**Speaker 2:**

No, first of all, we're talking about such a sort of yitka that even by attached to the ground is not boneh, it's just a decree shema yitka. Yitka is indeed.

**Speaker 1:**

No, because there we're talking about... how can you say that one distinguishes? One minute, one minute. The doors that are attached lo yitol v'lo yachzir. He's not talking here about hinges at all. As I said, placing the door on the place.

**Speaker 2:**

No, "lo yachzir tzir tachton shelahem". Right?

**Speaker 1:**

Those doors...

**Speaker 2:**

No, that goes up to delasos shida teiva u'migdal.

**Speaker 1:**

Very good. The same one that you said a minute ago that it doesn't have a tzir, suddenly has a tzir.

**Speaker 2:**

Okay. No. The first piece. And so, he's talking about doors that are attached to the ground, one may not do any removal and any return, not a lower one and not an upper one. Shema yitka. Now he says, delasos hakeilim is always easier. Delasos hakeilim is always easier. So what? That one may indeed be notel and machzir when one doesn't connect it to the tzir. But if there is another case, the door of the teiva u'migdal one doesn't want to remove or put back, but it's lying there, but the tzir has become weak and one needs to fix it a bit, one needs to push it back a bit.

**Speaker 1:**

So the lower one may be put back.

**Speaker 2:**

Shema yitka. The same decree, true?

**Speaker 1:**

You have the same, you sometimes have the same decree of shema yitka. So usually inserting is not teki'ah, whatever that means, but he can insert it. The same point the same thing as before, that lo notlin v'lo machzirin by attached to the ground which is more boneh from the Torah or something like that, because there is such a halacha of binyan in vessels from the Torah. So, then there is always shema yitka, and here there is a manner where there isn't shema yitka.

But I, Yitzchak, still don't understand the translation of what shema yitka means. What does inserting without being toke'a mean? What is there to be toke'a? And how can it be the upper door is more shema yitka? That's a third thing I don't understand. But first I don't understand plainly the translation.

I say, let's say over again the Rambam as I understood it. I'm not establishing what the reality is, tell me what the meaning is, he inserts a door and he's not toke'a. Translate, what does it mean?

**Speaker 2:**

Okay. Because something that is attached to the ground is actually there there is binyan, mainly binyan. Vessels are always easier. So he began like this, that the door of the house, even if there are no hinges at all, there is a large piece of board...

**Speaker 1:**

No, no, let me. Let me. What that means a door. Shema yitka means to be toke'a the tzir. So then it can be what you're saying is correct. From anything that is attached to the ground one may not take the piece of thing called a door and place it by the empty opening or remove it from there, a decree one will build, a decree one will bring a tzir, one will make a tzir and be toke'a the tzir. Stop here. A decree one will fasten there a...

**Speaker 2:**

What does fasten mean? You're not standing anything. I don't know what that means. Perhaps you know, but I don't know. What will he do? What is he doing now and what will he do? Just precisely.

**Speaker 1:**

By attachment to the ground one doesn't do even something that is not in the category of insertion. One doesn't play at all with the tzir. One is not busy with the tzir. Just from dragging a piece of wood and inserting it by a place where it's empty. Why? Because here it's forbidden like this, says the Rambam. But vessels one will indeed remove, but not put back.

**Delasos Mechubar LaKarka, Nireh K'Boneh, U'Machzir Chulyos Shel Shidra**

**Discussion: What Does "Fasten" Mean By Doors?**

**Speaker 1:**

What does fasten mean? You're saying words that you don't know what it means, at least. Perhaps you know, but I don't know. What will he do? What is he doing now and what will he do? Tell me precisely.

By attached to the ground one may not do even something that is not in the category of insertion. One doesn't play at all with the tzir, one is not busy with the tzir. He shouldn't even take a piece of wood and insert it by a place where it wasn't. Why?

Because it's not precise, so says the Rambam. But vessels one may indeed remove, but not put back.

You're not helping me. Besides that you inserted a whole story that never was, that the doors that we're talking about attached to the ground don't have a tzir – you made it up yourself. It doesn't say so. But I can bring proofs from good ways to say that the Rambam doesn't agree. I'm not trying at all to make support from the Rambam. That's not the plan. It doesn't bother me, it doesn't help me, because I know that it's left over.

**What Is "Yitka"?**

**Speaker 1:**

What is the meaning "yitka"? Meaning, tell me the meaning. I don't know what that means. I don't know precisely how the tzir looks, but you have a manner of connecting it to the wall, and that's called "yitka". That one certainly may not do, that's boneh. It's not what "yitka" means. We'll see, I don't know.

Because that inserting a door into the tzir properly, which apparently that's how a door sits, that means one may, but here is shema yitka. But according to delasos hakeilim it says explicitly such a case. There is such a thing, he inserts the door from above and from below into grooves, but he inserts it, but it's not teku'ah (inserted firmly). Now I ask you, what else can he do that means being teku'ah?

**Lecture on Hilchos Boneh (Laws of Building)**

tekiah, a tekiah is obligated because of boneh. It can't be a tekiah. Therefore, doors of a building one may not under any circumstances replace, even when one is not tokea, lest one will be tokea. But doors of vessels one may not be machzir, one indeed also may not be machzir because of the same reason. By doors of vessels, just as by doors of buildings. But we're talking about something else, about fixing the hinge, when it's not mechubar with the hinge...

**Speaker 2:**

But the distinction that you're making isn't stamped on all distinctions with hinges, because I know what that means yedka. I'm not here to fix your problem, I only tried to learn this piece of Rambam. But that's correct...

**Speaker 1:**

And I'm saying to the audience, the distinction that you're making, you think you're making a great chiddush that one may not place something... I know what they... In short, I don't know the reality that we're talking about here, it's basically...

**Questions for Practical Halacha**

**Speaker 2:**

Halacha lemaaseh I don't know, if one closes a door what does one do?

**Speaker 1:**

If I have a window where the window came out, may I put it back in?

**Speaker 2:**

Okay, that's different, he asked many details that are different.

**Return to the Topic of the Hinge**

**Speaker 1:**

In any case, I'm missing something about the meaning of what is the hinge?

And I see that I'm probably not the first one who knows this, as always it came out... No one knows... Daf lamed gimmel...

Responsa Maniach... Sheilas Yaavetz.

They say different explanations of what is the yedka, yedka means...

**Speaker 2:**

They say to know, what I tried to say approximately?

**Speaker 1:**

No, you're trying to understand and you're trying to make me... It's not completely fallen out, it is completely fallen out. You're making a third distinction of with a hinge and without a hinge that doesn't stand.

But that doesn't make a difference to me, because the term yedka certainly goes on a fourth thing, something else that we don't have... not in any of the cases, right? We didn't permit and didn't forbid the kiyamta! The kiyamta being is an action d'oraissa.

There are those who say here below that the kiyamta means actually screwing the hinge into the door, a completely different melacha, not the kiyamta being putting in the door, that I would understand.

So saying this answers my questions that I haven't understood for a long time.

**Question: A Door is Made to Turn**

**Speaker 1:**

A door is something else that it was made to turn, not something that it was made to be stuck, right? If you want to say that the kiyama means to fasten, a door doesn't need to be fastened, because it can open.

On the contrary, the opposite, one puts in oil on the hinge, I don't know what it's called, so that it can open. A door wasn't made to remain stuck, so how should I see to make it stronger? About this perhaps, as he says that tokea is something completely different. I don't know what it could mean, but something a completely different step is the tekiah, not putting in. But it could be, one turns with it and one gets involved with this door. "And lest he will be tokea", just as "lest" is indeed kol shehu, whatever, other "lests".

Kach tzarich lehadlik dakah. Very good.

**Halacha 26: One May Not Braid the Hair of the Head and Not Style It**

**Speaker 1:**

We'll see more rabbinic melachos that have some connection to boneh. This is further from boneh. **"One may not braid the hair of the head and not style it."** One may not braid the hair of the head, and not only braid but also **"not style it"**. "Style it" means something is turning. It means making, let's say, making a braid and making simply twisted beautiful hair. **"Because it appears like boneh,"** because it looks like boneh. It means gathering all the hair so it runs in a certain way, it should look similar to boneh.

"Appears like boneh". It looks, you don't mean actual boneh, because we didn't say any boneh on hair, on people. Boneh we learned only mechubar lakarke even. But boneh we did learn that on there machat al gabeiheh. True, chaim is already boneh. I know, we need to understand. On what explanation did we learn binyan in vessels? It's something not such a rule

that I meant. I don't know. Okay. **"Because it appears like boneh,"** it looks like boneh.

**Halacha 26: And One May Not Reassemble a Segmented Menorah**

**Speaker 1:**

**"And one may not reassemble a segmented menorah."** A menorah that's made from pieces, one can set it up and take it apart. One may not assemble it. Even though it's not boneh, it's made so that one should easily take it apart and assemble it, but it's similar to boneh. **"Nor a segmented chair or segmented table,"** or a bench or a table that's made from pieces that one can take apart. **"Because it appears like boneh."** All these things appear like boneh. It's not really built, because one can always take it apart again and rebuild it. It's an assembled thing. Appears like boneh. **"And if one did reassemble,"** if one did indeed reassemble, put back together the menorah or the chair, **one is exempt.** It's only rabbinic. Why? **Because there is no building in vessels, no demolition in vessels.** The law is that essentially there is no building and demolition in vessels, building is only in what's attached to the ground.

**Discussion: Machzir – Tightening or Assembling?**

**Speaker 2:**

And what do you call it, I understand that one may not be machzir when it's completely taken apart. But if it's already built, it's just weak, and he wants to just tighten it with the returning, may one be machzir.

**Speaker 1:**

Yes, being machzir means tightening? That seems to me.

**Speaker 2:**

By us he says regarding chalyos of chest, box and tower, perhaps there's a type of loose that one may in general, perhaps that's the distinction. That means a loose thing that belongs to loose?

**Speaker 1:**

Yes, what is a good attachment, if it's well attached. If it's something that becomes well assembled, one may not. But something that never becomes very strongly assembled, it always remains loose, it's less boneh at the time...

**Speaker 2:**

Why does he say it's permitted to return it? He should have said it's permitted to build it. That's a proof to your explanation.

**Speaker 1:**

Yes, but he uses the same language, machzirin. Machzirin means to reassemble how it looks when it's built. And taking apart will also be the same prohibition.

**Digression: Making Peyos on Shabbos**

**Speaker 1:**

He's talking, for example, the ideal halachos are very strict. There are for example Jews who said that one may not make the peyos curly on Shabbos, because that's a godlin or pokeis, one of these things. But the custom is not so, the custom of all Jews is to make the peyos on Shabbos, or almost all Jews except a few very pious ones. It seems that this isn't the level, it must be something a greater situation to be a prohibition. We're talking here about something a braid that one makes

once in a while, not something that one makes every day or that one fixes all the time.

### **Discussion: Folding Table and Temporary Building**

#### **Speaker 1:**

The same thing here, for example these vessels, may one open a folding table on Shabbos? It's as if he makes it broken, it's folded. It's more like something that's assembled like Legos, assembled from pieces. There's something, I think a folding table, also, it's folded, something different. There's something pieces. In short, chalyos means external pieces, one assembles pieces.

#### **Speaker 2:**

Yes, not clear. There are poskim who say as you say, that things that are made regularly to take apart is not boneh. There's no such halacha of temporary building.

#### **Speaker 1:**

What do you mean? When you say "boneh vesoter", what does that mean? It means that it's made to take apart. It's not a permanent building, it's not fastened. What point now remains?

#### **Speaker 2:**

But you'll see, ohel arai there's also prohibited rabbinically. Perhaps that has building? It's not like by a knot there's a thing of a non-permanent knot. Isn't there such a thing as a non-permanent building? I don't know.

#### **Speaker 1:**

People say that chalyos of the spine of a small child next to each other, a small child whose back has become crooked, one may not fix the pieces of the spine, because it appears like boneh. It looks like boneh. An interesting thing.

### **Halacha 26: Returning the Vertebrae of a Child's Spine**

#### **Speaker 2:**

It must be that this isn't real medicine. Yes, this is something that one does simply for beauty, not that his spine is broken.

#### **Speaker 1:**

But the vertebrae of the spine are broken, it's something dangerous, no? Is there danger in it? I don't know exactly what we're talking about. It means something a massage that needs to fix the bones so they go in place.

#### **Speaker 2:**

Um, yes. Okay, very good.

#### **Speaker 1:**

Ah, did you learn earlier that one may, yes, massage is only the prohibition because of anointing. Okay, one needs to know exactly what this is, the returning vertebrae of the spine next to each other. It's certainly some sort of thing, something to directly fix the vertebrae of the spine. It seems that one moves around a bone literally. Perhaps today one doesn't do that. I don't know.

I'm not an expert in the vertebrae of the spine. I had a friend who had a problem with his back, and he told me that he had to go to a chiropractor.

### **Discussion: What is Appears Like Boneh?**

#### **Speaker 2:**

No, it seems appears like boneh is like this: someone stands and knocks on someone else's back. A person himself...

#### **Speaker 1:**

No, no, it's not knocking. Knocking on the back is permitted. It means that you move. Next to each other. It must look like a building. Knocking on the back or a massage doesn't look like boneh. It looks like something else, as you say, perhaps a question of medicine on Shabbos and the like. But this isn't any appearance.

It needs to look like you stand and you make the peyos, or I don't know what, you make a braid of the hair. It looks like you're building something. When it looks, you take simply pieces and you make from it something. To give a knock on the back doesn't look like building. It looks and knocks on someone.

### **Digression: Lego on Shabbos**

#### **Speaker 1:**

There's a great dispute among contemporary rabbis whether one may play Lego on Shabbos. I don't know what the halacha is. It doesn't say. This is such a piece, that is, you can think about it. It's also already rabbinic, it's certainly not d'oraisa for sure, apparently.

I said that all these menorahs and all these things are, let's say that one can take them apart so it should be easy to put away, so it shouldn't take up too much space, but once one sets it up one uses it. Legos is made to set up, throw down, set up, throw down. That's the question of doubt.

Okay, I'm telling you, "bameh devarim amurim" could be what you mean. "Bameh devarim amurim" means that when it's such a type of vessel that one sets up for half an hour and one doesn't set it up strongly, but the Legos is perhaps in the category of loose packer. Yes, so one can think.

### **Halacha 27: One Who Makes a Permanent Tent is Liable for Boneh**

Further, another melacha of boneh is like this: **One who makes a permanent tent**, not only when one makes a building is one liable for boneh. It's a midrash like this, because the Mishkan wasn't any building, it was a tent. **One who makes a permanent tent is liable for boneh**. This is also a way of building, making a permanent tent. This is simple, we learned, I mean explicitly in the laws of boneh, that a tent is also boneh. This is only a permanent tent.

#### **Rabbinic Prohibition: Temporary Tent**

**Therefore**, for this, what prohibition did the Sages add? **One may not make a temporary tent lechatchila**. The prohibition of the Rabbis is that one may not make a temporary tent lechatchila, meaning the first time when one sets it up. One may not be soter, take apart a temporary tent. Why? **A decree lest one will make a permanent tent**. This is indeed a temporary tent, but if we'll allow making a temporary tent it's a decree that one will make a permanent tent.

#### **Discussion: What is the Distinction Between Permanent and Temporary Tent?**

This is, a temporary tent is a different type, a different sort of tent. It's not simply a decision whether we're going to leave it long or... because the Mishkan was also al pi Hashem yachanu, they will stay there a day or two days, they will stay there... Certainly. But it's always called a temporary tent, because it's a Mishkan, it's an important thing, even if we set it up for a day.

Precisely there there's a dispute in the Rishonim whether this means that they built every time, or also when it was only an encampment, a short encampment, whether they didn't build the Mishkan. There it says a verse "al pi Hashem", and many times, "they will stay there a day or two days". He asks whether when it was a day, did they also build the entire Mishkan. It's a huge job, building the Mishkan itself takes a day.

I saw someone says that the question is about this, that it was called a temporary tent, because a temporary tent is only when a longer time they built the Mishkan. Okay, certainly someone is talking about the question of temporary tent regarding that.

No, but I mean to say that the distinction between temporary tent and permanent tent doesn't mean to say whether the person decides if it's for long or not. It must be a different type of building or a different type of tent. Yes?

I'm sure that the question of the Mishkan someone already asked. But the Mishkan also had... Okay, what does it mean... even if one sets it up for a day, perhaps it can be called a permanent tent. I don't know what it means. Let's see the Gemara. Because by me, every tent is temporary. I mean, for this a tent isn't any house, because it's a tent. There are certain cultures where one lives in tents, that's their house. Yes, like one lives in deserts. And that's their way of building. No, but there are also people who have in their backyard a tent that they set up, and one sets it up once for a long time. I don't know. A tent doesn't mean...

So what does tent mean, a house of merchandise? He says that a permanent tent is a house of merchandise, and a temporary tent is something such a pop-up tent, something such a small thing that one builds up and takes down. Okay.

#### **And If One Made It – Exempt But Prohibited**

He says, **and if one made a temporary tent**, if one did... It wasn't boneh, that is, he doesn't call it boneh. Soter he does call it the same, but by building he doesn't call boneh on... He didn't do boneh, he only did a prohibition. But he does call it, but he does call it soter. How can he call it? Exempt? I hear. Okay, so he's exempt. He's exempt, it's only rabbinic, as stated.

#### **It's Permitted to Add to a Temporary Tent on Shabbos**

He says further, what may one do? **And it's permitted to add to a temporary tent on Shabbos**. One may make a temporary tent larger on Shabbos. This one may indeed do. The stringency didn't go so far.

He explains briefly, **a tallis that is spread over pillars or over walls**, a tallis is spread out on walls or on pillars, **and it was rolled up before Shabbos**, it was rolled up before Shabbos, and therefore there's no tent, you don't have a large enough tent, **but there is a tefach in it**, but there's a tefach, meaning a minimum gap of a tefach covering, if at least a tefach is open, there's already an explanation that there's already something a bit of a tent, you may set up the rest, **behold this one may spread it on Shabbos until he makes a large tent**, one may unroll the rolled-up tallis and stretch it out so it should become a large tent, because this he was only adding to an existing tent. The entire rule of poskim is that enlarging an existing tent one may, a temporary tent.

#### **Discussion: The Permit of Shlock on Shabbos**

Yes, this means here is the permit of a shlock, yes? Opening a shlock on Shabbos, this means apparently, I already know if it's talking about the hands, because you then can ask that it's

dark... I don't know the halacha, but it's certainly there where to think that this is an ohel harah. Because you need to make sure that there's always a tefach. Then what it's adding to the ohel harah. If you make a new shlock, on Shabbos, your door, one may not even if the fruits are a tallis.

What it says here, right? Can't you take a tallis and lay it over a midim bak shalom? How can we make the Simchas Torah that we make the... what is going on? Like the people... If people can want the partitions, they can also be pillars. Don't know. Okay, let's say it's not on a person. Let's say we're not laying to become wet. It's not standing there much a concern of tent. Or, it's only another concern of a question of carrying. Because a temporary tent means something that one builds, something that should lie on something. Holding a tallis in the hands, doesn't have any... Okay, let's see a few more halachos further. There's how to think.

#### **Halacha 28: Chuppah – Temporary Tent**

### **Chapter 22: Shevusim from Boneh to Soser – Continuation of Laws (Part 13)**

#### **Ohel Arai – Continuation of Laws**

#### **Discussion: What is the Difference Between a Kilah and a Mittah?**

One toleh is a kilah. One may not hang... the kilah is a... kilah is what I just spoke about... the kilah is the cover on the bed, such a... such a... what is it called? Such a... canopy bed. Yes. A villan. Yes. One may not hang such a piece of merchandise that the kilah is made letzeil, that one should be able to sit under it, **sheharei na'aseh tachteha ohel arai**. It's actually not the manner in which one makes an ohel, it's different.

Ohel arai? No, he says **"sheharei na'aseh tachteha ohel arai"**. He doesn't say that this means building an ohel. No, that's what he means. Ohel is once this. And the language doesn't look like that. **"Sheharei na'aseh tachteha ohel arai"** – under this you have something that is similar to an ohel, or you have a place that is covered, that is covered from above. I mean that all oholim are underneath, like a sukkah. An ohel is a thing that is ma'ahil, it covers.

He made it letzeil? Yes, it's letzeil or whatever, yes. The language here is very different, and otherwise I would have had to say that a kilah is also called an ohel arai. He already says **"sheharei na'aseh tachteha ohel arai"**.

**Mutar lehani'ach mittah vechissei vetraskeil** – one may place a bed and chair and traskeil, let's say, high, and be able to sit under it, **ve'af al pi shena'aseh tachteihem ohel**, even though under it becomes an ohel, **sheharei ein zo derech asiyas ohel**. It's not a way. Even children play like this many times, yes, one spreads out a blanket and sits under it. But this doesn't mean an ohel, because it's not a derech of making an ohel, **lo kavua velo arai**. It doesn't even mean an ohel arai, it means nothing.

Okay, so a kilah is a normal thing, it came about this way. The kilah is a simple way of how one makes an ohel arai, yes. But a bed, a bed is a bed, it's not made to be an ohel.

No, perhaps he means... sorry, he means something much simpler. He doesn't mean that one takes a bed and hangs it on top of the bed. He just means, you take a bed, you lift up a bed, and you put it down somewhere, and let's say it's a high bed, and there isn't the shiur ohel. Right, under the bed is an ohel. Anyway, you bring a bench, under the bench is an ohel.

Actually, you're not making an ohel, that's not even the derech. Understand? But if he does take a bench and places it from the height, not that, not the heter stands here. Understand? It's not normal from the tables. The question is, under a bench... under every bench is an ohel, so the chiyuv is now also been ohel. He moved the ohel. I mean, what is the...

And that's just plain.

No, here stands the heter.

I mean lekho'ora, no, I mean even if he places it on a bed, even if he places it on a high place, but this is not a derech asiyas ohel. Lo ikpas lei. Here we're talking about that law. Here stands the heter of placing a bench on the floor, because it could mean that he's making an ohel, he explains that's not how one makes an ohel. If he takes the bench and places it in the height, or somehow makes an ohel, the heter doesn't stand here, one needs to seek another heter if there is one.

Yes, he says that an ohel is a thing that is made to use from underneath. A bench is made to use from above, not made to use from underneath.

That's how the ohel is.

Right, it's temporary, but it's bederech arai.

A kilah he did make for this, to be tachtav.

A kilah is however an ohel arai, not made for a tachtav.

It's made le'eila, but kilah is made letachtav.

#### **Opinion of Magen Avraham and Rashba**

There are opinions that forbid it. The... he brings the Magen Avraham who says that there is a type of bed that one actually also uses the underneath, so one may not set up the bed. Let's say, the bed is empty, let's say it's not a bed that we have that already has a mattress, but it has such holes, and there's no lavud, whatever, one may not cover it because you're making an ohel from underneath. So the Rashba held.

#### **Law 29: Slanted Ohel**

Now, he says further today. **Kol ohel meshupah she'ein begago tefach**, there is... one places two pieces of merchandise slanted, so under it is like an ohel, but there isn't a tefach, it goes entirely slanted from both sides. It's like the laws of sukkah where he goes down in tzelem, that the two walls become the roof, the wall is the roof. Or at least when there is **pachos misheloshah samuach legago rochav tefach**, or an ohel that also doesn't have within three tefachim close to the peak a width of a tefach, **harei zeh ohel arai**. I wanted to say like this, I wanted to say like this that the roof has a width of a tefach, even if at the roof there's already no width of a tefach, or a bit before that there is a width of a tefach.

So it's an ohel arai. So this is ohel arai, ulevush oser lechatchilah beshabbos asur.

Very good. **Tallis kefulah**, what does kefulah mean? He folded the tallis,

### **Chapter 22: Shevusim from Boneh to Soser – Continuation of Laws (Part 13)**

#### **Ohel Arai – Continuation of Laws**

##### **Folded Tallis with Strings**

It means, ohel arai it would indeed be called. Not necessarily so it would indeed be called, like the roof has a width of a tefach. Even if at the roof there's already no width of a tefach,

or a bit before that there is a width of a tefach, it must be wide basically. So it's an ohel arai.

It's called ohel arai, vеха'oseh lecha techilah beshabbos is patur.

Here he goes, **tallis kefulah**, what does kefulah mean? Folded the tallis? Draped over, he says, on a... like one hangs a towel on the... such a fold of a folded thing that one puts on the roof. Not folded, folded means a thing that hangs in the middle, like one hangs a towel on a... and one can make a roof from it. So, if **havah lei chutim sheyitlu bah me'erev shabbos**, what are these strings? This means the tallis has strings, **mutar lenotah**, one may spread it out. **Vechen haparochos mutar lenotan umutar lefarkan**, because once it has strings one sees that it's a type of vessel that is made to move, to set up and to take down.

Ah, he's not talking about making a roof, he's talking about making a wall from it, a mechitzah. Like a mechitzah that one has that hangs like a tallis, and one moves it, this is permitted. Like parochos. But the point is, the strings make it so that it already lies there bekevi'us, and you're not now making an ohel. On the contrary not, one didn't mean why. It's not an ohel, let's say that one moves it, one doesn't make from above.

So the question is if it was, yes, if there is a tefach bagag, and the tallis can create a tefach bagag, but because it has strings... something I'm still missing. I don't understand what these strings are. Let's say there wouldn't be strings, may one not hang a tallis to make a mechitzah if one makes with it a gag tefach. If there is a gag tefach, that's the question. It's a continuation of the previous laws. Even in a manner which a gag tefach. But when there are strings on it, it's strings. So it's already... I don't know. It doesn't stand properly. I don't know.

Perhaps the point is because you haven't done anything on Shabbos. It's already lying there from erev Shabbos. You're just spreading it out now by the strings. You grab it by the strings, and you give it a pull. It's like mosif al ha'ohel. It's already made. I could understand that it's a heter that is like before, that mosif al ha'ohel arai, but here I don't grasp what's missing that the rope should do. I don't know. Not clear. One must understand... could be the rope makes it as if it's already made. There's already a roof there. Even if it's laid up, but there's a string there that is very easy to give a pull back to. One doesn't know where this is now metaken been an ohel.

In Tosafos it says, yes, it doesn't say with really... I don't know. Okay.

#### **Chuppah for Grooms**

**Kilas chasanim**. Here stands another... kilas chasanim, such an ohel that one makes for grooms, such a chuppah, yes. **She'ein begagah tefach**, either the roof doesn't have a tefach, **and also it doesn't have bifachos misheloshah samuach legago rochav tefach**, so, **ho'il vehu mesukon lechach**, since the kilas chasanim is made to be a bit... it's made to open and close, and it doesn't mean that when you open it and you close it you make an ohel. **Metaltelim osah umatilin lefarekah**. Notah is translated as closing it, and lefarekah means opening. It's going back to making an ohel, and lefarekah is going back to taking it down so it shouldn't be the highest in it.

Ah, here you see indeed the condition, even the thing that is mesukon lechach, is specifically if there isn't a tefach somehow like this. **Shelo tehei meshulsheles me'al hamittah**

**tefach.** I don't grasp the other translation, meshulshelles me'al hamittah. There is space on top of the mittah? I don't really understand. Where is there meshulshelles me'al hamittah? But the top of the mittah is not at a height of a tefach, somewhere I don't grasp from where we're talking. You see, on these laws one would have needed to make pictures. It's very open, very simple, it's geometry. One needs to have pictures to know what we're talking about. I don't know.

Further.

One needs to know, it seems to me very many things that people don't know if one may, or if it's at all a question of ohel.

#### Window Stopper

**Pekak hachalon**, something to plug the window. You meant that you mean like there is a piece of board. It's a simple board. It's next to a hole in the wall, next to a window, so really it's mesukon lechach. When there is there a piece of pekak that is prepared for the window, so even if it's not a matter of kashur venasun, with a likut al hachalon, one may place it in the hole and cover with it the window. Even if it's not, when it's kashur venasun it's certainly, but even without that it doesn't mean binyan. Let it already be mesukon for that.

#### Hat with Brim

**Kova**, a hat. **Kova shenosnin al harosh**, a hat that one puts on the head, **sheyesh lo safah makefes**, that has such a brim around the hat, **she'oseh tzeil kemo ohel lelovsho**, that makes a shade around the one who wears it, a wide hat, **mutar lelabsho**, one may wear it, **lefi she'eino ohel ela malbush**, because this doesn't mean an ohel, this means a garment.

**Im hotzi min habegadim seviv rosho o keneged panav kemo ohel**, if however he manages to make something seviv rosho o keneged panav that should indeed be kemo ohel, **vehidak al rosho**, and he fastens it so it should lie well on his head, **ve'asah sevivo safah kashah beyoser kemo gag**, and he managed to make from the garments such a piece of ohel around his head, but it should be hard kemo gag, not something that falls down, **asur mipnei she'oseh ohel arai**. Meaning, what I say that such a garment doesn't mean an ohel arai is only when it's truly a proper garment, but if it's specifically built differently than a normal garment, and it's made to be hard, a normal garment falls down, and when it's made hard, so yes, then it is indeed midrabbanan because it's somewhat a piece of ohel arai.

How does this differ from a hat? A hat is different from this something. Hotzi min habegadim, he's not talking about a hat. Kova is a hat. If one is particular that the mechitzah should be mehudad, and it's strong, it's kashah, it's not like a tallis. Okay.

#### Hanging a Paroches

Says the Rav, **"Hanoteh paroches vechayotza bo"**. What does noteh mean? Noteh, we say the whole time noteh. Noteh means spreading out? Yes, that's what I mean. A paroches lies on the bar or on the hook, when he hangs it, yes. He hangs it up. A whole, it's not made at all for the roof, it's made for the wall. But when he hangs it up, he is noteh. When he holds it, let's say, he wants to place the paroches where it belongs, but before it hangs down, one holds it in the hands so one should connect it well. So while he holds it and he places it, **"tzarich lizaher shelo ya'aseh ohel bish'as shenotahu"**, that when he fixes the paroches, he places the paroches in place, there shouldn't somewhere happen to be any ohel.

From here it appears that ohel arai means arai arai, really like for the one minute that it's called an ohel. One needs to be careful like the rabbanan. Right. **"Lefikach im hayesah paroches gedolah, toleh osah shenayim"**, two people should hang it. **"Aval echad asur"**. Why? Because when two people do it, it doesn't go through, yes. The concern doesn't happen. The ohel doesn't happen, because one can do it without a... one person will have to hold it with one hand and hold it spread out, but two people can... yes.

**"Umosif kilah"**, this is a Gemara. Okay. It's not for the previous kilah, it's a roof. Usually one hangs a paroches, yes? Just like that, I go back to the law of a kilah of mine. Ah, right. Not a paroches, but a kilah. Right. But we're talking now about hanging the wall, not fixing the roof. The roof he already said before, a kilah temei'ah. Okay. **"Ein moshchin osah afilu asarah"**. Why? **"Efshar shelo tikava yafeh milematah veyetzei tachteha ohel arai"**. By a paroches, if two people hang it together, it doesn't make an ohel arai. But a kilah sheyesh lah gag, when one spreads it out, automatically one makes an ohel arai.

#### Cloth on a Barrel

**Beged shemehaseh bo pi hechavit**, garments that one hangs on the opening of the barrel, like we already had in sukkah such a type of thing, **lo yehaseh bo es kulo mishum asiyas ohel**. Ah, interesting. Asiyas ohel inside the... technically, if a miniature person would sit inside the barrel, would he have an ohel? The usual ohel is simple that under it becomes an ohel. Okay. **Lo yehaseh bo es kulo mishum asiyas ohel**, but **mechaseh hu miktzaso**. One cannot cover the entire barrel.

It's very interesting, why does this mean an ohel? When the simple rule is a bottle, when someone puts a lid on grape juice, has he now made a roof? Grape juice is perhaps too small, but if it's a barrel, it's a bigger thing. But it doesn't have a chalah tefach. Tefach? It doesn't need to be a size for a person. An ohel doesn't need to be at all a size for a person. Okay, we saw also by the bench, a shiur tefach.

Ohel arai. It means, perhaps actually because of this it's ohel arai, because it's so placed, it's not an ohel mid'oraisa, but an ohel derabbanan. Yes.

Another interesting thing. He says here it seems at the end of Orach Chaim siman shin alef, that this is only by wine barrels, because the wine needs the air, and therefore it means really like one makes an ohel. Interesting.

#### Egyptian Basket

**Hamesanen bechefifah mitzris**, one who strains with an Egyptian basket, through his... through his wagon, whatever, **lo yagbi'ah karka hachefifah min hakeli tefach**. He shouldn't lift the basket... the translation is, one places merchandise. I don't know exactly what an Egyptian basket is. Cheffifah is a basket, a woven basket. One shouldn't place the basket, the... round thing, the thing that one has spun, one shouldn't place it high higher than the vessel, because then when you place it higher than the vessel, it becomes like a roof, which is a... it becomes an ohel arai, **kedei shelo ya'aseh ohel arai**.

I don't understand, we learned before that what is this different from a bench? It appears that here there is indeed benefit from the basket. A bench, I understand like before, a bench is made to use on top of the bench, not under the bench.

These things are indeed made to use underneath, it's made for the barrels, it's made for the barrels which is under the line from the bottom. Yes, he places it higher than the vessel a tefach.

### **End of Laws of Ohel Arai — Questions on Basket, Holding in Hands, and Umbrella**

#### **Basket on Vessels — Difference Between Basket and Bench**

##### **Study Partner A:**

I don't understand, we learned before that for example, what is this different from a bench? You see that here there is indeed benefit from the basket. A bench I understand before.

##### **Study Partner B:**

No, a bench is made to use on top of the bench, not under the bench. These things are indeed made to use underneath. It's made for underneath, for the barrels. It's made for the barrels which is under the basket, mitachas.

Yes, he places it higher than the vessel a tefach, and whatever covers the vessel from above, this is a matter of ohel arai.

Okay, until here laws of ohel arai.

#### **Piskei Teshuvos — Tallis by a Kli Narim**

##### **Chavrusa B:**

He brings here from below indeed that the Piskei Teshuvos says that one may indeed place a tallis by a kli narim, because one doesn't make a mechitzah (partition), one only makes something else around the walls. Whatever it's supposed to mean, I don't know.

#### **Discussion: Holding Something in One's Hands — Is That an Ohel?**

##### **Chavrusa A:**

We didn't have here at all something that a person holds in their hands. The whole time we spoke about when one places it on something.

##### **Chavrusa B:**

No, we did have. We did have. We had explicitly, when one hangs the paroches (curtain) he says that one doesn't need to hold it.

##### **Chavrusa A:**

Yes, but he's going to affix it afterwards on the side.

##### **Chavrusa B:**

At the second when he holds it in the middle of hanging and he holds it with his hands.

##### **Chavrusa A:**

He's holding it now indeed, but he's affixing it. But when the entire thing is that he holds it in his hands, I don't know. One needs to think. I don't know clearly. I don't know clearly.

#### **General Question on the Laws of Ohel Arai**

##### **Chavrusa A:**

I don't understand the laws of ohel arai (temporary tent), the Rabbinic ohel. Something is still missing. Which ohel? The ohel arai itself is still okay, but when it comes to small things, why shouldn't one make a general thing, something that has a similarity to an ohel? But a bench is very far from an ohel, a tefach (handbreadth). It's very interesting.

#### **Umbrella on Shabbos — Opening and Holding**

##### **Chavrusa B:**

Yes, the Acharonim (later authorities) have said that one may not go with an umbrella on Shabbos, because one makes an ohel. One may not open an umbrella. The question is when the umbrella is already open, whether holding it above one's head is also an ohel.