

Laws of Shabbat Chapter 23 (Auto Translated)

English

Auto Translated

Shiur Overview

Summary of Shiur – Laws of Shabbat Chapter 23 (Rambam)

General Introduction

Chapter 23 is the end of the rabbinic prohibitions that are connected to specific melachot. After this, the Rambam begins with general rabbinic prohibitions that are not attached to a specific melachah. The focus of this first part is **makeh b'patish** and the rabbinic decrees that are connected to it.

Halachah 1 – A Hole Made to Bring In and Take Out (Makeh B'Patish D'Oraita)

The Rambam's words: One who makes a hole... made to bring in and take out, such as a chicken coop made to bring in light and let out heat – is liable for makeh b'patish.

Explanation: Whoever makes a hole that is made for two functions – bringing in (for example, light) and taking out (for example, hot air) – is liable for makeh b'patish, because this completes the vessel and makes it usable.

Novellae and Explanations:

1. **What is makeh b'patish essentially – completion of work or fixing a vessel?** The Rambam said in **Chapter 10** that makeh b'patish is liable, and "anyone who does completion of work" is a toladah. This means that actual makeh b'patish (with a hammer) is the av, and other forms of completion of work are toladot. It's not entirely clear whether the av itself must also be completion of work, or whether makeh b'patish is a broader category of "minor fixes."

2. **Contradiction between boneh and makeh b'patish regarding a chicken coop:** In **Chapter 10** the Rambam writes "**One who makes any size hole in a chicken coop so that light will enter – is liable for boneh**", and here in Chapter 23 he writes that the same thing is liable for **makeh b'patish**. This is a well-known question that the commentators ask.

3. **Proposal: Makeh b'patish is a thing in itself, not just completion of work:** Makeh b'patish is not only "completing a vessel" – it is a special melachah of "making a new fix." If one makes a hole that is for bringing in and taking out, one is liable for makeh b'patish **even when this doesn't complete the entire vessel**. Completion of work is another form of makeh b'patish, but not the only one.

4. **Distinction between attached to the ground (boneh) and not attached (makeh b'patish):** Perhaps when the coop is **attached to the ground** it is liable for **boneh**, and when it is **not attached** – where boneh in vessels doesn't apply – one remains liable for **makeh b'patish**. This would resolve both Rambams.

5. **The Lechem Mishneh's approach:** The **Lechem Mishneh** says that one can be liable for both – boneh and

makeh b'patish – for the same action, and the Rambam brings each liability separately in its place.

6. **Building in vessels – connection to makeh b'patish:** Regarding ark, box and tower, where building in vessels doesn't apply (for example, putting on a door), perhaps this is liable for makeh b'patish because through this the vessel is completed.

Halachah 1 (Continued) – Rabbinic Decree on a Hole That Is Not Made to Bring In and Take Out

The Rambam's words: Therefore they decreed on every hole – even one made only to take out or only to bring in – lest one come to make a hole for which one is liable.

Explanation: A hole that is only for one function (only in or only out) is not liable d'Oraita, but the Sages prohibited it rabbinically, so that one shouldn't come to make a hole for which one is liable. A hole with no function at all (destructive) is not even rabbinic.

Novellae:

Two distinct reasons for the decree are identified: (a) "**like fixing**" – it looks like fixing a vessel; (b) "**lest one come to make another hole**" – one will come to make a proper hole. The "like fixing" reason explains why some cases are permitted (because it doesn't look like fixing), and the "lest one come" reason explains why a hole only to take out is prohibited. The distinction between the two reasons is used to explain various laws in this chapter.

Halachah 1 (Continued) – Hole in a Barrel: New, Enlarging, Old

The Rambam's words: Therefore one may not make a new hole in a barrel, and one may not enlarge it. But one may open an old hole, provided it is not a hole below the sediment.

Explanation: One may not make a new hole in a barrel, and may not enlarge an existing hole (both rabbinic). But an old hole that is plugged may be opened – this is not a melachah, just removing an obstruction.

Novellae:

Hole below the sediment: A hole below the sediment is different, because that hole serves **to strengthen** the barrel (the sediment adds weight), and therefore it becomes very firmly plugged. When one opens such a hole it is as if one is making a new hole, not simply opening an old one.

Halachah 1 (Continued) – Hole in the Lid of a Barrel

The Rambam's words: One may make a hole in the lid of a barrel – provided one makes it from above, but from the side – it is prohibited.

Explanation: One may make a hole in the lid (cover) of the barrel, but only from above. From the side is rabbinically prohibited.

Novellae:

1. **Question:** According to the rule that even a hole only to take out is rabbinically prohibited — why is from above permitted? This is also a hole made only to take out!

2. **Answer:** The novelty is specifically the prohibition regarding from the side. When one makes the hole from above the lid, this is **not the normal way of fixing a vessel** — it's not the normal way one makes a hole in a vessel. Therefore it is permitted. But regarding from the side, where it looks more like a practical fix, the Sages prohibited it.

3. **Two reasons for the decree — "like fixing" vs. "lest one come":** The "like fixing" reason explains why from above is permitted — because from above it is not "like fixing." The "lest one come" reason explains why a hole only to take out is prohibited — because one might come to make a proper hole to take out and bring in. The Rambam doesn't say this explicitly, but it is the best explanation.

Halachah 1 (Continued) — One May Break a Barrel to Eat Dried Figs From It

The Rambam's words: One may break a barrel to eat dried figs from it, provided one does not intend to make a vessel.

Explanation: One may break a barrel on Shabbat to remove the food inside it, but one should not intend to make a vessel.

Novellae:

1. **"Intend to make a vessel" doesn't mean intention in one's mind:** His intention is always the same — he wants to remove dried figs. **"Intend to make a vessel" means that he should not cut/break it in a nice way** — he should not make a nice opening that looks like an entrance. If he breaks it randomly, it remains a broken barrel and this is permitted. If he cuts it nicely, like an entrance, this is fixing a vessel and prohibited.

2. **"Vessel" here doesn't mean a vessel in the sense of a complete vessel, but the opening itself** — making a nice opening is "making a vessel" or "fixing a vessel."

Halachah 1 (Continued) — Cutting Off Its Head with a Sword Before Guests

The Rambam's words: A person may bring a barrel of wine and cut off its head with a sword before guests and need not be concerned.

Explanation: One may chop off the top of a wine barrel with a sword before guests, and need not worry.

Novellae:

1. **Why is this permitted even though he makes a nicer opening?** Regarding breaking a barrel for dried figs, one may only break, not cut nicely. Here he cuts it off with a sword! The answer: **His intention is to show his generosity** — he wants to show magnanimity to his guests, not to make an opening. The sword is part of the "show."

2. **Distinction between for oneself and for guests:** When a person opens a barrel for himself with a sword, it's certain he wants to make a hole. But when he does it **before**

guests, there is another reason — generosity — which makes it permitted.

Halachah 1 (Continued) — Plugging a Hole in a Barrel

The Rambam's words: Just as it is prohibited to open any hole, so it is prohibited to plug any hole. Therefore it is prohibited to plug a hole in a barrel even with something that is not spread, such as plugging with alum or a small pebble.

Explanation: Just as one may not open a hole, so too one may not plug a hole in a barrel — even with something that doesn't have the problem of smoothing, like a stone or stick.

Novellae:

1. **Three separate prohibitions regarding plugging a barrel:** (a) with something that spreads (fat, wax) — prohibited for **smoothing**; (b) with a cloth — prohibited for **squeezing**; (c) with alum or a small pebble (which has neither smoothing nor squeezing) — prohibited for **plugging a hole** (makeh b'patish). The Rambam's novelty is the third case — even without smoothing and without squeezing, the prohibition of plugging a hole remains.

2. **Hole vs. opening: "Hole" means a hole that is broken** — damage in the barrel that one fixes. This is not the same as the **opening** (lid/entrance) of the barrel, which one may cover (except if it's smoothing).

Halachah 1 (Continued) — Plugging a Hole with Food (Circumvention)

The Rambam's words: But if one placed food there to preserve it and the hole became plugged, it is permitted.

Explanation: If one puts food in the hole to preserve it, and it turns out that the hole becomes plugged, it is permitted. One may also remove it.

Novellae:

1. **This is a circumvention** — one puts food in the barrel, and although the real intention is to plug the hole, one can say "I only wanted to preserve the food." This is similar to the circumvention regarding straightening bread, but **a different type of circumvention** — here one does something that looks like a legitimate action (preserving food) although the real goal is plugging.

2. **The condition "to preserve it" is the permission, not the food itself.** The food **creates a reason** for preservation — because food is not a good plug, one can claim that one is placing it not to plug but to preserve. A toothpick, on the other hand, one cannot claim "to preserve," because a toothpick has no concept of preservation.

3. **"Whom is he fooling with this circumvention?"** — a fundamental question: The person himself knows that he wants to plug. It is compared to the circumvention with a beam — one asks him "what are you doing?" He answers "I'm storing a beam," and if it plugged the barrel — "lucky me!" It remains a difficult question.

4. **The Shulchan Aruch's distinction — only a Torah scholar:** The Shulchan Aruch says that only a Torah scholar may do this, because regarding a Torah scholar we believe that

he really means to preserve, and he won't come to do it in a prohibited manner.

5. **The foundation of circumvention in general** is touched upon as one of the "interesting topics" — sometimes yes, sometimes no — and it remains a major principle that needs to be understood.

Halachah 5-6 – Anything That Is Completion of Work – Makeh B'Patish

The Rambam's words: Anything that is completion of work one is liable for it as makeh b'patish.

Explanation: Any action that is completion of work (finishing a job / final touch) is liable d'Oraita for makeh b'patish. This includes any type of fixing a vessel — even a small scratch that completes the vessel.

Novellae:

The Rambam's language here is "a bit different" than usual — he doesn't place this as the beginning of the chapter, because earlier he already spoke of liabilities regarding holes. Now comes another type of liability — completion of work, and from this stem the rabbinic decrees regarding lest one fix a musical instrument.

Halachah – It Is Prohibited to Make the Sound of Music on Shabbat

The Rambam's words: Therefore it is prohibited to make the sound of music on Shabbat, whether with musical instruments such as lyres and harps, or with other things. Even to clap one finger against the ground or against a board one against the other in the manner of singers, or to rattle a nut for a baby, or to shake a bell in a cradle so that it will be quiet — all this and similar things are prohibited, a decree lest one fix a musical instrument.

Explanation: Because completion of work (makeh b'patish) is liable d'Oraita, the Sages prohibited all types of making the sound of music — musical instruments (lyres, harps), clapping with fingers on table/floor, drumming with nuts for a child, ringing a bell — all a decree lest one fix a musical instrument.

Novellae:

1. **Why are musical instruments especially connected to fixing?** Musical instruments (especially string instruments like lyre/harp) constantly need fixing — a string breaks, one needs to tune, etc. Therefore the concern of lest one fix a musical instrument is a real concern.

2. **Clapping, drumming, and dancing:** The Rambam also prohibits **clapping hands (clapping), drumming (drumming), and dancing.** Drumming is perhaps beating on a table/drum, while clapping is clapping hands. The distinction remains not entirely clear. With a **change** (in an unusual manner) one may clap.

3. **The Rama's permission — better they should be unintentional:** The Rama rules that because Hasidic Jews dance at the third meal, one should not protest them, based on the principle **better they should be unintentional than intentional.**

4. **The Aruch HaShulchan's reasoning:** The Aruch HaShulchan argues that when Hasidic Jews dance around the

table it is not at all "drumming and dancing" as the Gemara means — **drumming and dancing means professional performance** that has to do with musical instruments and beat, not just simple dancing around a table.

5. **A practical difference:** Between simple dancing at a Shabbat table, to a professional choir/singer who work during the week and are hired for Shabbat — for them this clapping is already "with more intention" and more relevant to lest one fix a musical instrument, because they are professional musicians.

6. **"In learning one learns what it says, in practice one does what the custom is"** — one must learn the law as it stands, even when the custom is different.

7. **[Digression: Slobodka]** — in the Slobodka yeshiva, students would dance on Shabbat, but they were very careful that it should be "around the table" — with a change, not a formal dance.

Halachah – It Is Prohibited to Swim on the Water

The Rambam's words: It is prohibited to swim on the water, a decree lest one make a barrel for swimming. But in a **pool in the courtyard** one may, **provided it has an enclosed rim.**

Explanation: One may not swim in a sea/pond on Shabbat, because one might come to make a floating vessel (barrel for swimming — an empty barrel that holds air and one swims with it). But in a pool in the courtyard one may, because in a small courtyard one doesn't build boats.

Novellae:

1. **Barrel for swimming** — an empty barrel/tub that holds air inside, and with it one can swim. It's not a major melachah.

2. **Enclosed rim** — the water must have clear boundaries/shores, so that they won't go outside the boundary. A normal swimming pool automatically has an enclosed rim.

3. **Practical difference — swimming on Shabbat in a swimming pool:** According to the Rambam one may apparently swim in a normal swimming pool on Shabbat. But in practice one doesn't conduct oneself this way, and this has to do with the topic of **bathing** (not swimming). Bathing in cold water is fundamentally permitted, but the later authorities (Mishnah Berurah) don't conduct themselves to wash on Shabbat even in cold water due to various concerns. **Swimming is a separate law, not bathing** — swimming has its own decree (barrel for swimming), and bathing has its own concerns.

4. **Swimming as exercise:** Perhaps there is a side prohibition of swimming because people do it as exercise (like sweating on Shabbat). But only when one does something one doesn't like, only for exercise, is this a problem. If one enjoys it (like swimming), even though it's also exercise, it is permitted.

5. **Mikveh vs. pool:** Someone who regularly goes to a pool, perhaps he may not go to a mikveh on Shabbat, because for him there is no "appears as cooling off." But regarding mikveh the problem is "fixing" (immersion), and "appears as cooling off" is the answer.

Halachah – Reed Tube (Straw in a Barrel)

The Rambam's words: One may not cut from a reed tube — one may not cut a straw (reed) to insert it in a barrel. **But if it was prepared** — if it is already prepared/cut, one may insert it in the hole of the barrel, **and we are not concerned lest one fix**.

Explanation: A straw (from reed/straw) that one places in a wine barrel so the wine will flow out. To cut the reed fresh is prohibited due to fixing a vessel. But if it is already prepared, one may insert it.

Novellae:

1. **What is the prohibition of cutting?** This is **makeh b'patish** — he makes the reed fit for use, he gives it completion of work. It's not building and demolishing in vessels, but fixing a vessel.

2. **"We are not concerned lest one fix" — what does "fix" mean?** It can mean (a) he will cut a new tube, or (b) he will fix the barrel by inserting the straw.

3. **The background of the Gemara:** In the Gemara there is a **dispute among Amoraim** whether one may insert an already-cut tube at all. The Gemara makes a limitation that to cut fresh everyone agrees is prohibited. The Rambam rules like the opinion that one need not be concerned.

Halachah — Myrtle Leaf in a Barrel

The Rambam's words: One may not place a myrtle leaf in the hole of a barrel **so that the wine will flow**, because this is **like making a spout on Shabbat**.

Explanation: A myrtle leaf has a pointed shape that fits well into a hole in a barrel, and it serves as a spout/faucet so the wine will flow in one direction instead of spraying.

Novellae:

Question: Why is a reed tube permitted but a myrtle leaf prohibited? Both are ready things? The answer: A reed (tube) is already an existing vessel that one knows can be used as a tube. But a myrtle leaf — through squeezing it in, bending it, and shaping it, **one makes it now for this purpose** — this is like making a spout, one creates a new function.

[Digression: Barrel vs. Bottle — Opening Bottles on Shabbat]

An important reasoning is established that a **barrel** is a fundamentally different reality than a **bottle**:

- A **barrel** is a huge thing, almost a piece of furniture — one builds it with hammer and nails, it stands in storage, it has a bit of **building** or **vessel** status.

- A **bottle** is a tiny thing that one brings to the table, a child can hold it — **it doesn't make vessels**.

The claim: Perhaps the entire approach of poskim who prohibit opening bottles (based on the lid of a barrel) is **wrong**, because they equate a bottle to a barrel which is a completely different reality.

Another novelty: Perhaps there is a rule that **anything that one eats at the table is not melachah** — things that one does while eating at the table (like selecting immediately, dipping, fixing salt in radish) have a leniency. The brother R' Elazar formulated this rule, although it is "thought up on one's own."

Another point: The question of **ease** — whether the fact that something is easy to do is a reason to be lenient. The conclusion: ease itself is not a permission, but the question is whether he did a **significant thing**.

Halachah — One May Not Break Pottery and One May Not Tear Paper

The Rambam's words: One may not break pottery and one may not tear paper

Explanation: One may not break a shard (pottery) and may not tear paper, because when one breaks a shard to get a small piece for a specific use, this is **like fixing a vessel** — one makes a new vessel. The same with cutting a piece of paper — a whole roll of paper one cannot use, only when it is cut. This is **fixing a vessel rabbinically**.

Halachah — Branch Tied to a Gourd (Vessel for Drawing Water)

The Rambam's words: A gourd (vessel/pitcher for drawing water) that is tied to a **branch** — **one may draw with it on Shabbat**. But if the branch is **not tied** — **one may not draw with it**.

Novellae:

1. **What is the problem?** The concern is **lest one fix a vessel** — fear that he will cut a branch and prepare it (not cutting from a tree, but **fixing a vessel**). When it is already tied, it is ready and one does nothing new.

Halachah — Prohibition of Polishing Silver Vessels with Girtakon

The Rambam's words: It is prohibited to polish silver vessels with girtakon because it whitens them in the manner of craftsmen, thus it is like fixing a vessel in its completion on Shabbat. But a person may polish his cup with sand and natron. And similarly all vessels one may polish and carry with anything.

Explanation: One may not polish silver vessels with girtakon (a sharp chemical), because this is the professional way that craftsmen finish silver vessels — it looks like fixing a vessel in its completion. But with weaker materials (sand, natron) one may clean. Other vessels (not silver vessels) one may clean with anything, because for them cleaning is never completion of work.

Novellae:

The distinction regarding silver vessels is not between using/not using, but between which material one uses — girtakon (professional) vs. sand/natron (ordinary). Regarding silver vessels no condition was set that one must use it again that Shabbat (as with eating vessels later). This shows that the prohibition is a special matter — it looks like completion of work of the vessel itself, not just effort.

Halachah — Prohibition of Washing Vessels Not for Shabbat Use

The Rambam's words: It is prohibited to wash bowls and pots and similar things because it is like putting away, unless one washes them to eat with them another meal on that Shabbat.

Explanation: One may not wash plates/pots after using them, because it looks like one is "putting away" (clearing away/fixing the vessel). Only if one washes it for another meal on that Shabbat, is it permitted.

Novellae:

The Rambam's Reason — "Like Putting Away" = Fixing a Vessel

The Rambam's language "like putting away" means it looks like one is fixing the vessel. When one washes it to put away (not for immediate use), it feels like a long-term fix — similar to a fold that will last long. But when one washes it for immediate use, it will soon become dirty again, so it's not fixing.

The Raavad's Dissenting Opinion

The Raavad says that the prohibition is not due to fixing a vessel, but due to **effort not for Shabbat use** — one exerts oneself for a weekday thing. This is also the accepted explanation by most people.

Question on the Rambam from Silver Vessels

Regarding silver vessels it is permitted to polish with sand/natron without any condition that one will use it again that Shabbat. Why is it stricter regarding eating vessels? A silver vessel that stands on the shelf for beauty, where one washes it "for a long time," should apparently look more like fixing! The answer: A silver vessel that stands for beauty already has immediate use — a beautiful candelabra stands on the table, this itself is already use. But the answer remains not entirely satisfying.

General Rule About Categorizing Melachot

Often the category where one places a prohibition is more uncertain than the essence of the prohibition itself. Both — Rambam and Raavad — agree that one may not wash vessels not for Shabbat use. The dispute is only under which category it falls (fixing a vessel or effort). **The Sages didn't work from rules to details, but the reverse** — they looked at each action in particular, ruled that it is prohibited, and only afterward did the Rambam search under which melachah/category it falls.

Today's Practical Differences — Washing Dishes Today

Today when one places plates in the sink, everyone knows that after Shabbat one will wash again well with soap. The first rinse is not "fixing" — it is only minimal cleaning so as not to have grossly dirty plates with cholent. Therefore some poskim are more lenient in modern times.

An Interesting Paradox

According to the Rambam one would be allowed to **polish silver** on Shabbat (because with natron one may), but **wash a plate from cholent** not — which would be very strange. This shows that one must understand the reality of then. Perhaps one may indeed not polish silver, because it is **effort on Shabbat** — not a Shabbat thing.

Halachah — Drinking Vessels (Cups and Pitchers)

The Rambam's words: But drinking vessels such as cups and pitchers... for there is no fixed time for drinking.

Explanation: Cups and drinking vessels one may wash all the time, because **drinking has no fixed time** — one can always become thirsty.

Novellae:

Regarding eating vessels (plates) — when one finishes the meal, one knows that one will not use it again today, thus washing is preparation. But regarding drinking vessels — because "there is no fixed time for drinking," it is never clear that one has finished. Perhaps in modern times, where people snack and eat fruits in the afternoon, a plate is also not so connected to only a meal.

Halachah — One May Not Spread Beds on Shabbat

The Rambam's words: One may not spread beds on Shabbat to sleep on them tomorrow... but one may spread from Friday night for Shabbat.

Explanation: One may not spread/prepare bedding on Shabbat for after Shabbat, but for Shabbat itself one may.

Novellae:

An inquiry — what is the reason for "making a bed"?

- **Opinion A:** One makes the bed **so the room will look orderly** — because during sleep it becomes messed up anyway, thus the purpose is not for the sleeping itself but for the appearance of the room.

- **Opinion B:** One makes the bed **so one can sleep normally** — when one comes late at night one shouldn't arrive at a mess. It is much easier to fall asleep when the bed is orderly. This is compared to setting a table — one does it for eating.

Halachah 8 — It Is Prohibited to Immerse Impure Vessels on Shabbat

The Rambam's words: It is prohibited to immerse impure vessels on Shabbat, even if one does not intend to fix vessels... but an impure person may immerse, because it appears as cooling off.

Explanation: One may not immerse impure vessels on Shabbat, because it looks like **fixing a vessel** — before immersion one could not use the vessel, after immersion one can. But a **person** who is impure may immerse, because "**it appears as cooling off**" — it looks like he is cooling off.

Novellae:

1. **Why is it only "like fixing a vessel" (like fixing) and not actually fixing?** Because no real physical change happened in the vessel — it is only a **halachic/spiritual** change, a status designation.

2. **Question about immersing vessels from a non-Jew (modern times):** Today the main relevance is immersing new vessels that one buys from a non-Jew. Does this have the same law as an impure vessel? It is answered that it is **not fixing a vessel** in the same sense — but it remains not entirely satisfying, because there is also here a decree that one should not use it before immersing it.

3. **Can one say "fixing" about a person?** When a person becomes pure, is this "makeh b'patish on the person"? It's not that the person is a vessel, but he does a **melachah of fixing**.

4. **Why is healing on Shabbat not prohibited due to fixing?** If one can say "fixing" about a person (as with immersion), why is healing only prohibited due to **the decree of grinding medicines** and not due to fixing itself? Regarding people, fixing a vessel in that sense doesn't apply —

fixing the body is not the same law as fixing a vessel. The prohibition of healing on Shabbat is only due to **the decree of grinding medicines** (lest one come to grind medicines). It is compared to the law of **fixing vertebrae in a child's spine** — which is also not considered fixing a vessel.

Unintentional and Intentional

The Rambam says: If someone unintentionally immersed a vessel on Shabbat — **if unintentional he may use them, if intentional he may not use them** (until after Shabbat).

Novelty: The law of **if intentional he may not use them** applies not only to Torah prohibitions, but also to rabbinic prohibitions. The penalty of "not using until after Shabbat" applies even when the prohibition itself is only rabbinic.

Halachah – Immersing Impure Water on Shabbat

The Rambam's words: It is permitted to immerse impure water on Shabbat. How should one do it? One places it in a vessel that does not receive impurity such as stone vessels, and immerses the vessel in a mikveh until mikveh water rises over it, and behold it is pure.

Explanation: One must make contact — so the impure water will touch mikveh water. This one may do, because he is not working with a vessel (he is not fixing a vessel), it doesn't look like fixing.

Novellae:

Why must one place it in a **vessel that does not receive impurity**? Because if one places it in a regular vessel, the vessel becomes impure from the water, and then one must immerse the vessel — which one may not do on Shabbat. During the week it would not be a problem, because one could immerse the vessel too. The whole trick is only relevant for Shabbat.

Halachah – One May Not Separate Terumot and Ma'asrot on Shabbat

The Rambam's words: One may not separate terumot and ma'asrot on Shabbat — because **it appears as fixing something that was not fixed.**

Explanation: One may not separate terumot and ma'asrot on Shabbat, because the fruits were tevel (not fit for eating), and through tithing one makes them fit — this is fixing.

Novellae:

1. This is a **spiritual fixing** — not a physical fixing of a vessel, but rabbinically it is treated like fixing something that was not fit for eating.

2. **Practical point:** In the Land of Israel almost everything is already tithed with a hechsher, but people tithe stringently. If it is already basically kosher, it is a question whether this "tithing stringently" is really fixing or not. Also mentioned is the practical problem when one forgets to take challah from matzot on erev Pesach that falls on Shabbat.

Halachah – Me'

abed (Toladot and Rabbinic Decrees)

The Rambam's words: One who softens leather with oil in the manner that tanners and sellers do — behold this is me'abed and liable.

Explanation: Softening leather with oil as leather-workers do is the av melachah of me'abed.

A Person May Not Anoint His Foot with Oil Inside the Shoe

The Rambam's words: Therefore a person may not anoint his foot with oil while it is inside a new shoe or sandal. But he may anoint his foot with oil and place it inside the shoe even if they are new.

Explanation: One may not pour oil on the foot when one is already wearing new shoes, because it looks like he is pouring on the shoes (me'abed). But one may smear oil on the foot and then put on the shoes — because it is a great change and it doesn't look like fixing.

Rolling on a New Leather Mat

The Rambam's words: And one may anoint his entire body with oil and roll on top of a new leather mat and need not be concerned, for this is not the manner of tanning at all.

Explanation: One may smear oneself with oil and roll on a new leather mat, because this is not the manner of tanning.

Novelty: The distinction is: **softening leather with oil** means one uses a tool and works directly on the leather. Here the oil comes to the leather indirectly through the body — this is **not the manner of tanning.**

Little Oil vs. Much Oil

The Rambam's words: Regarding new ones — if there was a little oil there just to polish the leather — permitted. But if there was much oil there to soften the leather — behold this is prohibited as similar to me'abed.

Explanation: Regarding new leather: a little oil that only gives a shine — permitted. Much oil that actually softens the leather — prohibited for me'abed. Regarding **old ones** — permitted even with much oil, because it has already been tanned.

Halachah – Memachek/Memareach — One Who Spreads a Plaster

The Rambam's words: One who spreads a plaster — is liable for smoothing the leather.

Explanation: When one spreads the medicine on the plaster (bandage), one is liable for the melachah of smoothing — smoothing out a hide.

Novellae:

1. **What is the connection to smoothing the leather?** Smoothing means smoothing out a hide — removing hair, warts, and other irregularities until **the surface of the leather becomes smooth.** With the plaster it is the same action: he spreads the cream on the plaster **until its surface becomes smooth** — he makes the surface of the plaster smooth.

2. **The liability is not for spreading on one's own skin (body),** but for spreading the cream on the plaster itself.

3. **What kind of material is a plaster:** In the times of the Sages a plaster was a piece of leather or coarse fabric that had irregularities — hard pieces, prickly threads — and through spreading with cream one smoothed it out, exactly like smoothing the leather. A modern Band-Aid is not leather, but the law stems from that reality.

Halachah – Plugging a Hole with Wax (Decree Due to Spreading/Smoothing)

The Rambam's words: Therefore — it is also prohibited to plug a hole with wax, because wax is a material that one naturally spreads, and the spreading is smoothing.

Explanation: This is a decree — one fears that he will come to spread (smooth) the wax, which is smoothing. This connects back to earlier laws about covering a hole in a barrel.

Halachah – Kotev: Prohibition of Applying Kohl with Puch

The Rambam's words: It is prohibited to apply kohl with puch and similar things on Shabbat.

Explanation: Kohl is a cosmetic dye for the eyes. The puch is the tool that one uses to apply it. This is rabbinically prohibited because it is similar to writing — he takes a tool, places at the end something similar to ink, and makes a color/mark. Even though it's not actually writing (he doesn't write letters), just making a color, it is rabbinically prohibited.

Halachah – Buying and Selling, Hiring Workers, Borrowing and Lending

The Rambam's words: It is prohibited to engage in buying and selling on Shabbat, a decree lest one write. A person may not hire workers on Shabbat. And a person may not tell his fellow to hire workers for him.

But: To borrow and lend — borrowing and lending objects one may. **To borrow and lend** — borrowing money one may not.

Explanation: Buying/selling, hiring workers — all prohibited on Shabbat, a decree lest one write. But borrowing objects one may, because when one borrows an object one doesn't write. With money one needs to write down accounts.

Novellae:

1. **[Digression: Origin of writing]** The first writing was invented for commercial purposes — for writing down accounts when borrowing and selling. Writing is fundamentally connected to buying and selling.

2. **[Digression: Torah novellae on Shabbat]** May one think of Torah novellae on Shabbat, because one will want to write? One may learn Torah and think of novellae, just one may not write. Writing Torah novellae is not ideal but after the fact is good.

3. **Borrowing a jug of wine and a jug of oil:** One may borrow wine and oil from a friend. But one should not say **"lend me"** (language of lending) but **"loan me"** (language of borrowing). The distinction: "loan me" means he brings it back soon (after Shabbat), but "lend me" means a loan for 30 days, which requires writing even for wine and oil.

4. **Another explanation:** When one borrows jugs of wine, the person can return money instead of wine — this is already a loan. But if one says "loan me" it means he brings back the same type of thing.

5. **Novelty:** Even when he pays with money (borrows money), it is permitted as long as one doesn't use the word "loan" — because technically it is a borrowing, not a sale.

Halachah – Whether One Sells Verbally or by Transfer
The Rambam's words: Whether one sells verbally or by transfer, it is prohibited.

Explanation: Whether one sells through verbal agreement, or through physical transfer — it is prohibited on Shabbat. Even a sale that consists only of trust (he believes him on his word) without any formal acquisition, is also prohibited.

Halachah – Weighing, Measuring, Counting on Shabbat
The Rambam's words: Just as it is prohibited to weigh whether with scales or without scales, so it is prohibited to count and to measure whether with a measuring vessel or by hand or with a rope.

Explanation: All types of measuring, weighing, and counting are prohibited on Shabbat — whether with a tool, by hand, or with a string.

Novellae:

- "With scales" has two prohibitions: (1) the actual act of weighing as a manner of commerce/weekday activities, (2) the use of scales as a tool. "Without scales" shows that even without a tool the actual action of weighing is prohibited.

- Regarding the laws of techumin one needs to know measurements, but everything regarding techumin is done approximately, not precise measurement.

Halachah – No Judging, Chalitzah, Yibum, Betrothal on Shabbat

The Rambam's words: One may not judge on Shabbat, and not perform chalitzah, and not perform yibum, and not betroth — a decree lest one write.

Explanation: One may not conduct a Torah judgment, chalitzah, yibum, or betrothal on Shabbat, because one will come to write.

Novellae:

1. **Question regarding betrothal:** Betrothal doesn't require a court, it's a matter between three people (groom, bride, witnesses). Who will write?

2. **First answer:** Judges kept ledgers of divorces and betrothals. But this is rejected because betrothal doesn't come to court.

3. **Second answer:** Perhaps it means writing a ketubah document.

4. **Third answer (main):** Betrothal is similar to buying and selling — "behold you are betrothed to me with this ring" — he purchases her with monetary value. "A decree lest one write" here doesn't mean a specific writing concern, but it is a type of negotiation that falls under the rule of buying and selling.

Halachah – No Consecrating, Evaluating, Devoting, Terumot and Ma'asrot

The Rambam's words: And one may not consecrate, and not evaluate, and not devote, and one may not separate terumot and ma'asrot — for they are similar to consecrating those fruits that he separated.

Novellae:

Terumot and ma'asrot has **two prohibitions**: (1) fixing — one makes tevel fixed; (2) similar to buying and selling — one consecrates for the kohen, just as one consecrates to the Temple. The Rambam brings both reasons; perhaps there is a practical difference between them.

Halachah – One May Not Tithe Animals

The Rambam's words: And one may not tithe animals — a decree lest one mark with red dye.

Explanation: One may not perform animal tithing on Shabbat because one will come to mark (inscribe) with red dye on the tenth animal.

Halachah – Consecrating One's Pesach Offering on Shabbat

The Rambam's words: And a person may consecrate his Pesach offering on Shabbat and similarly his festival offering on Yom Tov, for it is the mitzvah of the day.

Explanation: Erev Pesach that falls on Shabbat one may consecrate the Pesach offering, because it is the mitzvah of the day.

Novellae:

Three approaches why the Sages didn't decree here:

1. **Simple answer:** Regarding the mitzvah of the day the Sages simply didn't decree — it's a rabbinic decree and for a mitzvah they were lenient.

2. **Reasoning answer:** When a person prepares an offering for now, it doesn't look like buying and selling. With animal tithing one goes through with his "accountant" how much to pay — this is buying and selling. But taking an animal that is already his and making it a Pesach offering is not a business act.

3. The rule "there is no rabbinic decree in the Temple" is mentioned but not accepted as the main answer.

Halachah – One May Not Consecrate Purification Water

The Rambam's words: Just as one may not consecrate, so one may not consecrate purification water.

Explanation: One may not prepare purification water on Shabbat (pouring water into red heifer ashes). The reason: one takes a mundane thing (water) and makes it holy — this is "consecration" itself.

[Digression: Red Heifer] The Rambam also speaks **laws for the Messiah**. The Jews of Ethiopia had a tradition to slaughter a red heifer and sprinkle until they came to the Land of Israel.

Halachah – Separating Terumot and Ma'asrot on Shabbat After the Fact

The Rambam's words: One who separates terumat and ma'asrot on Shabbat — if unintentionally he may eat immediately, if intentionally he may not eat until after Shabbat.

Explanation: After the fact it works — it has become tithed. One doesn't say "it doesn't work."

The Rambam: And similarly one who consecrates or evaluates or devotes on Shabbat, whether unintentionally or intentionally, his actions are done. And similarly one who transfers to his fellow on Shabbat, his acquisition is valid. Needless to say on Yom Tov.

Novelty: Yom Tov is easier in general regarding matters of eating and offerings, therefore "needless to say."

Halachah – Tithing Demai on Shabbat

The Rambam's words: One may tithe demai [on Shabbat].

Explanation: Demai one may tithe on Shabbat, because demai is only a doubt — most common people do tithe — and one can eat it in pressing circumstances without tithing.

Novellae:

Demai is special because one can eat it ideally (in pressing circumstances), therefore this tithing is not a "fixing" per se. But definite tevel — even if it's only a doubt — one may not.

Halachah – Designating Terumat Ma'aser of Demai / Ma'aser Ani of Definite

The Rambam's words: One who designated terumat ma'aser of demai or ma'aser ani of definite — may not take them on Shabbat, even though he designated a place for them before Shabbat and they are known and placed beside the fruits.

Explanation: Even if one already designated before Shabbat which fruits are terumat ma'aser/ma'aser ani, one may not physically remove them on Shabbat. The visual act of removing looks like buying and selling / fixing.

The Rambam: But if there was a kohen or poor person accustomed to eat at his place — behold these may come to him and eat, provided he informs the kohen that this which he is feeding him is terumat ma'aser, and informs the poor person that this which he is feeding him is ma'aser ani.

Explanation: If the kohen or poor person are accustomed to come eat at his place, they may come and eat this on Shabbat — but he must inform them what it is.

Novellae:

1. This is permitted because it doesn't look like "the manner of tithing" (separating and giving), but like "the manner of hospitality" — taking guests. The visual appearance determines.

2. **The obligation to inform is not a law of Shabbat, but a law of ma'asrot.** Without this the homeowner would be misusing terumah — he uses it for his own meal/benefit (he shows his generosity as a host), instead of giving it as a gift to the kohen/poor person.

3. **The distinction between "guest" and "gift":** When a guest eats at your place, it is **your meal**, not his. The kohen/poor person must know that this is **his gift**, not just your hospitality.

Halachah 5 – It Is Prohibited to Cast Lots (Lottery/Gambling)

The Rambam's words: It is prohibited to cast lots — one may not make a lottery on Shabbat.

Explanation: Gambling (playing with dice) is prohibited on Shabbat because it is buying and selling.

Novellae:

- During the week some hold that playing with dice is permitted (because it is *asmachta*). But **on Shabbat** it is prohibited because it has a form of buying and selling.

- **Distinction:** Among people at home (members of his household) one may make a game — "who gets the bigger piece of challah?" — **large portion against small portion.** This is not buying and selling because they are like his son and members of his household, one domain, and no one is really particular.

Halachah 6 – It Is Prohibited to Calculate Accounts / Secular Documents

Accounts on Shabbat

The Rambam's words: It is prohibited to calculate accounts that are needed for tomorrow on Shabbat — a decree lest one write.

Explanation: Accounts that one needs for tomorrow (practical purposes) are prohibited. But accounts that have no need — just for interest — are permitted.

Novellae:

- Examples of permitted accounts: "how many se'ah of grain did he take to so-and-so" (last year), "how many dinars did he spend on his son's wedding" — this is just conversation-information.

- **Accounts of mitzvah** — the Rama doesn't want to say that one may, because it is a weekday thing, but it is **not a prohibition** from the perspective of Shabbat.

Secular Documents

The Rambam's words: It is prohibited to read secular documents on Shabbat — so that it should not be like weekday and one will come to erase.

Explanation: One may not read documents of buying and selling (or other secular writings) on Shabbat.

Novellae:

1. **What does "secular documents" mean?** Two explanations: (1) The Rambam in Mishneh Torah interprets it as documents of buying and selling. (2) In the Commentary on the Mishnah the Rambam says: everything **except the books of the prophets or their commentaries** — secular means everything that is not written by people with divine inspiration.

2. **Interesting language "so that it should not be like weekday and one will come to erase":** Why doesn't the Rambam simply say "lest one erase"? The Rambam means **two things:** (a) **so that it should not be like weekday** — it's not Shabbat-like, it brings in a weekday mindset; (b) **and one will come to erase** — it leads to erasing.

3. **Why specifically erasing (not writing)?** With secular writings/news, when something is no longer relevant, one erases it. With holy books no one erases — because the content is holy.

4. **Practical halachic difference:** If the main reason is "lest one erase," then today when one reads a newspaper (which

one doesn't erase), the reason falls away. But if "so that it should not be like weekday" is a separate reason, it could be that even reading a newspaper is a problem because it's not Shabbat-like.

5. **Commentary on the Mishnah** — the Rambam says there that everything that is not the writings of the prophets or their commentaries is prohibited to read on Shabbat, even wisdom.

Halachah – It Is Prohibited to Read Writing Under Pictures and Portraits

The Rambam's words: It is prohibited to read writing that goes under pictures and under portraits on Shabbat.

Explanation: Descriptions under pictures or statues — like in a museum lies a small plaque with a description — is also included in secular documents.

Novellae:

The **novelty** is: one should not think that because it is only a few short words under a picture, it is not secular documents. It is secular documents. A person might have thought that words under a picture are only an explanation of the picture — like looking at a picture. No — it is like reading a document.

Halachah – It Is Prohibited to Read Ketuvim During the Time of the Study Hall

The Rambam's words: Even to read Ketuvim on Shabbat during the time of the study hall — is prohibited.

Explanation: One may not read Ketuvim (the section of Tanach) on Shabbat at the time when there is a shiur in the study hall.

Novellae:

1. **"Study hall" doesn't mean a place, but a shiur.** "Midrash" in the language of the Sages means a shiur/sermon. "During the time of the study hall" means during the time the rabbi is giving a sermon.

2. **The reason:** One should not say "I sit at home and read Chronicles" instead of coming to the shiur.

3. **The main novelty:** This is not neglect of Torah — this is **neglect of the study hall.** The person is learning, but he destroys the study hall. When everyone sits at home with their own answers, the shiur is nullified. This is a completely different category.

4. **In practice:** When it says on the notice that the rabbi is giving a sermon, one may not then sit at home and learn, even holy things.

Halachah – A Fire Broke Out in the Courtyard on Shabbat — Laws of Rescue

The Rambam's words: A fire broke out in the courtyard on Shabbat — a decree lest one extinguish the fire in order to save, because a person is anxious about his money. Therefore they decreed that one may only save food that he needs for that Shabbat, and vessels that he needs to use on Shabbat, and clothing that he can wear.

Explanation: When a fire breaks out in the courtyard on Shabbat, one may not extinguish it. One may only rescue: (1)

food that one needs for that Shabbat, (2) vessels that one needs for Shabbat, (3) clothing that one can wear now in the act.

Novellae:

1. **Why not rescue everything even with an eruv:** If he goes to rescue everything, he enters a "rescuer-mindset" and will forget that one may not extinguish. **A person is anxious about his money** — a person loses himself when it concerns his money.

2. **Distinction between clothing and vessels:** Regarding vessels — "that he needs to use on Shabbat" (what he needs for Shabbat). Regarding clothing — "that he can wear" — what he can wear **now in the act**, not during Shabbat.

3. **The reasoning of the decree:** When a person thinks only of what he needs **for Shabbat**, he is distracted from all other things. But when he thinks of what he needs for Tuesday, he is completely distracted from Shabbat.

4. **A difficult question on the decree:** How could the Sages make such a decree that a person should despair of his **entire property**? Several proofs:

- **Up to a third of his property:** For a mitzvah a person must give up only up to a third of his fortune.

- **A sick person without danger:** May violate all rabbinic decrees — and a person whose house is burning is much worse!

- **The Sages' way:** In all the laws of Shabbat the Sages never leave a person "stuck."

5. Answers:

- The Rambam says specifically "**in the courtyard**" — not in a house. In a courtyard it is a limited fire.

- Sometimes it was a normal thing — a fire in the courtyard didn't mean one loses the entire fortune.

- The Sages permitted telling a non-Jew regarding a fire — "don't tell him extinguish and don't tell him don't extinguish" — specifically because a person is anxious about his money. This balances the stringency.

6. **In practice today:** Today one is more lenient with extinguishing, because (1) it is almost always a danger (smoke is dangerous), (2) we live among non-Jews and we don't want to God forbid burn down an entire city (like the incident in Frankfurt).

Halachah – Food for Three Meals (Parameters)

Gemara: If a fire broke out on Friday night — one saves food for three meals; in the morning — one saves food for two meals; at minchah — one saves food for one meal. What is fit for a person for a person, what is fit for an animal for an animal.

Novellae:

For animals one must also save — "what is fit for an animal for an animal."

Halachah – One Vessel (The Parameter of Carrying Once)

Gemara: When does this apply? When one saves in one vessel multiple times — when he needs to make multiple trips with the same vessel. But taking out one vessel — as long as he

takes it only once in one vessel, even if it's for several meals, it is permitted.

Explanation: The distinction is between carrying multiple times (limited to three meals) and carrying once with a large vessel (no limitation).

Novellae:

- Examples: a basket full of loaves, a circle of pressed figs, a barrel of wine.

- **Tallit method:** He spreads out his tallit, places in it everything he can, and carries it out full — this also counts as once.

Halachah – Come and Save for Yourselves

Gemara/Rambam: He calls other people: "Come and save for yourselves" — come rescue for yourselves — and each one rescues as much as he needs.

Novellae:

1. **The homeowner must give permission:** A person cannot go on his own to rescue from someone else's fire without permission.

2. **Ownerless mechanism:** When the homeowner calls "come and save for yourselves" — it becomes ownerless. After Shabbat, if the rescuer is a good person, he returns it, and the homeowner pays him a wage.

3. **Shabbat wage:** How can one take a wage for rescuing on Shabbat? This is Shabbat wage! Several answers: (a) He did nothing — he only took ownerless things; (b) It is more like a gift/returning; (c) It's a one-time thing; (d) This is not "wage" in that sense because he didn't do any melachah for the homeowner.

Halachah – Rescuing Clothing

Gemara/Rambam: Clothing — one wears all that he can wear, and carries and wraps all that he can, until he reaches a settlement.

Novellae:

1. **Stringency regarding clothing compared to food:** Regarding clothing they didn't permit at all to carry out with his hands — only worn, in the manner of clothing. With food he may take in his hands. But regarding clothing there is also a leniency — as much as he can wear, even more than he needs for Shabbat.

2. Regarding food it doesn't say "all that he can eat" — one limits to three meals. Regarding clothing it says "all that he can wear" — much more.

3. **Come and save for yourselves regarding clothing:** The same law of calling others applies also for clothing — each one wears according to his ability.

Halachah – Clean Bread vs. Unclean Bread

Gemara: If he started with clean bread — he may not go back and take unclean bread. But the reverse — if he started with unclean bread, he may go back and take clean bread — he may say "I want better quality for Shabbat."

Halachah – Rescuing Holy Writings

Rambam: Holy writings one may save even without an eruv — to another courtyard even without eruv chatzerot, on condition that there are three partitions.

Novellae:

1. **Greater leniency regarding holy writings than food/clothing:** Food and clothing require an eruv; holy writings one may even without an eruv — but only where there are three partitions (not a karmelit).

2. **Condition — written in Assyrian script and in the holy tongue:** Only holy writings that are written in Assyrian script and in the holy tongue have sanctity. If they are written in another language or another script — they have no sanctity, and one may not save them in this manner.

Halachah — Holy Writings That Are Not Written in Assyrian Script and in the Holy Tongue

The Rambam's words: Provided that the holy writings are written in Assyrian script and in the holy tongue. But... in another script or in another language — one may not save them... and in general it is prohibited to read them.

Novellae:

1. **Question from reading Shema in any language:** The Shema one may say in any language, and a siddur one may have in other languages. How can the Rambam say that holy writings in another language have no sanctity at all? The answer: The Rambam speaks specifically of a Torah scroll — a Torah scroll must be in Assyrian script and the holy tongue. One fulfills the Shema orally in another language, but when it is **written** in another language it has no sanctity at all.

2. **Greek — the Maggid Mishneh's explanation:** According to the Rambam's opinion Greek would indeed have sanctity, but the Rambam doesn't bring the law because he already ruled in the laws of a Torah scroll that today there is no longer true Greek in the world.

3. **"It is prohibited to read them" — sharp conclusion:** According to the Rambam it turns out: one may not read secular documents, one may not read holy writings that are not in Assyrian script. The only possibilities: go to the study hall to hear a shiur, or read a kosher Torah scroll. A Mishnayot one may not write, a siddur one may not write — all from the rule "things that are written you may not say orally."

4. **"Assyrian" — what does it mean practically:** Not only that the lines are straight — it means the specific form of the script. Yiddish handwriting (Yiddish script) is not Assyrian script.

5. **The Rishonim's answer — "in their days":** This was only in their time, when they held strictly to "things that are written you may not say orally." But today, when they have already permitted writing the Oral Torah (a time to act for God, they have violated Your Torah), one may already read everything.

Halachah — Written with Dye and Red Paint

The Rambam's words: Since they are written with dye and red paint... but since they are written properly in the holy tongue — one saves them.

Explanation: Even if holy writings are written with dye or red paint (not with the regular black ink), nevertheless, as long as it is written in the holy tongue, one saves them. It doesn't need to have all the laws of a Torah scroll.

Halachah — Margins of Books

The Rambam's words: The margin of books above and below... between section and section, between page and page...

Explanation: The empty spaces (margins) in books are not saved from fire.

Novellae:

It must be that one speaks of margins that were cut from a Torah scroll. Even such margins, which once belonged to a Torah scroll, still have sanctity (because they were part of a Torah scroll), but one doesn't save them from fire.

Halachah — Blessings and Amulets

The Rambam's words: Blessings and amulets — even if there are in them divine names and verses — **one may not save them from fire.**

Explanation: A siddur (blessings) or an amulet that has holy names and verses — one doesn't save them from fire, because they don't have sanctity like holy writings.

Novellae:

In other laws (laws of the foundations of the Torah) one sees that on amulets there is not the prohibition of erasing the Name. Earlier one learned that one may carry an amulet on Shabbat, but save from fire — not.

Halachah — A Torah Scroll That Was Erased — 85 Letters

The Rambam's words: A Torah scroll that has in it... eighty-five letters... like the section "And it was when the ark traveled"... one saves it from fire.

Explanation: A Torah scroll that is erased or invalid, but 85 letters (complete words) remain, one saves it from fire.

Novellae:

1. **The measure of 85 letters:** 85 letters is the measure of a section — specifically the section "And it was when the ark traveled" which has 85 letters. Even if it's not a complete section, but if this many letters remain, there is significance of sanctity.

2. **Or a complete section:** If a complete section remains, even a short one like "And Amalek came," one saves it.

3. **Or mentions (names):** If there are divine names in the section, as in "And God said to Moses saying" — which is the shortest section with only two verses — this is also a reason to save.

Halachah — The Case of the Book

The Rambam: Margins one may not save, but **the case of the book one may save.**

Novelty: An interesting distinction: margins that are cut from the book itself — one doesn't save. But the case (the cover/wrapper) which is also separate from the book — one saves. The distinction: the case is not cut from the book, but

the book is removed from the case — the case still has its status of sacred utensils.

A Great Question on the Rambam — Requires Great Study

The Rambam said that one may not read writings that have no sanctity, one doesn't save them, and writings not in Assyrian script are prohibited. But the Rambam

himself writes books! How does this fit together? This remains requiring study — "one must really think what the Rambam's opinion is, it is a great wonder."

[Digression: Can One Learn Rambam Without Gemara?]

A lengthy discussion is conducted about the fundamental problem of learning Rambam without the Gemara:

1. **First problem:** Often one doesn't know the **meaning** of words in the Rambam without the Gemara. In the Commentary on the Mishnah the Rambam translates many words (in Arabic or the holy tongue), but in Mishneh Torah he brings simply the language of the Mishnah without any explanation. This shows that Mishneh Torah is written for someone who has already learned Gemara/Commentary on the Mishnah.

2. **Second problem:** Even when one understands the words, the **context** is missing — one doesn't know that the Rambam is deciding a dispute, one doesn't know what the other side would have been, one doesn't know why he brings specifically this distinction.

3. **A defense:** Even without the Gemara one can make reasonings in the Rambam itself — he gives a reality and a ruling, and one can understand a reasoning. The Maggid Mishneh sometimes does this.

4. **Conclusion:** It remains **requiring great study** what the Rambam meant when he wrote that one can learn his book without Gemara.

[Digression: General Discussion About Learning Laws of Shabbat and Practical Halachic Ruling]

The Rambam's Project — "To Fix and He Didn't Fix"

R' Yehoshua'le Kretshker's critique of the Rambam: The Rambam wanted to make a book of the entire Torah with principles, but in practice he doesn't bring the reasoning of each law — he brings only the details from the Gemara without explaining the principles that stand behind them. R' Chaim

Krasna tried on one law (Pesach) to show how one would rewrite Tractate Pesachim, and didn't even finish that. The Rambam at least carried out his project, although not perfectly.

Problem of Application to Today's Reality

- The Gemara's examples stem from a completely different reality.

- Tractate Shabbat is full of **examples/realties**, not **principles** of each melachah. There are very few general principles within each melachah.

- Therefore it is almost impossible to build a rule from a detail and apply it to new situations. "A rule built on a detail, built on nothing — how does it work?"

Distinction Between Laws of Shabbat and Other Parts of Torah

In Choshen Mishpat there are general mechanisms (presumptions, established status, miggo) that one can apply. But laws of Shabbat are based on specific realities, which makes it harder to extrapolate.

Why We Don't Learn Practical Halachah in This Shiur

The shiur learns **principles**, not practical halachah — because practical halachah requires looking practically at our reality, and this takes more time. From what one learns one can only learn that **in the case that appears in the Rambam there is such a prohibition** — but exactly what the case is, and how it applies to today, is a separate question.

An Interesting Point About Torah in General

In Torah one must know the entire Torah in order to understand a piece. This is different from other wisdoms. The same is in Sefer HaMada with philosophical disputes, and in Hasidic books where one must know the Zohar and Midrashim.

[**Digression: Educational trick**] — how great ones say "you know the famous Ketzot?" in order to make the student feel that this is the norm, even when he doesn't know it.

[Digression: Catering on Shabbat]

People who run a large operation on Shabbat (like catering) must be very careful about laws — e.g. one may not write on which table who sits (counting the guests). One may calculate orally but not from a document. An advice: if one must read from a note, one should read it aloud.

End of the shiur.

| Full Transcript

Laws of Shabbat Chapter 23 – Makeh B'patish and Rabbinic Prohibitions

Introduction to Chapter 23

Speaker 1:

We are learning Laws of Shabbat Chapter 23. And with this chapter the Rambam finishes the rabbinic prohibitions that are added to the specific melachot. That is, he enumerated the 39 Torah melachot, and he enumerated all the rabbinic prohibitions that are added to a specific melachah. But we still have additional rabbinic prohibitions that are not necessarily

attached to a specific melachah, more general ones. And here he is in the middle of rabbinic prohibitions that are similar to melachah or that can lead to melachah.

And before we learn we must praise the supporters who make it possible that there should be flour, that there should be Torah, those who support our shiur, and at their head our friend and our partner, the distinguished rabbi, the generous patron Rabbi Yoel Halevi. We thank him and all the other supporters.

Law 1 – Makeh B'patish: A Hole Made to Insert and Remove

What is Makeh B'patish – Completing a Task

Speaker 1:

Now we will learn as follows. We are going to learn the melachah of makeh b'patish, and what the rabbis prohibited regarding makeh b'patish. So earlier, in the tenth chapter, the Rambam said that makeh b'patish, that is striking with a hammer, but that doesn't say enough yet. He says what it means is gemar melachah, the final strike with the hammer, something that finishes and makes something into a vessel. As he will say here for example closing the barrel, because when one opens it the barrel becomes fit to be used to insert and remove, and with this one has made the barrel into a vessel that can be used.

The Rambam says as follows. The Rambam said in chapter 10 that makeh b'patish is liable, and one who does any other gemar melachah that is not with a hammer, then it is a toladah of makeh b'patish. So, you may be right that the first makeh b'patish with a hammer is also specifically when it is a gemar melachah, but it's not stated clearly. He says that a type of makeh b'patish is liable, and any gemar melachah is a toladah. Toladah means that it's the same thing but in a different manner. But makeh b'patish also means the final strike. That is, when someone is building and he strikes with a hammer, it is apparently building. But not necessarily the last one. It's a type of first gemar melachah, or a small repair of a task.

The Words of the Rambam: A Hole in a Chicken Coop

Speaker 1:

We will learn as follows. First the Rambam will say what is actually liable. The Rambam says that when the liability comes out according to the stringencies of the rabbis who decreed that one has come to do the manner in which one is liable. In chapter 14 the Rambam said one of the toladot of makeh b'patish is when someone has a blister and he makes a hole in it, it's called like a hole that is made to remove and insert, because he wants blood to come out, he wants air to come in. He says here a similar thing, one who makes a hole. What is the rabbinic prohibition that was added to makeh b'patish? Not rabbinic, the Torah law, of course. This is the case, this is a manner of makeh b'patish. Making a hole in something.

He says as follows, **one who makes a hole**, someone makes a hole, but not just any hole, a half hole that is made only for one small function, but a proper hole that is made **to insert and remove**, to take in and take out. **For example**, someone has **a chicken coop**, a box, a structure for chickens, but this needs to have a hole, an opening. So someone makes a hole in the chicken coop, and the hole is made for what? It is made for two things: **made to insert light**, to bring light into the coop so that one can see what's going on there, **and to remove vapor**, to remove the hot air that lies inside the chicken coop. Then he is **liable for makeh b'patish**, because one cannot use the chicken coop without this, it would be... the chickens would be choked there, I don't know what, it wouldn't be good. So with this one completes the chicken coop, this is liable for makeh b'patish. He makes this type of hole.

Discussion: Contradiction Between Building and Makeh B'patish

Speaker 2:

I'm not sure, he doesn't bring... first of all, we learned that a chicken coop is liable for building, no? Or am I not remembering correctly?

Speaker 1:

A chicken coop was mentioned earlier, true, that he makes a hole... almost certainly in the melachah of building the Rambam said, "One who makes any size hole in a chicken coop so that light can enter is liable for building." That's what it said in chapter 10, and here he forgot about building, and they learned that it's also for building. Because in the same chapter he spoke there about a hole that... in the same... yes, that's the contradiction, yes? In the same a bit earlier he spoke about a hole that he makes in a cloth cover, that he makes in a barrel.

Speaker 2:

As you say, as you say, the cloth cover, the hole, the whole thing is also an addition. But there he says makeh b'patish.

Speaker 1:

I'm saying, here is also a hole, and in the same chapter there's a bit of a contradiction here. Isn't every hole and every thing the same? But both have the same nature of removal and insertion. So perhaps it can be explained. Also by makeh b'patish he wrote again "one who makes any size hole", for the cloth cover, "one who makes any size hole is liable for makeh b'patish, a toladah of makeh b'patish, on condition that it is made to insert and remove."

I don't know why, it could be that the same thing becomes liable for both.

Speaker 2:

Very good, you're already asking the question all the commentators ask, and it's truly not clear.

Explanation: Makeh B'patish as a Repair in Itself

Speaker 1:

It could be, I want to think, you said that makeh b'patish is liable because this completes the building work, whatever the coop. It could even be that makeh b'patish is liable separately, that is makeh b'patish is like a small building. You now open, a hole is built, the hole is a building, even when it's not because with this one finishes. You understand? We call gemar melachah is another thing.

Speaker 2:

But building is also any amount. I don't see, if building is any amount, then even one strike with the hammer is already enough building. If building had a measure, I could say that the last one has a smaller measure, but you can't say that there.

Speaker 1:

So the distinction will remain difficult, because it clearly states that one is also liable for building. It could indeed be that it's both, or perhaps when it's attached to the ground it's building, and when it's not attached to the ground, where there is no building, it will be liable for makeh b'patish.

But what I want to think is perhaps makeh b'patish is a thing in itself. That is, you make a new repair, that is you open something, you make a hole, the hole is a real hole, it's useful, it's to insert and remove, then one transgresses on this, even if the entire vessel isn't finished. You understand? It's not finishing the vessel with this. On the contrary, finishing the vessel is another repair that can be done for a vessel.

Speaker 2:

Interesting that you say vessel, because by vessel there's no building and demolition at all.

Speaker 1:

No, I'm saying it's a repair of a vessel. It needs makeh b'patish. But before the Rambam speaks of the coop, he also speaks apparently of the same coop, which is apparently, if it's not connected, it's not... there's a distinction. In any case, I'm saying it's a small repair. It's a very small, relatively small thing, but one opens something.

Now, the Lechem Mishneh says that one is liable for building, and the Rambam brings it as a revelation once, that if there is a prohibition of building, one is liable for building, and if there is a prohibition of makeh b'patish, one is liable for makeh b'patish. It's a different thing. The Rambam says so, it's a general thing.

Okay, anyway, that's... I mean the other part, that in a manner where there is no building, makeh b'patish still remains. Makeh b'patish is basically a melachah made for small types of repairs.

Speaker 2:

Therefore, yes? One must think. You're asking a strong question, for example, because we learned earlier that placing a door on a vessel, on a field chest and tower, is not building, because it's building in vessels. Perhaps, why shouldn't it be? With this the field chest and tower is completed, it becomes makeh b'patish. I don't know if every thing is so. One must know.

The Sages' Decree on Every Hole**Speaker 1:**

Further, okay, so, the hole that was made in the chicken coop is liable for makeh b'patish. The Rambam says, this is the Torah law. So what is the rabbinic law? He says, "**therefore they decreed on every hole**", the Sages decreed on every hole. That is, even in a manner when it's not liable, it's not makeh b'patish from the Torah. Why? **Even when it's not made to remove and insert, even if it's made only to remove or only to insert**, the Sages prohibited, "**lest one come to make a hole for which he is liable**". Because if one will make a hole that is only halfway useful, one will also make a hole for which one is fully liable. That is, a hole that is not to remove and not to insert is simply destructive, is nothing, is not even rabbinic. But a hole that has some function, although it's not liable because it's makeh b'patish, but it's very close, then "lest one come to make a hole." Very good.

The Law of a Hole in a Barrel: New, Enlarging, and Old**Speaker 1:**

"**And because of this**", he will bring an example of what is not permitted. "**And because of this one may not make a new hole in a barrel, and one may not enlarge it**". For this reason, someone has built a new barrel, he says "new hole", not "new barrel". A barrel may not have a hole added to it, one may not make a hole in a barrel. And also, even if there is already a hole, one may not enlarge the hole. Although, it's only to remove, as you say, or in the manner of enlarging he didn't even now make a hole, he only enlarged the existing hole, but it's prohibited rabbinically, because the rabbis decreed on every hole.

But what may one do? **But an old hole** that one doesn't build now and also doesn't enlarge, it only became blocked, **one may open** the old hole, because this is not called a melachah,

this is simply removing something that blocks the hole, this is not a melachah.

Exception: A Hole Below the Sediment**Speaker 1:**

But, even in this there is also an exception, **provided that the hole is not below the sediment**, if one makes the hole at the bottom of the barrel, there where the sediment lies, that type of hole helps strengthen the barrel, it makes the barrel, it's not like a regular hole is only to remove, to take out the wine, but the hole that one makes below the sediment, if one opens or closes that hole, that hole is made to strengthen, sediment strengthens, it's a type of hole that holds on this, it lies on this more heavily, it's more important, therefore one must make a very strong closure, therefore when you open it it's not simply, essentially as if you're making a new one. So, making a new one is not permitted, because there is a place where one plugs it very strongly, it's not called simply like opening a plug, as is usual to remove, opening a hole that already exists, it's called like opening a new hole.

A Hole in the Cover of a Barrel**Speaker 1:**

Very good. Further, more laws similar to this, regarding whether one may make a hole in the cover of a barrel, the cover, on top of the barrel there is a cover, and in the cover of the barrel one makes a hole to be able to remove wine, and this is not a hole that is made to remove completely, when one wants to make such one opens the cover entirely, it's only made to remove. **And provided that one makes it from above**, but only if one makes the hole from above, on top of the cover, but on the other hand, if one makes the hole on the side of the barrel, then it is prohibited rabbinically, although it's not...

Speaker 2:

The side of the cover or the side of the barrel?

Speaker 1:

Okay, it could be the side of the cover. Then it is prohibited, why? Because Rashi comes to explain, it's only a rabbinic prohibition, although it's not a hole that is made to remove and insert, but this looks much more practical when...

Makeh B'patish Rabbinically: Making a Hole in a Barrel Cover, Breaking a Barrel for Dried Figs, and Closing a Hole**Law: Making a Hole in a Barrel Cover**

Speaker 1: opening a hole that already exists. It's called like opening a new hole. Very good.

Further, more laws similar to this. **One may make a hole in a barrel cover** — the cover on top of the barrel, there is a cover, and in the cover of the barrel one makes a hole to be able to remove wine. And this is not a hole that is made to remove and insert — when one wants to make such one opens the cover entirely, it's only made to remove. **And provided that one makes it from above** — but only if one makes the hole from above, on top of the cover. **But from its side** — if one makes the hole on the side of the barrel, then it is prohibited rabbinically, although it's not... the side of the cover or the side of the barrel?

Speaker 2: The side of the cover.

Speaker 1: Okay, it could be the side of the cover. Then it is prohibited. Why? We had a shiur that came in Satmar, it's only prohibited rabbinically, although it's not a hole that is made to remove and insert, but this... it appears that it's more practical.

Discussion: Why is From Above Permitted?

Speaker 1: We learned a new leniency, that from above is permitted. Although this is also a hole made only to remove, apparently it should be prohibited according to the rule. No, the novelty is the prohibition, not the permission. Why? This is a proper hole. The permission is prohibited, not made to remove and insert. Well, but the Sages didn't allow it. One foot, one hole in the barrel is not complete, I don't agree. And the barrel cover from above, then something we may do. Why? Because it appears that this is not the way. But why does he say it's a weak repair? But why does he say that from the side is prohibited? One said it's prohibited because simply so, because it's a hole. It seems to me like there's something... this is actually repairing... they know this! The cover is something... I'm saying... again...

We already learned the law that one prohibited initially even a hole that is made for one thing, either to insert or to remove. This explains why not here? There is an exception, a double exception. I mean one exception. That one may do it on the cover. That one may not do it on the side is obvious, because one may not make any hole at all. He is explaining... here is a place for all things... he is only explaining why from above is a hole. Because there is no... with the rabbis are either here, or there. They are two different decrees.

Earlier he said clearly "every hole lest one come to make another hole." This is made to explain why from above is indeed permitted. He means to bring out that when you do it from above it's not repairing, because somehow this is not a way to open a cover or to make a hole, therefore then one may.

Speaker 2: Yes, but this is, he makes a hole. There is no prohibition to make a hole in the world, as you said. But the prohibition is not "like repairing", the prohibition is "making a hole lest one come to make another hole". Only such a hole that opens something. Made to remove, right? Opens something. If it opens nothing at all, or it opens something in a strange way, not the normal way, not a vessel repair, then one may.

Explanation: Two Reasons for the Decree — "Like Repairing" and "Lest One Come"

Speaker 1: Again, again, again. A hole that is only either to insert or only to remove is prohibited, the Rambam said, "lest one come to make another hole." Such a type of hole that is repairing. So says a new Rabbeinu Menachem by the Rambam. It's difficult to say this because the Rambam doesn't say it clearly, but I don't have another explanation.

Speaker 2: Okay, I agree with the explanation. I'll make another explanation. This is the explanation.

Speaker 1: If you make a hole in a barrel, then it's a repair, then it's a melachah. But if you make it in the cover and you make it in a manner that is not a vessel repair, then one may.

Anyway, the law is certainly so. The law is so, but I'm saying that "like repairing" and "lest one come" are two different reasons for the decree that the Rambam said. I know he said so, I don't know what is always so different. Here it's actually a bit difficult, it doesn't look so different, but let's say it's so

different. We will see it several times when the Rambam says "yes" or "lest one come."

But in short, the "like repairing" is to explain why from above is indeed permitted. This is the answer. Do you understand what I'm saying?

Speaker 2: Okay.

Speaker 1: I'm writing this backwards. I'm writing it in the manner that is indeed forbidden, but this is what comes out.

Speaker 2: Yes, okay.

Halacha: A Person May Break a Barrel to Eat Dried Figs From It

Speaker 1: Further. **Shover adam et hechavit le'echol mimenah grogerot** — a person may break, here we're not talking about making a nice hole, but breaking the barrel. Another heter basically. Another two heterim. To remove from it what's inside the barrel. If he intends, it can mean not just an intention in his head. If when the barrel is closed on all sides, one must break it, until now there was no vessel, because it wasn't anything useful. When he breaks it, it's as if it now becomes useful. But one should not intend to make a vessel.

Explanation: "Yitkavein La'sot Keli" Doesn't Mean Intention in the Mind

Speaker 1: What he means to say is not intention. What he means to say is, if you break it, it's permitted, as long as you don't make it nice, you don't cut it nicely. You don't make it like a vessel means an opening, not a vessel, not you're making the barrel into a vessel.

Speaker 2: I don't know where you got to say you're making the barrel for a vessel.

Speaker 1: The vessel he means to say is the opening of the barrel. He's making like a tikun keli, like he said a minute ago. He's making a nice opening on the side, which that made, that's called asiyat keli, or not exactly a vessel, a tikun keli. But if you break it into the world, it remains a broken, a broken barrel, meaning not fixed. If you make it nice, you cut nicely, you break it in a way that it becomes nicer, like an opening, then it's forbidden.

Speaker 2: I would have been able to say that he's talking about the same breaking, but if in the breaking lies also that the barrel should be more useful and one should be able to use it. It's always broken, what's standing here you say?

Speaker 1: The yitkavein means that he makes it nice. There's no doubt that this is the meaning, not any matter of intention, because the intention he always has the same, he wants to take out a dried fig, that's what he wants to do. It must mean that he does something different, he cuts it more nicely.

Halacha: A Person May Bring a Barrel of Wine and Strike Off Its Head With a Sword

Speaker 1: And another third halacha, these are all halachot all conditions basically. We spoke earlier that one may not make any hole, so there are three ways that one may indeed make a hole. **Mevi adam chavit shel yayin u'matiz et roshah b'sayif bifnei orchim v'ein choshesh** — one may indeed bring a barrel and chop off the top of the barrel, even though with this one makes like a hole which is to remove, but here one may. Why? Because when one does this, one doesn't make with this a vessel. Usually when one makes a hole, one makes it so the vessel should be more useful, so one should be

able to, the vessel should be better. But here the reason why he opens it with a sword, and not just as he pours out a bit of wine, is kavanto leharot nedivut libo, that he shows generosity that wine is going to be poured, therefore his intention is not to make an opening, but his intention is to distribute wine in another manner.

Discussion: Why Is This Permitted Even Though He Cuts It Nicely?

Speaker 2: The intention, that which he cuts the barrel in such a manner can enter that he indeed makes a somewhat nicer hole, not just he breaks the barrel. Breaking the barrel will pour out all the wine. He cuts it off somewhat with a sword, should you be able to think that here he's making an opening for the barrel? No, he only did it in such a manner. What is the other manner? Is to break, or make an opening above which we just spoke about which he may. But he indeed makes it apparently in a nicer manner. But here the answer is his intention. His intention is only to show that he is large, he's distributing a whole thing of wine, he even did it with a sword. This is permitted.

Speaker 1: Why is there a distinction? When a person opens a barrel for himself, and he does it with a mituz rosho b'sayif, it's certain that he does it because he wants to make a hole. When he does it for guests, there's another reason why he would want to make a hole. When he does it, the shover agozim v'chaviyot lehotzi mehen grogerot, when a person makes for himself, he breaks for himself, when it's dealing with a case of dried figs, then only that is permitted. But by the shover agozim v'chaviyot one wouldn't be allowed to remove the head b'sayif, but specifically breaking one may.

Here we know that he doesn't intend to make, he only intends to show his nedivut libo.

Speaker 2: Yes, I mean that the sword is part of the promotion.

Speaker 1: It's like you've sometimes seen the king cuts a cake with a sword, it's such a custom. With a sword one doesn't bring, at home one has a can opener, one doesn't need a sword. A sword one makes for a show, a display.

Speaker 2: I've seen dictators shoot with a huge gun at some bottle to distribute wine.

Speaker 1: Yes, one does so.

Halacha: Just as It's Forbidden to Open Any Hole, So It's Forbidden to Close Any Hole

Speaker 1: Okay. **U'cheshem she'asur liftoach kol nekev** — we've now learned a few things about opening a hole, that one may not, and a few ways that one may. He says, **u'cheshem she'asur liftoach kol nekev**, one may not open a hole, **kach asur listom kol nekev** — closing a hole is also a matter of makeh b'patish. **Lefikach, asur listom nekev hechavit** — one may not plug up the hole of the barrel. He says, with what may one not? **Afilu b'davar she'eino memareach** — because earlier, by the melacha of memacheik, memacheik we haven't yet learned then, but we learned by a barrel of pressed items, that one may not put in a cloth because of squeezing, but one also may not smear on it on Shabbat to close it, because it's memacheik. But something that isn't memacheik, we don't have the problem of sechita. That is, if one puts on Shabbat, there's a problem of memacheik. If one puts a cloth, it has a problem of sechita. And even if one puts something that has neither problem, but

one puts a plug or a small pebble, a stone, one also may not, because just so there's a problem of closing a hole of the barrel.

Discussion: Two Prohibitions — Memacheik/Sechita and Makeh B'Patish

Speaker 2: It's interesting, because it comes out that when one does with a cloth or with something that one smears, one is transgressing on two things. One is transgressing on memacheik and on makeh b'patish. Hard to say it's so, it doesn't say so earlier when we learned the halacha of sechita.

Speaker 1: Ah, it's derabbanan, derabbanan.

Speaker 2: Ah, both derabbanan. Okay, it can be that it's two derabbanans.

Speaker 1: No, no, there we have, let's be clear, earlier we learned about a bottle that already has a hole, one just plugs it. Here also, not a hole, nekev means here, not listom nekev, means a hole, not the lid of a bottle that has a top that one opens it, which is open. Nekev means a hole, it's broken, you're fixing it now so to speak. You understand? Nekev doesn't mean the opening of the barrel, but the hole of the barrel. One may cover an opening of the barrel, except if it's memacheik. Sechita, we learned sechita is when it's by the opening, not by the hole.

Speaker 2: Okay.

Halacha: But If One Placed Food There to Hide It and the Hole Was Found Closed, It's Permitted

Speaker 1: Kegon sheyistom b'chosem u'vetzror katan — one may not. **Aval im natan sham ochel kedai lehatzni'o, v'nimtza hanekev nistam, mutar** — but what one may indeed do to a hole of a barrel is, one may stuff in there a piece of food. Why? Because he can say, I just pushed food into a barrel kedai lehatzni'o, and the hole was found closed, permitted. So the Rama says mutar leharim davar zeh, and one may also remove it. Once one puts food, that's not a normal way of plugging a barrel. Actually he means that he wants to plug it, but it looks...

Laws of Shevut Because of Makeh B'Patish: Closing a Hole, Musical Instruments, and Swimming

Halacha: Closing a Hole in a Barrel With Food — Herama

Speaker 1:

But if he placed food there kedai lehatzni'o, what one may indeed do to such a hole of a barrel, is he may stuff in there a piece of food. Why? Because he can say, I just pushed food into a barrel kedai lehatzni'o. Then the hole becomes closed.

The Rambam permits the herama in this thing. With this one may also be ma'arim. Once one puts food it's not a normal way of plugging a barrel. By the way, actually he means it indeed to plug, but if it looks good it's good. It's similar to what we learned yesterday by rediyat hapat, where we learned another sort of herama, that he has a hole, we call it an orcha.

Speaker 2:

No, but I would have said why. Because here stands a condition, "kedai lehatzni'o". That is, one may not put food kedai listom, because then it's still a pat akum.

Speaker 1:

But you see the herama, that even when he indeed means to close it, he indeed means to close it, but it looks like lehatzni'o.

He says, I know, herama means that it looks like he's doing something else. I don't know what this means, whom is he fooling with the herama? I don't know. He's fooling himself.

Speaker 2:

No, there stands the guest, he asks him, "What are you doing?" He says, "I'm putting in a beam, you'll perhaps help me hold the beam." It's not clear. He says, "No, I actually wanted to keep the beam." Oh, it plugged the barrel? Really a mazal.

I don't know, something is funny about the herama. I don't know, he's fooling himself, whom is he fooling? Not clear.

Discussion: What Is the Foundation of Herama in This Case?

Speaker 1:

Apparently, the point is that with food it's not a true closing, it's not really forbidden. It would perhaps have been forbidden as "halo petach hu lo", the whole prohibition with a pebble is also forbidden with food. Why?

Speaker 2:

But here you see the opposite, actually everything is forbidden, and if one puts kedei, the kedei is the heter, not the food is the heter.

Speaker 1:

No, I didn't say that the food is the heter. I said that the food makes the heter, because it creates a reason lehatzni'o, because it's not a very good closing, it's lehatzni'o. That is, he doesn't put it kedei listom, he puts it exactly.

Speaker 2:

But there must be another distinction between a plug or food.

Speaker 1:

I don't see that there must be. On the contrary, for this one needs the herama, not for nothing does one need the herama. Because just so he can say that with food one may. One needs the herama because one needs, a plug, it's not relevant to be matzni'a a plug, one puts it for fixing. But food, it can be so, it can be so. You say that you put it for that? It just became noticeable. It can be so, that a person can say until tomorrow that he wants to be matzni'a the small contribution, but the herama doesn't work. The herama is something a learning that can make sense.

Speaker 2:

He can't verify it. I mean, one puts away a small contribution, but exactly in your barrel where you needed? It's already too suspicious. It looks, again, this is the reality that we're missing here, it looks it was a normal thing. Sometimes it happened that a person puts bread in his barrel lehatzni'a. I don't know, the reality I'm missing here.

But here he doesn't make it truly completely. He has somewhere else where to put, or he would have indeed been able to decide to eat the bread, whatever it is. But in short, it's a different sort of herama than before.

Speaker 1:

The Mishna earlier when I didn't call guests, I did call guests, I didn't call guests, it's a different sort of herama. Here it looks like Abaye according to his opinion, like a bedieved. He placed food, and afterwards he laid down, ah, it's Pesach today, stop. But Rav Matna says, one indeed means, one does it specifically so. Okay, fine.

So in short, one must understand the foundation of herama, a great foundation.

Speaker 2:

No, it's indeed divided. The Shulchan Aruch says only a talmid chacham may do it, because a talmid chacham one will believe that he only means lehatzni'a, or one won't come because of this to do in a manner that is indeed. A talmid chacham deserves the distinction. Not clear.

The laws of herama are among the interesting topics that we've already seen more than once, the topics of herama, sometimes yes, sometimes no.

Halacha 5: Anything That Is Completion of Work — Makeh B'Patish

Speaker 1:

Okay. **Kol davar shehu gemar melacha.** Okay, until here we've learned halachot from here and onward, now we're going to be able to learn topics of gemar melacha. Yes.

He says, the Rambam, **Kol davar shehu gemar melacha, chayav alav mishum makeh b'patish.** This is obligated from the Torah, we've already learned. Interesting that his version is here a bit different. Usually this is the good beginning of the whole chapter.

Speaker 2:

Yes, no, because earlier he said things that one is obligated because of hole, is one sort of obligation. Now will come another thing obligated which is gemar melacha, and the rabbanan that came because of concern lest he do gemar melacha. Because when every gemar melacha is an obligation, gorer kol shehu, he'll scrape something off, and with this he finishes, he touches a vessel that needs another last scratch. If he's metaken keli, is he not like already fixing, he's fixing a vessel with two what? Obligated. But this is further still obligated with thirty. They haven't yet learned this, perhaps in fourth grade.

This is simple though, keli blaka, melachat makeh b'patish includes any sort of grinding or asiyat gerira, tikun, scraping. Scraping, yes, I mean that the melacha, it was too rough on one side, he scraped off a piece.

Halacha 5: It's Forbidden to Make the Sound of Song on Shabbat — A Decree Lest One Fix a Musical Instrument

Speaker 1:

Lefikach, now comes, lefikach, like the Rambam, the Sages also forbade things that would have had to be permitted. **Asur lehashmia kol shel shir b'Shabbat**, one may not make heard with instruments a sound of song on Shabbat, **bein b'klei shir, kegon kinorot u'nevalim**, whether with musical instruments, like fiddles and nevel is another sort of fiddle, a harp. I don't know, okay, **bein b'she'ar devarim.**

Speaker 2:

A flute? I don't know. A flute is not. No, they both have strings. I don't know why a flute is here so strongly relevant to be a musical instrument, a wire is something one must always fix.

Speaker 1:

Okay, in short, **afilu lehakot b'etzba al hakarke o al haluach**, drumming with the hands on the floor or on a table, **achat keneged achat k'derech hameshorrim**, with one finger he makes the major and with one finger the minor, whatever he plays around with the fingers.

O Iekarkeish et ha'egoz latinok, and another thing that one shouldn't do, clapping with two nuts, drumming with two nuts for a child, he plays for him with a nut. But also making heard a musical instrument with the nut. **O Iisachek b'klei bezog**, or clapping with a bell, a little bell, which we've already had twice, by mevi chamin motzaei Shabbat, yes, also by the women. **Kedei sheyishtok**, to calm the child. **Kol zeh v'chayotza bo asur**. Why? Because all these things one makes heard musical instruments, so there's a concern, one says that **shema yetaken klei shir**, he'll come to a musical instrument and he'll fix it, and he'll transgress on makeh b'patish.

See that a musical instrument is a delicate thing. Do you think you also need to fix it? And one works with coming to fix. And sometimes one must transgress on the Torah prohibition. Yes, one indeed must change from the Torah it's forbidden.

It's Forbidden to Clap, Dance, and Pat on Shabbat

Speaker 1:

Says the Rambam, not only clapping with anything or with the fingers, but even clapping with the hands one into the other, or dancing. Dancing however also apparently on the beat, dancing in a manner that he's now the drum set, yes? Just dancing with musical instruments. One may not clap with the hands, or dance, or pat.

What is the distinction between patting and clapping? He says that clapping means knocking on the table or on a drum perhaps? Or isn't that with the finger on the ground or on a board? Perhaps different, ground or board? I don't know. Clapping.

In short, one may not dance or clap to the beat, or clap the hands, pat the hands, yes? A decree lest one fix a musical instrument. Because that's part of singing.

The Rama's Heter: It's Better That They Be Inadvertent Sinners

Speaker 1:

This is chunk 3 of 11 of a Yiddish shiur (Torah lecture) about Shabbos laws. I need to translate it carefully, maintaining the conversational tone, transliterating Hebrew/Aramaic terms, and keeping the structure intact.

Key terms to transliterate consistently:

- teshuva
- hashkafa
- halacha/halachos
- minhag
- issur
- melacha
- Shabbos/Shabbat
- seudos
- mitzvah
- Torah
- Gemara
- Rambam
- Mishna Berura
- Aruch HaShulchan
- Rema
- etc.

I need to maintain the dialogue structure with Speaker 1 and Speaker 2, keep the section headers, and preserve the natural flow of the lecture.

Let me work through this systematically, section by section.

But he says right away that with a shinui (change), you may clap. The halacha of dancing and clapping is a bit difficult, because Chassidic Jews dance at shalosh seudos (the third Sabbath meal). So the holy Rema said that the custom is that we conduct ourselves with "mutav sheyihu shogegin" (better that they should err unwittingly). That means, there is a principle—we'll learn it later in hilchos Yom Kippur, I don't know if he brings it generally—that regarding something that is forbidden that the people don't know about the prohibition, there's no obligation to tell them, because many times when you tell them they'll continue doing it anyway, and then they'll be doing it deliberately. So the Rema says mutav sheyihu shogegin, that if you see people dancing on Shabbos you shouldn't tell them, because it won't help and it will only make it worse.

And he adds that there is a heter (permission), because we don't conduct ourselves specifically to be metaken kli shir (fix a musical instrument).

Speaker 2:

The Aruch HaShulchan I think says what you want to say, yes? He brings the Aruch HaShulchan? Do you remember?

Speaker 1:

Ah, the Aruch HaShulchan wants to argue that it's not clear that what we do when we dance a little like this, Chassidic Jews around the table, that this is called sifuk verikud (clapping and dancing). This is more like what you wanted to say. Sifuk verikud probably means some sort of professional dancing, where then it comes in, has something to do with kli shir, exactly on the beat or exactly with... In short, that you need to practice for it. Not just dancing.

But being careful about the custom is, and we drink the vodka, also according to a heter, in honor of simchas mitzvah (joy of a commandment), yes, simchas rabanan (joy of the rabbis), food for... Yes, it says in the early Shulchan Aruch, the Geonim already said that on Simchas Torah we dance because of kavod haTorah (honor of the Torah), therefore also for a chasan v'kallah (groom and bride), and therefore if you're a Chassidic Jew you can already say that simchas Shabbos (joy of Shabbos) is also there, but then it's really a contradiction to the Shabbos that we talked about.

Anyway, the custom is that we're not so careful about this. But you must learn what the halacha is, not what the custom is. Yes, learning you learn what it says, doing you do what the custom is. Two different things, you can't mix the two things.

Discussion: Shema Yetaken Kli Shir — Even Today

Speaker 1:

But I don't know, for example metaken kli shir, you can understand that even today, the people who play, keep one with the beat, they are very much kli shir. You can perhaps think, it could be, that dancing with a baal tefillah (prayer leader) is permitted, but actually if there's a choir that works during the week, and on Shabbos you hire them for a simcha, and they sit around the table and one leads, that is perhaps already the professional singer who is already more relevant to shema yetaken kli shir.

I mean to say, they sing and they also clap, but once the clapping is already yes with a bit more intention, it's not just the yetzer hara (evil inclination) clapping, one needs to think. Let's see more.

Speaker 2:

When the Aruch HaShulchan says that even the Lithuanian type goes dancing. Lithuanian certainly, it doesn't start.

Speaker 1:

With intention? May one bring intention on Shabbos? Already. My father told me that he used to learn in Slobodka on Shabbos, and there were bachurim (yeshiva students), and they used to dance on Shabbos, but they were very careful that around the table. K'l'achar yad (in an unusual manner), k'l'achar yad, k'l'achar yad one does even not on Shabbos, which is a question of mourning. I don't know. In short.

Halacha 5: It is Forbidden to Swim on the Water — A Decree Lest One Make a Barrel of Boats

Speaker 1:

Already, another rabbinic decree of shema yetaken. Perhaps we'll come to an apathetic place. One may not swim, to swim on the water, a decree lest he make a quick little boat.

Speaker 2:

Ah, he'll make a boat, is it a whole huge job of making a boat?

Speaker 1:

No, one can make a quick one. One can make such a decree shema yetaken chavis shel shayatin (lest he fix a barrel of boats), he'll perhaps find a piece of wood that... can make something from a piece into a boat. A chavis shel shayatin is a tub. A chavis, yes, you take an empty barrel. A piece like a tub, yes. One can hold air, therefore it keeps, it floats to the courtyard. But breicha shebechatzer, a pool in the house.

Hilchos Shabbos: Swimming on Water, Reed Tube, and Digression on Learning Rambam

Halacha: One May Not Swim on Water

Speaker 1:

You may not swim, swimming on the water, a decree lest he make a chavis shel shayatin. Ah, he'll make a boat. Is it a huge job of making a boat? No, I can make a quick one... One can make such a decree shema yisshot (lest he squeeze). A chavis shel shayatin, he'll find some piece of wood that one can make something from it into a piece of a boat.

A chavis shel shayatin is such a... a chavis? Yes, you take an empty barrel... a piece like a tub, yes. Something that can hold air, therefore it keeps from swimming with it.

But a pool in the courtyard, a pool in the house, is permitted, even if it's not a pool, just a pit, because in a courtyard one doesn't make... it's too small, one doesn't build little boats there.

V'hu she'yesh la sfin mukafos (and it must have defined boundaries), that it has a clear place where the water ends, **shelo yetz'u chutz lima** (so they won't go outside the water), the water shouldn't go out. **Dehaynu, she'yesh lahen heikef v'afar sfasa gevohim** (that is, that they have a perimeter and the earth of its edge is high), means that the shores are high, that's what he means.

He means this, that if the water comes from a river, from a lake, you know, and as long as there's an external boundary... I

thought that if a person has a lake in his courtyard, he says actually it's a courtyard where there we don't conduct ourselves to make a chavis, but there, as it looks... even if it's not connected, it looks different. I can say you're right, that it's talking about when it comes in, therefore one needs to make a piece of a fence.

I say, every pool is... that means sfah mukefes (defined boundary). It's placed in some external building around. Sfah mukefes means to exclude when there's a stream that runs, and somewhere by the stream there's a pool. A building means a sfah means a... clear boundaries. It has boundaries, yes. It has a shore.

Discussion: Swimming on Shabbos in a Swimming Pool in Practice

Speaker 1:

According to the halacha that we're learning here, one may swim on Shabbos in a normal swimming pool. Except if it's warm, and then it becomes a question of rechitza (bathing). The only reason I think that the world generally doesn't conduct themselves to swim, but this has to do with rechitza.

Speaker 2:

No, rechitza, rechitza we learned that there are differences among the Acharonim (later authorities) on rechitza.

Speaker 1:

Rechitza b'tzonen (bathing in cold water), in cold water, one may l'chatchila (initially) on Shabbos, it says here explicitly. But the poskim ha'acharonim, as I remember from Rav, and the Mishna Berura says that we don't conduct ourselves to wash on Shabbos even b'tzonen, because various concerns have occurred to people. But from the essential law one may.

But swimming doesn't mean rechitza. Rechitza means simply one goes in water, and here it means swimming. But here you see that even swimming is not permitted.

Interesting, one needs to think and say that someone who goes regularly to the pool, perhaps he may not go to the mikveh (ritual bath), because there's no macheizi k'meyaker (appearance of fixing) by him. If he sometimes falls into the pool, he can say also the mikveh will be macheizi k'meyaker.

Speaker 2:

Mikveh is a better... ah, you mean regarding... that there the problem is the tikun (fixing), and here the answer is macheizi k'meyaker.

Speaker 1:

Yes.

Discussion: Swimming as Exercise

Speaker 1:

Look, I don't know, I already know why now people go to the country and so on. Seemingly, simply one may swim on Shabbos according to all opinions from the halacha. There is a custom. Yes, it's not accepted because of seemingly because of the prohibition of rechitza.

But I want to think the opposite, rechitza I understand that it was forbidden, okay. If the issue is sechita (squeezing), the same thing swimming, I don't know, swimming isn't the same thing as rechitza. It could also be that perhaps certain people always think about swimming that it's a good exercise, a good workout, perhaps that's the thing why one shouldn't do it.

But one needs to learn hilchos exercise there. We learned what is a mazia (exertion). But to walk, even to run on Shabbos, there's another prohibition of running on Shabbos, but someone who has pleasure, it's only when one does it only a thing that one doesn't like, only in the name of exercise. But swimming, if people who do it actually in the name of exercise, yes, but someone who enjoys it and it happens to also be exercise?

In any case, this is what the essential halacha is. I've seen places where there are Jews, here communities of Jews that I've seen how they swim yes on Shabbos. It depends, it's more like... whatever. Okay. Yes.

Halacha: One May Not Cut from a Reed Tube

Speaker 1:

Ein chotkin mishfoferes shel kaneh (One may not cut from a reed tube). They tried to make a straw. Like today there are straws, today it's made from plastic, they used from this a piece of straw. Ah, that's a straw. A straw is modeled after the original, the straw that grows. They put it in a barrel, and from that it flowed. Everyone knows, when you put for example a straw by a barrel and you give it a bit of suction, it will keep running from there.

So, when someone wants... we're holding here in the middle of the halachos of... we're talking about metaken, but we've brought various things that one does with a barrel. Interesting why, but various things with a barrel, and this is also, in the barrel of wine one takes the straw.

So, already a month before Shekalim, one may not take a... we're not talking here about cutting from the ground, that's certainly, that's tolesh (uprooting), kotzer (reaping). But it's already cut down, it's not actually any first cutting. But one may not cut so that one can put it in the barrel, we're concerned about metaken kli, because it's as if he's metaken kli and he creates something.

Discussion: Why Isn't It a Real Metaken Kli?

Speaker 2:

Why isn't it a real metaken kli? Seemingly because it's not a kli, because it's still just a straw, because one gives it a cut.

Speaker 1:

A real metaken kli we should have learned in previous chapters.

Speaker 2:

In binyan u'stirah b'keilim (building and demolishing regarding vessels)?

Speaker 1:

Seemingly, no. The nature of a kli one weighs... metaken kli is a real melacha. That means a toladah (subcategory) of makeh b'patish (final hammer blow). Like for example...

Speaker 2:

Ah, not building, but makeh b'patish.

Speaker 1:

Okay, we're talking here about makeh b'patish. To find some melacha that should have been really a completion but a new use. A use should also be a completion. Okay, for example, sewing thread.

Speaker 2:

Very good. Then to the thread. This... he doesn't really make a kli, but it has come to be a kli with rabbinic status. Yes. But... it could be that one can use it anyway, one makes it a bit more convenient, perhaps.

Speaker 1:

The use of the kli, that's the way the new kli becomes fit and usable. And one makes the kli, the tube, becomes a kli that one can with it take out wine from the barrel. It could be metaken kli means it in fixing the barrel by adding the straw.

But not so clear, let's see. **Hutach hatichon** (if it was already cut), if the tube is already cut. It's already made as it should be. **Afilu einenu metukan** (even if it's not yet installed). Even if one hasn't yet installed it, I think. Metukan means placed on the barrel. **One may, from before Shabbos, but to make a hole in the barrel on Shabbos is not permitted.**

There's a hole in the barrel, we learned earlier, that one can plug with a pebble. But with a pebble one may not, because one can plug with a piece of earth, because one sees that he places it permanently. In short, in that hole one can insert the straw permanently from before the day, **v'ein choshin shema yetaken** (and we're not concerned lest he fix). We don't say that if we're going to let him insert this in the holes, he'll also cut and he'll also do more.

Discussion: What Does "Shema Yetaken" Mean?

Speaker 1:

He says "ein choshin shema yetaken." It's a bit... his language is interesting. "Shema yetaken" means to say the original, preparing the tubes. To cut is a metaken, or some tikun.

Speaker 2:

Or are you asking that perhaps there's metaken in inserting, installing.

Speaker 1:

But ein choshin shema yetaken that with this he'll be metaken kli, or he'll take a non-cut piece.

This is one of the pieces of Rambam, like most pieces of Rambam that we're learning here, that is hard to understand and one doesn't know the context from the Gemara. In other words, what I would have thought that one needs to be concerned. But the secret is, that in the Gemara there's a dispute of Amoraim, and perhaps a dispute of Tannaim also, whether one may cut the tubes at all, and the Gemara makes such an ukimta (limitation) that the dispute is only whether one may take what is already cut, whether one may insert it, because to cut from fresh everyone agrees that it's forbidden.

Speaker 2:

A rabbinic decree.

Speaker 1:

Yes, and there's about this an investigation itself, here what's happening with the Gemara makes the distinction in being. But anyway, in general all these things...

Speaker 2:

Yes, excuse me.

Speaker 1:

But anyway, this piece, the two distinctions are only because the Gemara makes the distinction, because there's someone else, an opinion that says that we actually don't because we're concerned. Because no, it doesn't make any sense to anyone, he doesn't think to be concerned. Okay, every thing one can

start to be concerned. There are actually people who are concerned, but one doesn't need to be concerned. The Rambam rules, he decides the opinion.

Digression: Can One Learn Rambam Without Gemara?

Speaker 1:

So, when one learns the Rambam, under every halacha there's a whole sugya (Talmudic passage) in the Gemara, a few, sometimes more sometimes less. But if one wants to learn really yeshivish, one can learn on every piece of Rambam forever and ever.

So it's a bit interesting when one tries to make sense with the Rambam within the Rambam, but there are commentators on the Rambam who do so. Maggid Mishneh does sometimes so, that one makes a reasoning in the Rambam itself, one doesn't always go back to the sugya. It's interesting what you're saying. There isn't any one commentator that I know who does this officially. There are commentators who do this who have forgotten the Gemara. I don't know. But because I'm telling you, because it doesn't make any sense.

Speaker 2:

Yes, but the Rambam did want a person to be able to read his book and from that get some...

Speaker 1:

Okay, we've already talked about this many times. It requires great investigation, the Rambam who said that one can learn his book without the Gemara. It's simply not consistent. And it requires investigation what the Rambam thought. Either he thought that he didn't succeed, or he thought somehow like you're saying, that something one will be able to understand from the Rambam even if one won't know that the Gemara means it something else. It requires investigation.

Speaker 2:

No, I wanted to say this, the Gemara has some certain reasoning behind the Gemara. So instead of... certainly you can't know the sugya, the back and forth, how one rules. But usually there's some reasoning under it. So instead of using the reasoning in the Gemara, you can use it here. It's that he gives you a certain reality, for a certain ruling, you can make sense. Certainly the real explanation of the things lies in the Gemara, but...

The Problem of Translation and Context

Speaker 1:

Let's understand. My problem is that you can't know the translation of the Rambam, many times one doesn't know the translation of the Rambam without knowing the Gemara.

And I even have a proof about this, that the Rambam in Perush HaMishnayos (Commentary on the Mishna) translates many words. Many words that are in the Mishna, the Rambam writes "this" is such and such and so on. This is the translation, in Arabic or in lashon hakodesh (Hebrew), even he explains simple words. Afterwards in Mishneh Torah he brings simply the language of the Mishna.

So the Rambam knew that normal people don't know the Hebrew translation of this, and he didn't care. Because Mishneh Torah doesn't speak to people who can't know any Hebrew translation from the Gemara. He speaks to someone who has already learned Perush HaMishnayos, or who has

already learned Gemara and he knows the translation, and he tells him the halacha.

Speaker 2:

But the Rambam writes that the book is for everyone to be able to learn without knowing Gemara?

Speaker 1:

Actually requires investigation.

Right. The second type of problem is like here, that you don't understand why it occurred to me that it's harder to learn the Gemara? Someone was concerned. You're right that here one can learn without knowing the Gemara, because there's no mistake, but still, the context to understand what the Rambam is doing is actually a ruling of the halacha, a decision in a dispute in the Gemara. The context wouldn't be there without knowing the context, and it's hard to know what the Rambam wants from me when not that you know the Gemara.

Speaker 2:

Right. True.

Speaker 1:

The truth is that on the Gemara—

Discussion About Learning Torah, Barrel and Nullification, and Hilchos Shabbos

General Introduction - The Nature of Torah Study

Laws of Shabbat Chapter 23: Prohibition of Polishing Silver Vessels with Gartakon, Washing Dishes, and Discussion of the Rambam's and Raavad's Positions

Law 8: Prohibition of Polishing Silver Vessels with Gartakon

Another thing that one may not do because of repairing vessels:

"It is forbidden to polish silver vessels with gartakon."

One may not — "polish" always means to scrape, just as washing means soaping the head for example, soaping and scraping. One may not scrape, polish silver, silver vessels, "with gartakon" — with a type of chemical called gartakon. I will see later what it means — sharp material.

"Because this is whitening in the manner of craftsmen."

Because this is a professional way of how to clean and polish silver. This is the way that craftsmen, people who are professionals, people who make silver vessels do it this way.

"It turns out to be like repairing a vessel at the completion of its work on Shabbat."

It appears, it is similar to repairing a vessel and completing work on Shabbat. Even though he thinks he is only cleaning, but this is the way that the vessel gets its shine, the vessel is completed.

"But a person may polish his cup with sand and with natron."

But — this means that we have not forbidden every type of polishing a silver vessel. With weak materials, with sand or a type of soap, one may indeed scrape it. Because one may clean a vessel on Shabbat.

"And similarly all vessels one may polish and carry with anything."

All other vessels, not silver vessels, there is no concern, because it is never the completion of work of a vessel to clean it, one may indeed scrape it with anything.

Discussion: Why is a Silver Vessel Different?

Speaker 1:

But I do want to understand — a silver vessel one may indeed polish with sand and natron. Are we speaking about when one will use it again?

Speaker 2:

I don't believe so. So why did they make a distinction for a silver vessel between which materials?

Speaker 1:

Perhaps it remains there simply. Perhaps one will indeed use it, perhaps it is there for beauty, it is there. But by a silver vessel there was no condition at all, it wasn't the condition that one will use it again that Shabbat. It was just put away, and one uses it. It is just something that stands on the shelf, it stands in...

Speaker 2:

Why should it be easier than eating vessels?

Speaker 1:

What? You're asking that it comes out opposite according to me?

Speaker 2:

Right, if anything one would say that eating vessels are something that one keeps using, a silver vessel that one puts away...

Speaker 1:

No, I'm not saying that one puts it away, one uses it specifically for beauty.

Speaker 2:

Exactly. It's already a use. A beautiful candelabra stands on the table, you already have a use from it.

Speaker 1:

Yes, but what you have now washed is for a long time.

Speaker 2:

So here we have now learned that when one washes something for a longer time, one won't use it now, one will put it away, it is perhaps fixing.

Law 8 (Continued): Prohibition of Washing Dishes Not for Shabbat Use

Further, but what may one not do?

"And it is forbidden to wash bowls and pots and the like."

One may not wash out plates or pots and the like, wash out dishes after using them.

"Because it is like clearing away."

What it looks like is that he is clearing away the vessels. This is very interesting.

"Unless one washes them to eat with them another meal on that same Shabbat."

If he washes them out to eat another meal with them on that Shabbat, then it doesn't look like he is clearing away, he is simply preparing them for the next use. But when he washes them off to put away, then it looks more like someone who...

Explanation of the Rambam's Position: "Like Clearing Away" = Repairing a Vessel

I think that the Rambam's problem is that it sounds like he is fixing it. When he does it to put away after Shabbat, it feels or sounds like he is now fixing something in the vessel.

Yes, I think like the distinction for example to when one makes a fold and it will hold for a long time, or it will become dirty again. When he will use it again, it will then become dirty, it doesn't look like he is fixing. Here he is indeed doing something long-term, until the next time one will use it, or until when one will use it, it is clean.

The Raavad's Position: Exertion Not for Shabbat Use

Speaker 1:

I know, the Raavad is actually in disagreement. The Raavad says that it is not about fixing. So says the Raavad. The Raavad says that the point of the matter is not fixing, but rather because one exerts oneself for a weekday matter.

Speaker 2:

That is actually accepted, most people say so. One knows that one may not for example make the bed. On Friday afternoon one may make the bed because it is for the day, but when one took a nap in the afternoon, no longer.

Speaker 1:

So says the Raavad. The Raavad says that it is an exertion for all.

Principle: Categorization of Labors is More Uncertain Than the Prohibition Itself

Perhaps it's not so far from that. We learned that many melachos, which category you put it into is more uncertain than the actual prohibition itself. It says that it's forbidden. The Rambam puts it under the category of metaken keli (fixing a vessel). It's not clear to me that it's really a tikun keli.

It says, all these melachos, one must know a great principle, as it says in Hilchos Shabbos. It's not simple that the Chachamim worked with a list of rules, like definitions of melachos, and then they saw that this thing fits into that melacha. It's actually the opposite. There's a bunch of things that they looked at directly, at the particular case, at the action, and they saw that this may not be done on Shabbos. Afterwards, the Rambam for example was very curious to know under which melacha this goes, so he put it in. In the Gemara many times we don't even know which melacha it is.

But even in the Gemara, when it comes afterwards, so there's a dispute between the Rambam and the Raavad about which melacha it is, but both agree that the actual melacha itself is not in dispute. And it could be even the Rambam himself, if you asked him, "Does it fit better in this definition or that definition?" "Yeah, you know what, it fits."

Practical Difference Between the Rambam's and Raavad's Positions

It could be there are practical differences when one thinks of a case in a way that it's not...

Speaker 1:

It is, you want to know why specifically when one does it only for after Shabbos is it forbidden? For the Rambam and Raavad, simply it makes more sense. For the Rambam one needs to say something forced, as you said, that it looks less, it doesn't fit with the previous halacha.

Speaker 2:

So the Raavad's approach apparently makes more sense regarding the practical difference.

Speaker 1:

But there are commentators who say that the Rambam also means with metaken keli, he doesn't mean that it's the prohibition of tikun keli, it's the prohibition of doing things that... One can squeeze it a bit. Because which category you put it into is less real, less basic here than the actual halacha.

Contemporary Practical Differences: Washing Dishes in Our Time

For example, there are contemporary poskim who discuss this, that today it's very normal that when a person brings in the plates from the table, one goes to put them in the sink, and this is not the usual way of washing. Usually one will after Motzaei Shabbos wash again with soap, wash well. So this first washing no one will look at as metaken, it's just, give it a rinse.

There are those who say that in today's reality it's completely different, and one is somewhat more lenient. There are those who permit using grated soap. But once we know that the washing is only because one doesn't want to have gross dirty plates with cholent still sitting there, it's simply not pleasant, that one wants to rinse it a little, there are those who say that it's different from what the Rambam is talking about.

Digression: General Discussion About Learning Hilchos Shabbos and Practical Halacha

Speaker 1:

Yes, every thing, every thing, Hilchos Shabbos in general, one must learn principles, and this is not practical halacha.

Speaker 2:

But why not? Because one is afraid, because one will be yelled at afterwards.

Speaker 1:

Why must one learn a chapter today, or a chapter today, or practical halacha? Practical halacha will simply take more time.

Speaker 2:

No, I just want to bring out that the principle of this, that is, let's say there's a whole question here, and we will now come to the end of this, this is the last chapter of Hilchos Shabbos, of the thirty-nine melachos that are forbidden on Shabbos, and one reaches the details.

The Rambam's Project: "Litaken V'lo Tikan"

There are so many problems, because if there really were principles, there's a question altogether, Rav Yehoshua'le Kretschker criticized the Rambam, we've already spoken about this perhaps more than once, that the Rambam held "litaken v'lo tikan" (he set out to fix but didn't fix). The Rambam says he's going to make a book of all the Torah, and meanwhile the Rambam doesn't make the principles, he doesn't bring the reasoning of each halacha, so that one could understand the details oneself. The Rambam brings all the Gemaras that are in the Gemara.

Now, first of all, the Gemara doesn't fit many times, one must struggle oneself what the principle is. And secondly, from this you also can't learn, because we don't live, we don't hold, every Rambam, even when it says explicitly, I don't know if it's exactly the same reality. My dishwasher is a bit different from the Gemara's dishwasher or the Gemara's sink.

In general, when one sometimes speaks of medeiach kelim (rinsing vessels), I don't know if there was a sink that one would light the sink. One is talking about several melachos. It's very hard to know what one is talking about. And let's not talk about today certainly, where one lives very differently from how one lived once. But even in the Rambam's times they already wrote doubts about the Gemara, and thousands of things are different. And from the Rambam's Gemaras we learn almost nothing!

You learn that in the Gemara's times, whatever was then a docheh (a rinse), was forbidden. And it's a big problem, because if you go with the reasoning and you want to work backwards the reasoning within this, it's very hard, because it didn't start from the reasoning. The reasoning follows the practical halacha.

So how do you want to rule practical halacha on a case of today, I don't know how one does it. Except if one goes to the very general principles, like what a melacha means, the most general principles. But from all these details, like someone says, "One may not open a bottle cap because it's similar to a barrel." I still don't understand the concept of a barrel. I only know that it says in the Gemara the case. Okay, if there's the case, one must rule like the Gemara. But a new thing, to make a principle built on a detail, built on nothing, how does it work?

The Difference Between Hilchos Shabbos and Other Parts of Torah

Not in all parts of Torah is there this problem. For example, Choshen Mishpat, there's very much, there are chazakos, there's muchzak, there's migo, there are such kinds of things. But here it's almost all realities, where Maseches Shabbos is full of examples. The Gemara doesn't make principles of each melacha and then... There's a bit, there's more general thinking about all of Shabbos, but there are very few principles within the melacha. It's more various examples.

The Rambam's Contribution: "Lo Alecha HaMelacha Ligmor"

But the Rambam certainly did better than nothing. On this the Mishna says, "Lo alecha hamelacha ligmor, v'lo atah ben chorin lihibatel heimenah" (It's not upon you to complete the work, but neither are you free to desist from it). Because I can't do a perfect job like Rav Chaim Krasna who was a perfectionist, does it mean I shouldn't do anything at all? He brought us closer to it.

Speaker 1:

Rav Chaim Krasna worked on one halacha, and that's even Pesach, he wrote how he would rewrite Maseches Pesachim, and he didn't even finish that.

Speaker 2:

So you're right, he talked about it and he didn't get to do it.

Speaker 1:

Okay, I'm busy, one can't complain that a person doesn't finish a preparation he had. But it's true that the Rambam actually carried it out, and he didn't.

Speaker 2:

The Rambam had a goal to accomplish, he says it, that a people needs to have legislation, a people needs to have a law, and he served that interest.

Speaker 1:

True.

Why We Don't Learn Practical Halacha in This Shiur

But because of this I say, this is the deep reason why we don't learn practical halacha. And why many times, when one notices, many times he says things that sound very very logical, it doesn't make any sense.

Speaker 1:

Why do you say that?

Speaker 2:

Because you think one can't rule the stringency that the Rambam says, or the leniency, whatever, because it doesn't make any sense. Forbidden. People shouldn't do this, because from practical halacha one must look practically at our reality.

But I say that from what one can learn is only that in the case that's stated in the Rambam there is such a prohibition. Exactly what the case is...

For example, let's take this as an example, I didn't mean to say that it's permissible to use a sink. Rather because when you ask a person why are you washing off the plate from the cholent, it's not about I want to have a nice plate.

Discussion About Washing Dishes on Shabbos, Making Beds, and Immersing Vessels

Continuation: The Reality Has Changed

Speaker 1:

Because you think that one can't rule the stringency that the Rambam writes, or the leniency, whichever way, because it doesn't make sense. And I, I say "but it's forbidden." When I say "it's forbidden" I don't mean one shouldn't do it, because - practical halacha - one must look practically at our reality. But I say that from what one can learn is only that in the case that's stated in the Rambam, there is that prohibition. Exactly what the case is, yes.

For example, when one takes this as an example, I didn't mean to say because it's very easy to use a sink. Why exactly does a person, why do you wash off the plate from the cholent? It's not about, about he wants to have a nice plate, rather he wants to rinse off the cholent, that's a different thing. Where is the case of proper washing? It's very difficult, it's very hard to think. He goes out Motzaei Shabbos still with stones and soap or he puts it in the dishwasher. Basically he puts it in the sink and he gives it a little rinse, because he doesn't want to have a gross mass of cholent in his sink.

So, so it's not that the Rambam doesn't fit, rather our reality has changed, therefore... Yes, in short.

Two Questions: The Reasoning and the Reality

Speaker 1:

So true, that question is really so brought from below, so basically there are two questions. There's the question of the reasoning of the halacha, and number two that our reality has changed. Today it's also called proper washing, but it's completely a different thing. It's different washings, it's different plates.

Yes.

Okay, if someone says he doesn't wash out the plate, he washes it out in his room, completely a different thing. He has to put cholent in the room. Or true reasons why one puts the water is just, so it should be easier to wash later, then it could indeed not be preparation.

The Paradox: Polishing Silver Versus Washing Plates

Speaker 1:

But it would be very interesting if one tells a person like this: You may polish your silver on Shabbos. Take the candlestick and polish it, because we learned here that with neter (natron) one may. But go wash off a plate from cholent you don't, it would be very strange for a person.

But this one holds simply more with the reality, one must know what the washing vessel is, and what proper washing is, and how then the order of procedure went. It's not so much the reasoning.

True.

It could be that the halacha one actually may not polish silver, because it's a burden... It's not a Shabbos thing, it's a burden on Shabbos.

But if one goes with the literal translation, it says that one may, but...

Halacha 8: Drinking Vessels - That Have No Fixed Time for Drinking

Speaker 1:

Okay, but drinking vessels, rather one goes the... Further. **But drinking vessels, such as cups and the like.** This we've done, not proper washing, because proper washing, once one has finished the three meals, one has finished the meal, one washes it... and puts it away, and with that one is finished. But regarding drinking, drinking, even if he doesn't know that he'll drink again, such as cups and pitchers, cups...

Utensils, yes, utensils, in general one may indeed wash the whole time when one finishes drinking, **because there's no fixed time for drinking**, drinking has no set time. One can always be thirsty. Also in the Rambam, where he talks about health, he also says that it's a good thing to drink a lot of water. I remember well. No? He doesn't say? Doesn't he say when one should drink? Okay, but a lot of water is... Today's doctors say one should drink a lot of water.

The Difference Between Eating and Drinking

Speaker 1:

You've finished using and now you're putting away. Because you haven't finished using, you can always use it again. It's interesting, the main thing one probably also speaks in such a way, when it's a plate that one uses for the meal. You spoke about which plate, when will you use it again? If it's in today's times, then, people snack, yes, you have fruit in the afternoon. A plate is really more a thing when one finishes the meal.

One brings that there's a type of plate that one will eat later. My cousins told me that my cousin Rav Leibush Leizer's children, the Pshevorsker Rebbe's children, they gave popcorn there, and someone asks, "Can I give...?" He says, "One can't eat with a spoon, it's too refined for that." Yes, you say. Okay, snacking is without utensils.

And One May Not Make the Beds on Shabbos

Speaker 1:

And one may not spread the beds on Shabbos, another thing that one may not do for the same reason, one may not spread out, make nice the bedding on Shabbos, **in order to sleep on them tomorrow**, for example Shabbos, when one has already finished sleeping for the Shabbos, and one makes the beds only for Motzaei Shabbos. We don't do. **But one spreads from Friday night for Shabbos**, on Shabbos we

may indeed. So spreading here certainly doesn't mean putting together, because what we call putting together the bed is for beauty, that the room should look orderly. It's exactly the opposite, one is going to sleep, when one sleeps one messes it up. So I mean spreading means filling the for example the blanket, putting in, earlier we spoke about putting in stuffing, but let's say putting in the pillowcase, or in the holder of the blanket.

What Does "Matzi'in" Mean?

Speaker 1:

I mean that spreading means the sheet with the blanket, not the blanket. It's the opposite, when one sleeps it actually falls off, or whatever, it gets mixed up, and one prepares the blanket on the bed.

I say that what we call today making the bed so it should look nice, is not because I'm preparing it for the next time sleeping. I'm doing it for now so the room should look pleasant.

Discussion: Why Does One Make the Bed?

Speaker 2:

This is a debate between the mothers and the children. I mean that one does it indeed so one can sleep. Do you want to go sleep in a dirty bed?

Speaker 1:

It's not dirty, but it won't anyway give a touch to the blanket.

Speaker 2:

No, no, no, not that. So that when one comes to sleep it should be orderly. Do you want to go into bed, is it more pleasant for you to go into a bed that's already made or not?

Speaker 1:

If it's not made, not necessarily will I say more, because for example the pajamas, it's easier when everything is lying outside. One puts away the pajamas in the drawer, one puts...

Speaker 2:

It's the opposite, so the room should look nice.

Speaker 1:

I don't agree. No, that's for messy people. A normal person wants to go sleep where the bed is already made, not where the bed is unmade.

Speaker 2:

And I'll tell you, perhaps making the bed means spreading out the sheets, or that's what one does, that's the reason. Not making that the blanket should lie nicely on the bed, and everything should lie in place. Rather it means spreading out the sheets or what one needs to have, putting in the pillow in the pillowcase. That yes, because that one needs to have to sleep. But making that it should lie smooth, it should lie nice, is usually because the mothers like when the room is orderly.

Speaker 1:

No, I mean that it's also so one can go sleep normally.

Okay.

And each river has its own way. Further, **it's forbidden to immerse impure vessels.**

I look at it that it's so the room should look orderly. Because when I go to sleep I'll anyway mess it up.

Speaker 2:

Again, every thing, I understand you, I feel you, I want to ask you a question. And according to your opinion, that you set a table is also not for the eating, but for before the eating. Because during eating it anyway gets mixed up, true? Well, because you want to arrive at an orderly table.

Speaker 1:

Be good, it's much easier to fall asleep when the bed is normal. The same thing.

Speaker 2:

When I make the bed, if I make my bed, it's so the room should look orderly.

Speaker 1:

No, I don't agree. It's like this, certainly it looks orderly, but I make the bed so I can go sleep in the orderly, not the room should look orderly. One doesn't turn around in the bedroom all day. It's only for what? For what? Because when one goes to sleep late at night, one shouldn't arrive at a pigsty, arrive at a dirty room. You come to a bed that already has the bedding on it and so on. From there it started.

Speaker 2:

This has to do with how the mother looked at cleanliness and order in the house.

Speaker 1:

No, I'm explaining to you, I'm explaining to you. The mother should understand herself, she should think it doesn't fit. What do I care if the bedroom is clean? I care that when one goes to sleep it should be normal.

Speaker 2:

I've never heard such reasoning from a mother.

Laws of Shabbat: Immersion of Vessels, Tithes, Tanning and Smoothing

Speaker 1:

I'm explaining to you, I'm explaining to you very late. Okay, let's continue.

Law 8: It is Forbidden to Immerse Impure Vessels on Shabbat

Speaker 1:

Law 8. It is forbidden to immerse... Ah, the same tzaddik who doesn't eat with a fork, but fish he is very careful to eat with a fork, because it's not modest to eat with a fork. Fish means an important meal, "yokhlenu beyado" (he should eat it with his hand), because there are matters. Matters are matters. You can't have two, because the old people didn't have popcorn, it's nothing. Okay, let's continue.

Speaker 2:

No, do you understand what I'm saying? The same great service that you have to eat the fish with your hands, you have there to eat popcorn with your hands.

Speaker 1:

No, we're not talking about that, he's very refined. If you know the person I'm talking about, he's terribly refined, he can't see himself dirtying his hands with peas and shooting them in.

Speaker 2:

Yes, but we're not talking about the kind of person who devours fish with his hands. He doesn't eat fish with his hands, he comes with refinement, but he does it because his father did

it that way. We're talking here yes about a person who is very pedantic, a better person who is very particular.

Speaker 1:

Okay, anyway, it doesn't come in at all.

The Rambam's Words

Speaker 1:

It is forbidden to immerse impure vessels on Shabbat, even if one does not intend to repair vessels. One may not immerse vessels that have become impure, and we're talking here, you still know the laws of impurity and purity, yes? It's not here, we don't conduct ourselves, we don't see it properly. Anyway, yes, it's not here. Everyone is impure. You know that there is more impurity than...

Speaker 2:

No, vessels can become more or less impure. Yes, but a person who is in the category of impure from a corpse, and he walks over graves all day... No, is his vessel not impure. I'm saying, the law is not relevant to current times. Current times it's only relevant to a new vessel, where there is the mitzvah of a vessel that one buys from a non-Jew that one must immerse. Seemingly it should also be the same law. No, it's not repairing a vessel. It looks like he's repairing a vessel, because before, as long as the vessel is impure you may not use it, and after he immerses it he can already yes use it. It looks like he's repairing a vessel. Why is it only like repairing a vessel? Because there hasn't occurred a true change in the vessel. It's only a spiritual... But it's only a halachic change, a status has occurred.

Yes. Continue.

Question: Immersion of New Vessels

Speaker 2:

I see that you're not satisfied. I actually have a question here about a new vessel, whether it has the same law as an impure vessel. Why shouldn't it be so?

Speaker 1:

It's not impure, there's a different enactment.

Speaker 2:

But there is an enactment that one shouldn't use it before one immerses it. What is the explanation that with this it's repairing? It's not clear to me.

Speaker 1:

Continue.

But an Impure Person — Appears as Cooling Off

Speaker 1:

"**But an impure person**", he explains, "a person". What about a person? An impure person does yes need to immerse. Why? "**Because it appears as cooling off**", because when he immerses it's not clear... When someone immerses a plate, the plate doesn't want to catch a good swim on a summer day, it's clear that he's doing it because something he's repairing here. But when a person immerses himself, it looks like basically he's cooling off, it's not recognizable that he's repairing.

Discussion: Repairing a Person

Speaker 2:

But I don't understand, repairing a person and repairing a vessel is the same kind of thing? That's how it looks here, but

it's a different thing. A vessel was... Yes, I can hear. A person was impure and became pure.

Speaker 1:

And you say it's not repairing a vessel. You say makeh bepatish. Can you say about a person makeh bepatish? When a person became smart, have you now done makeh bepatish on that person? Something is interesting.

Speaker 2:

I hear.

Speaker 1:

It's a makeh bepatish on the person.

Speaker 2:

No, I mean that the melachah, he does a melachah of repair. Not that the person is a vessel. One may not do...

Speaker 1:

Yes, by the way, it's understandable. But according to this I would ask you, perhaps why shouldn't healing on Shabbat be forbidden as repair? Why is it only because of grinding medicines? Lest he go grind. I only think about grinding, about a decree of grinding medicines.

Speaker 2:

No, here why shouldn't we say that... That hole that you like to talk about regarding the maftach marzev that he makes an opening. The maftach marzev is not repairing the person, because he makes something that's called an opening.

Speaker 1:

No, no, shezemanin mehalchin ela rofe, shezemanin mehalchin is not a thing in itself, because... But you see that there should be a law that... He says building a hole in the person's stomach. But he's not repairing the person, then something is a law that it gets a law of an opening because it is made to bring in and take out. But you see that... that healing is not a repair with people... What tells you, I bring you a proof from there, that it shouldn't be going out for a rule with people one may do... and he makes a repair in the body, in the guf adam that he fixes there, that's the fact.

Speaker 1:

Yes, but such a thing, to actually be a person, he would need to be doing, but it's not doing, because it's not actually repairing.

Speaker 2:

Ah, it's like we learned yesterday about repairing the vertebrae in the spine of a child. Yes, with people there is a repair, but just a person...

Discussion: Repentance, Immersion, and Sprinkling Purification Water on Shabbat

Speaker 1:

Question about doing repentance, may a person do repentance on Shabbat?

Speaker 2:

Absolutely we don't do. Shabbat baal teshuvah, but just repentance... there are questions why repentance on Shabbat... But repentance should be permitted.

Speaker 1:

But immersing should be permitted?

Speaker 2:

And sprinkling on Shabbat? One also may not sprinkle mei chatat on a person, because that is yes, because that's not a leniency of merukem meikara.

Speaker 1:

Yes.

Speaker 2:

Yes, good.

Digression: Red Heifer and Laws for the Messiah

Speaker 1:

Just, the Rambam speaks here about laws of the Messianic era and such.

Speaker 2:

I already know what he says about laws of the Messianic era. Also the red heifer. I saw that the Jews in Ethiopia, our brothers in Ethiopia, used ashes of the red heifer until now, until recently, until they came up to the Land of Israel they had their own tradition. They would slaughter a red heifer, sprinkle, and all things. But generally speaking, it's accepted that it's something that one needs to have purity, and one needs to have a Temple for this, and one needs to have vessels, kohanim who are pure, and one needs to have for this the whole structure. But it's not a question, because the Rambam always also speaks laws for the Messiah.

Speaker 1:

I don't understand the process, I don't see why one can't do it today. What, explain? You don't have a number? Do you know someone? I could use a bit for a red spray. I don't feel so pure.

Speaker 2:

Ah, ah, ah, ah, ah, you don't hold of feelings.

Speaker 1:

Okay.

Speaker 2:

Okay, let's learn.

One Who Immerses Vessels on Shabbat – Inadvertently and Deliberately

Speaker 2:

Inadvertently, if one immersed vessels on Shabbat. If someone transgressed the prohibition and did yes immerse vessels on Shabbat, simply he transgressed the rabbinic prohibition of repairing a vessel, so, **inadvertently he may use them. Deliberately he may not use them.** One should not use the vessels until after Shabbat. It's interesting, here we see that the prohibition of deliberately he may not use them is not only by Torah law, it's also by rabbinic law. That if one transgressed something that is forbidden, we have not allowed to use it.

Speaker 1:

Yes, the same law is then also by the barrels, by all the laws here?

Speaker 2:

I don't know. I think so. Yes.

It is Permitted to Immerse Impure Water on Shabbat

Speaker 2:

Ah, continue. **And it is permitted to immerse impure water on Shabbat.** Someone has water that is impure, and the way how one repairs this is through making contact that it should touch the pure water, this one may yes do. Why?

Because he's not working with a vessel, it doesn't look like he's repairing something a vessel or what. Okay. **How should he do it? He places it in a vessel that doesn't receive impurity, such as stone vessels, and immerses the vessel in a mikveh until the mikveh water rises upon it, and behold it is pure.** That means, the water needs to touch the mikveh water, or is it enough that the vessel touches.

Speaker 1:

Aha.

Discussion: Why Does One Need a Vessel That Doesn't Receive Impurity?

Speaker 2:

Why does he need to place it in a vessel that doesn't receive impurity?

Speaker 1:

Because if not the vessel becomes impure from the water that you pour into it, and then... What's the problem? Pure it will become.

Speaker 2:

He says that the problem is that one shouldn't immerse the vessel on Shabbat. But during the week it wouldn't have been a problem. This is also thought, is it an act of immersion? It's an act of immersion, because one places in the vessel with the water, it doesn't matter. One places the whole thing into the mikveh. The problem is only that one shouldn't do immersing on Shabbat, because I may not immerse an impure vessel on Shabbat. But interesting, simply that the vessel becomes for example, let's say the water is a rishon, the vessel becomes a sheni, okay, one needs to think. Yes, continue.

Speaker 2:

Another thing that one may not do... Impurity of a corpse for a kohen, yes. Seemingly even impurity of a corpse for a kohen has no immersion, because it looks like one is repairing a vessel, there's no difference. He says here he has places.

One May Not Separate Terumah and Tithes on Shabbat

Speaker 2:

One may not separate terumah and tithes on Shabbat. It's interesting, he doesn't say "one may not give terumah", lifting up. Magbihin, the terumah is the same thing. Terumah is with the language of lifting, lifting up.

Speaker 1:

Magbihin, no, there's no difference. Magbihin, that's how it's called in the Mishnayot.

Speaker 2:

Ah, does it mean the separating or does it mean the tithe that one lifts up?

Speaker 1:

It means separating.

Speaker 2:

One may not separate terumah and tithes on Shabbat, one may not tithe or remove terumah on Shabbat. Because **it appears as repairing something that was not repaired.** The fruits were not repaired, as long as it didn't have terumot and ma'asrot it was tevel. So one is repairing it now. It's related to repairing a vessel. It's a spiritual repair, it's not a true repair, but it's rabbinically repairing a vessel, or like

a repair of something that was not fit for eating, now it became fit, therefore one may not. Until here the laws of...

Practical Point: Tithing Out of Stringency in the Land of Israel

Speaker 2:

I'm explaining to you, in the Land of Israel there is very often that almost everything has already been tithed originally, perhaps it even has a rabbinic that it was tithed, but people tithe out of stringency. One needs to know whether one tithes out of stringency, can say for that person who is in practice repairing or not, because it's already essentially kosher.

Continue, there is perhaps also other solutions, if I remember, if one forgot to tithe on Shabbat, there should be something a solution. I don't remember. Right, one needs the solution for example on Pesach, if one catches oneself one didn't take challah from the matzot, here is a question how one does it on Pesach. Or Shabbat, Pesach that falls on Shabbat, erev Pesach itself is easier because it will mean like a melachah of ochel nefesh, but Yom Tov that falls on Shabbat, how does one tithe the erev Pesach matzot? It happens a lot one forgets to take challah from erev Pesach matzot. Okay.

Me'abed – One Who Softens Leather with Oil

Speaker 2:

Continue, me'abed. The next Torah melachah was me'abed, it means working out the hide, the skin of the animal. One needs to rub it with oil and work it so it should become fit to become parchment or become a vessel. Me'abed and memachek. If you remember well, these are the same melachot, yes, sometimes one writes me'abed, sometimes one writes memachek.

Speaker 1:

What was written? But one removed... two melachot, two melachot.

Speaker 2:

Ah, no, but which melachah did one remove and put in in honor of?

Speaker 1:

I think that one wrote... memareach, memareach.

Speaker 2:

Ah, memareach is a type of me'abed. Okay, continue.

Speaker 2:

Now we're going to learn what are the rabbinics of me'abed and memachek. Says the Rambam, me'abed is an av melachah. Says the Rambam, **One who softens leather with oil, someone makes soft leather, he makes that the leather should be better, it should feel better, with oil, in the manner that the tanners and sellers do**, as those who work with skins, skin merchants do. The leather, yes. **Behold this is me'abed and he is liable.** That means me'abed, and also here me'abed is from the Torah. Yes, this is me'abed from the Torah, this is the obligation.

A Person May Not Rub His Foot with Oil Inside the Shoe

Speaker 2:

Therefore, so, a person has a shoe or a boot that is made from leather, there is a solution, one wants that it should become oily, let's say it became hardened, there is such a trick that the person should pour oil on his foot and it should go onto the shoe. This one may not do. **Therefore, a person may not rub his foot with oil while he is inside the**

shoe or inside new sandals, that when he is wearing the shoes, he pours oil on his foot that it should slide down and it should go onto the shoes, this one may not do, because he pours it because he has the shoes on, it looks like he's pouring on the shoes. **But he may rub his foot with oil**, one may yes rub oil on the body, on the foot, **and afterwards put on the shoes, even if they are new**, even if they are new shoes and with this putting on the oil helps for the shoes, one may, because there is a great change and it doesn't look like repairing a vessel.

Speaker 1:

It's not repairing a vessel, it's me'abed, yes, me'abed is repairing a vessel. Everything in the world one can call repairing a vessel.

Rolling Around on a New Katavliya

Speaker 2:

Continue, **And he may rub his whole body with oil and roll**, a person may do such a trick, a person has a new katavliya, it's something a type, I don't know, a large piece of merchandise of leather, and he wants to oil it, but one may not on Shabbat, he can do such a trick, he should pour his body with oil, **and roll on it**, roll around on the katavliya, on the katavliya, **and he need not worry for this is not the manner of tanning at all.** It's sort of like such a Shabbat afternoon, it's a good activity.

Speaker 1:

Seriously, this is poor katavliya is such a... a blanket that is made from leather.

Speaker 2:

Yes, such a perhaps a mat, okay you need to be a bit better. He comes rubs himself with the oil, and then rolls a lot on it, and then he puts on the... first he puts on a bathing suit like, it's all ironed clothing.

Speaker 1:

Well then, use yours.

Speaker 2:

No, I'm trying to understand.

Speaker 1:

Yes, approximately, yes.

Speaker 2:

It's truly the story.

Speaker 1:

In short, it's a thing that one can do. Okay, by the Midbar Meriri.

A Little Oil vs. Much Oil

Speaker 2:

By the Midbar Meriri, **If there was there a little oil just enough that the leather should be polished only**, when he puts a little oil that the leather should become, get a shine, it should get a bit softer, but a little bit. **But if there was there much oil enough that it should soften the leather**, if he pours with abundance that it should actually do a greater work on the leather that it should become really soft, **behold this is forbidden, because it is like me'abed**, this is yes more like me'abed.

Speaker 1:

It's not like, it's actually me'abed, but he does it with his body with such a piece of trick. He places it in a tub of oil, I'm not talking just how we rub so. But what he does it with his body, it's basically only like perhaps... He found a way how to do with a trick with such a...

Speaker 2:

One calls it softening leather with oil? You ask such a question? Softening leather with oil? I hear.

Speaker 1:

It's perhaps all less, I don't know. It's only a trick that he places the... It looks so, he rolls on the leather because he wants that the oil should come to it. He does it specifically fake.

Speaker 2:

It could be that softening is something a certain thing, one uses a tool, one is actually softening with oil. And this is basically comes to the oil which is not actually softening. It must be something like this, I understand.

With Old Ones It's Permitted

Speaker 2: Says the Rema, **vechol zeh bechadashim**, all these things that we've discussed here are with new shoes or new leather, where at that time the leather is truly a toldah (derivative) of metaken (fixing), me'abed (processing). **Aval beyeshanim, mutar**, but with old ones it's permitted, because it's already been processed, you're not processing it now.

Mochek – Hamemare'ach Retiyah

Speaker 2: Says the Rema on the next halacha, mochek. Says the Rema like this, **hamemare'ach retiyah**, retiyah means a bandage that one places already on it smeared cream that needs to be applied. So, he smears the retiyah, he smears the medicine on the retiyah, on the... how do you say the word in Yiddish? Nu? On the bandage.

Hilchos Shevus: Mochek, Kotev, Mekach Umemkar

Halacha: Memare'ach Retiyah – Chayav Mishum Mochek Es Ha'or

Speaker 1:

Says the Rambam on the next halacha, mochek. Says the Rambam like this: **hamemare'ach retiyah** — retiyah means a bandage that one places already on it smeared cream that needs to be applied, medicine — so if he smears the retiyah, he smears the medicine on the retiyah, on the bandage, on the gauze pad, whatever, **chayav mishum mochek es ha'or**. So he is liable for mochek es ha'or.

Mochek es ha'or usually means smoothing out the hide of an animal after one has flayed it, to remove the hair from it, and so on. So when one smears out the retiyah and makes it so the cream should lie well on the retiyah, it's similar to mochek es ha'or. Not similar, he is liable for mochek es ha'or.

But according to this it's not the hide that he's going to place on his body afterward, rather it's on what he does to the retiyah, because he smears it out so it should lie well smeared on the retiyah.

Discussion: What Is the Connection to Mochek Es Ha'or?

Speaker 2:

What does it have to do with mochek es ha'or?

Speaker 1:

Because the retiyah becomes like applying, smearing oil on a hide, it's me'abed (processing). Mochek is also something the action of smearing, scraping on a hide, on merchandise, so it should become better. And memare'ach retiyah is something... I don't know, don't you have clarity? What was written about mochek or memachek? I saw earlier... the Raza there... mochek or...

Speaker 2:

Yes, mochek.

Speaker 1:

And here it says mochek.

Speaker 2:

No, mochek.

Speaker 1:

Mochek, but he says memare'ach.

Speaker 2:

Yes, yes, I understand. Mochek min ha'or.

Speaker 1:

The chapter of mochek, says the Rambam, let's remember, mochek in the Raza means he rubs off the hair or the wool me'al ha'or **ad sheyachalik pnei ha'or**, to smooth out the hide. I don't understand. And here it also says, chayav, yes, it was written, **chayav hamemare'ach retiyah ad sheyachalik paneha chayav mishum mochek**. Because he makes the retiyah smooth, he makes it smooth.

The retiyah isn't a hide, it's something else. The retiyah is perhaps fabric that is mechuspas (rough), yes, but it has hard pieces, with them sticking out. And he takes the oil and he makes it so the gauze should be smooth, easy gauze, it should lie well on the wound, it shouldn't scratch and so on. So it's exactly like mochek.

Mochek is that he takes a piece of hide from an animal that still has hair, and it still has little roots, and it still has things, and he smooths it out so it should become a smooth hide. The same thing happens, he takes a gauze pad that has thorns coming out of it and such, let's say thorns. Let's say hide, or even from fabric, but it has hard pieces that come out from it and will scratch the wound, so he is memare'ach, he smooths it out so it should lie well on the wound. So he is truly mochek. This is truly mochek.

Speaker 2:

But with a gauze pad it doesn't make sense, because a gauze pad isn't something that's bumpy that one needs to smooth out.

Speaker 1:

No, I mean more the coarse wool, you know like steel wool, let's say, that has sharp pieces sticking out.

Speaker 2:

No one puts steel wool on their wound.

Speaker 1:

No, you know the old-fashioned gauze that's truly pieces of thread, it's a lot of threads, that isn't very smooth. Such... what's it called?

Speaker 2:

I don't know what you mean.

Speaker 1:

Can you think of a piece of fabric that isn't very refined, it's not smoothed out.

Speaker 2:

But one isn't interested in making it smoother. When one applies a cream, when one applies the cream that one applies today, Desitin, so it should make a healing or something, no one cares to make the bandage smoother or whatever.

Speaker 1:

But he said, the bandage does have scratchy pieces that he wants to remove. That's how he learns it, and it makes sense.

Speaker 2:

But I don't see that bandages have scratchy pieces.

Speaker 1:

Why then should it be mochek es ha'or?

Speaker 2:

Because this is a type of example of mochek es ha'or, because he's going to place it on his skin.

Speaker 1:

No, that's how the Rambam learns, perhaps there are others who do learn like that. No, the retiyah that the Rambam learns is such a piece of hide basically, that's what's implied. A piece of hide that one works it out so it should lie well on the wound.

Speaker 2:

That's what's implied.

Speaker 1:

It should lie well on the wound, but a bandage isn't a hide, I don't see why he should bring in this law.

Speaker 1:

Kach nir'eh li (so it seems to me).

Halacha: Sotem Nekev Beshavah — Gezerah Mishum Memare'ach

Speaker 1:

Therefore, automatically, therefore what we've also forbidden similar to this, **ein sotem nekev beshavah**, we've already had several halachos at the beginning of this siman, how one covers a hole in a barrel. There is one way of taking wax and smearing it. One may not do it, even if one explains plainly to place a piece of wax, because wax is something that on it is relevant and it's pleasant on it to be memare'ach and smear around, so the name memare'ach we're afraid he'll smear, and the smearing is mochek, very good, because it's a concern that's common when there's a hole, many times, that one seals less properly, it's less memare'ach so necessarily it's a gezerah mishum shevus.

Good. Now there were earlier matters. I mean several things have to do with the hole. It's because it's a great matter not to stop up holes on Shabbos. Holes, holes, chalilim (flutes), chalilim. Okay. Yes.

Halacha: Kotev — Issurim Derabbanan

Speaker 1:

Says the Rambam further. Now there are about kotev (writing). Which is kotev? What becomes kotev with the Rabbis? Says the Rambam. Very many things are forbidden because of kotev, that is, actions, giving, and so kotev. Kotev is from avos melachos (primary categories of work). We've learned it ourselves.

Therefore, what is derabbanan (rabbinically forbidden) from this? **Asur lichachol befuch uveyosef uveshabbos**. One may not smear with kachol, kachol is makeup, something that one colors the eyes with, ancient. Ufuch, what is a fuch is a... is the vessel with which one does it. Because it's similar to writing with a pen, he takes a vessel and puts at the end a little something that's similar to ink, and they're not kotev, even though it's not kotev, but it doesn't write any letters, still he makes a color, it's like kotev, and it's forbidden by the Rabbis.

And here we see clearly that one is derabbanan and one is a name. Yes, exactly.

Halacha: Mekach Umemkar — Gezerah Shema Yichtov

Speaker 1:

What else is there that one may not do, one may not borrow and lend, gezerah shema yichtov, which is a decree lest he write.

Speaker 2:

Ah, yes good. He'll want to write it down.

Speaker 1:

I read that the first writing that existed was for commercial transactions, for borrowing and lending. When a person who runs a large business, they had to invent a way of writing down accounts. But borrowing and lending, or doing accounts is connected with writing. Now we use writing for much more, but... yes?

Speaker 2:

Basically everything is to buy, to sell... what? What do we write today that's not for money? I have friends who write... worlds of... everything is for money! Hello? Everything is for mekach umemkar.

Speaker 1:

No, I understand. Basically everything is to buy, to sell, everything? No, I'm saying today for example, that one may not think chiddushei Torah (Torah insights) because he'll write. Because it's very accepted, that if one has a good thought one wants to write it. But here it seems like writing was made for things that one needs to keep important accounts.

Speaker 2:

But I may not write. But I may not write, but one may learn Torah, but one may be mechadesh chiddushei Torah. Be mechadesh chiddushei Torah, ah, okay, one may not write chiddushei Torah, but bedieved (after the fact) it's good.

Speaker 1:

No, also there's the thing whether one may learn be'iyun (in depth) on Shabbos at all, which Reb Avraham'l spoke about.

Speaker 2:

No, I'm saying, writing chiddushei Torah is even not lechatchila (ideally), but bedieved. So Shabbos isn't the issur of "lo yisalku", he does it during the week.

Speaker 1:

But besides doing all sorts of mekach umemkar, selling, buying, hiring and being hired on Shabbos, "shema yichtov", he'll write it down, because it's important, he needs to write it down to keep track.

Halacha: Sechirus Po'alim

Speaker 1:

Further, **lo yiskor adam**, another type of thing that's similar to mekach umemkar, one may not hire workers on Shabbos. Actually earlier he said hiring a house or renting out a house, or whatever, a donkey. One also may not hire workers on Shabbos. And not only that, but one may not even make a messenger to hire workers for him. **Lo yomar adam lachabeiro liskor lo po'alim.**

But, there are things that we did permit. **Lish'ol ulehash'il**, borrowing and lending one may do, borrowing things. Yes, that doesn't have, it comes as an extra thing. Right, one may borrow eggs, flour, onions and things. **Lilvotos ulehalotos**, borrowing money, one may not. Things yes.

Discussion: Why May One Borrow Objects?

Speaker 2:

Why aren't we afraid about writing?

Speaker 1:

Why? He doesn't write. Objects, when one borrows one doesn't write. One is borrowing the object.

Speaker 2:

But if he needs to pay, he needs to write it down.

Speaker 1:

One borrows, and you'll bring him the object.

Speaker 2:

And if the other one is going to use it up for eating?

Speaker 1:

Ah, very good. Look, it's food. **Sho'el adam mechaveiro kadei yayin vekadei shemen.** One may borrow from a friend wine and oil. Ah, very good. Even though he's going to drink it and he's going to bring another one, so perhaps there's a place for him to write down a note that he needs to pay the other one wine. But one may, because it's not like a loan, it's more like a borrowing. So one shouldn't actually use the word loan. **Al yomar adam lachabeiro halvini**, rather he should say, what should he say? **Tash'ilini**, not "halvini".

In Yiddish there's no difference. Both are called borrowing money and borrowing objects. He argues in the name of I don't know which commentators, that when he says it in the language of borrowing he can return it to the lender. Now a loan is for thirty days, then one needs to write even if it's wine and oil. But when one says borrowing, it means motzaei Shabbos bring me back oil, and the like.

I see, he has another good explanation, that when he borrows kadei yayin vekadei shemen from him, the person can bring back money instead of bringing back the wine. He's already acquiring other wine, if one says in the language of halvini. This is a loan. Interesting.

Speaker 2:

No, I'm saying, one may even do that, that a borrower pays money, even though he has the account that he's going to pay him money. It's accounts that are customary between them, if perhaps one can.

Speaker 1:

No, because that is actually the issur of sale. But as long as one doesn't use the word, it's on borrowing and he's going to pay him with money, it's technically... he's going to pay him because he doesn't have any change with money. Meanwhile he's on credit.

Halacha: Echad Hamocher Befeh O Bimesirah

Speaker 1:

Further, **echad hamocher befeh o bimesirah asur** selling. They said one may not sell on Shabbos. It makes no difference whether he sells and he tells him from now it's yours, or he hands it over to him.

And here is another novelty, that even in Yiddish there's no difference between borrowing wine and borrowing oil. One says one shouldn't borrow at all, one should give. I don't know exactly what they... this is already further the French, the poskim want to present a reality that doesn't exist.

Speaker 2:

Okay. Yes.

Speaker 1:

But one does see that the poskim did translate word by word. For example the Tosafists, because you could say such a type of person that even when he borrows an onion he writes it in the ledger. But they didn't go to make such types of innovations. Usually when one borrows an onion one doesn't write it. We're talking about something that would perhaps have needed to be forbidden, but here stands a permission.

Further, **echad hamocher**, this is a gift to sell. It makes no difference whether he sells by making a kinyan (acquisition), or by handing over, or even just saying. He believes him in trustworthiness, I am transferring it to you, from now it's yours.

Halacha: Shekilah BeShabbos

Speaker 1:

Weighing on scales, whether when one weighs, one weighs it, bemezid or shelo bemezid (intentionally or unintentionally). No, good. He says, **keshem she'asur lishkol**, just as it's forbidden to weigh, that is, one may not measure on Shabbos. We did learn one may measure on Shabbos, no?

Speaker 2:

No, they didn't learn any one may measure.

Speaker 1:

But it's many, keshem she'asur lishkol, they didn't learn there any, no, somewhere, I don't remember from here. Keshem she'asur lishkol, that is, keshem, earlier one saw a Mishnah, it's not written somewhere a Mishnah, but he sees such a Mishnah, one may not weigh on Shabbos, one may not weigh on Shabbos.

Interesting, because he says, bein bemo'znayim bein shelo bemo'znayim, with scales there are two prohibitions, there's the sale, and there's that he does it also with scales. He means, mainly the shelo bemo'znayim one also may not. He tells you, and just as there's a prohibition of weighing things, weighing because it's a derech sechar (way of commerce) or because it's ma'aseh chol (weekday activity), so too derech mekach umemkar, because mekach umemkar is forbidden, the same thing. **Kach asur limnos velimadod**, other types of ways, it's the same action, counting money is like weighing things, or limadod, limnos is counting an amount, or limadod is measuring what is size. **Bein bichli midah**, whether when one does it with a vessel, with a measurer, **bein beyad**, **bein bechevel**, or with a rope, any way of measuring one may not do on Shabbos.

Discussion: Hilchos Techumin and Measuring

Speaker 2:

It's interesting, one sees all these laws of techumin (Shabbos boundaries) are tricky, it says that everything needs to be done with approximation, one may not actually measure. Good, but if a person is stuck on the laws, he finds himself in a place on Shabbos, he may only walk so much and so much, one doesn't measure on Shabbos, is there an advice for this.

Speaker 1:

Okay, further.

Speaker 2:

Okay, but it's also a type of counting and measuring, one needs to know exactly how far one goes counting and measuring.

Speaker 1:

But it's not there.

Speaker 2:

Okay.

Issur Danin, Chalitzah, Yibum, Kiddushin BeShabbos**Speaker 1:**

Another thing from mekach umemkar. A baal habayis (householder), a merchant, buys and sells. What does a rav do? What is his business? He does rabbinical business. Commerce of people who are designated for this, making judgments, and such things.

Okay. **Ein danin beShabbos**, one may not make a din Torah (Torah judgment) on Shabbos, **velo choltzin velo meyabmin**, one doesn't do chalitzah, yibum, **and one doesn't do kiddushin**. All these things are **gezerah shema yichtov**.

Discussion: Why Kiddushin – Shema Yichtov?**Speaker 2:**

Yes, these are new things that I didn't know. Usually one only writes, simply one became betrothed. Why kiddushin shema yichtov? I don't understand clearly.

Speaker 1:

Ah, umm, he writes, so-and-so asked. Who writes?

Speaker 2:

One sees that there was a kol (public announcement).

Speaker 1:

The beis din, the one who does it.

Speaker 2:

Oh, one sees in halacha that there's such a thing as a kol. A kol usually begins from a certain beis din that holds... no, the dayanim (judges) kept certain ledgers of gittin and kiddushin.

Speaker 1:

No, on gittin.

Speaker 2:

A baki beget gittin vekiddushin (expert in divorce and marriage documents). One sees that there was such a matter of writing down who became an eshes ish (married woman). But here, kiddushin doesn't need a beis din. It doesn't come into beis din. One does yibum and one does kiddushin, one doesn't need a beis din. It's something that three do. Perhaps it's about writing a kesubah (marriage contract)? Perhaps about the kesubah? There are things that come with the kiddushin that one writes. Do you understand it like that?

Speaker 1:

It could be that the point is that kiddushin is similar to a mekach umemkar. Yes, he buys her with a shaveh kesef (something of value), "harei at mekudeshes li betaba'as zo" (behold you are betrothed to me with this ring). So gezerah shema yichtov means to say, a decree from commerce. It doesn't mean that here there's a specific shema yichtov. It's a type of commerce, he's buying a wife.

Issur Hekdesh, Ha'aracha, Hachramah, Terumos Uma'sros BeShabbos**Speaker 1:****Continuation of Lecture**

Further, **and one may not consecrate**, one may not consecrate an animal for the Temple, or evaluate oneself and say "erki alai," the value of such-and-such thing to give to the Temple. **And one may not make a cherem**, making a cherem is a type of declaration for holy purposes. **And one may not engage in business transactions**, all these things are like buying and selling. **And one may not separate terumot and ma'asrot**, you already said this earlier as metaken. He clarifies it. **Because they are similar to one who consecrates those fruits**, what's the problem with that?

Speaker 2:

Yes, because they are similar to one who consecrates those fruits that he separated.

Speaker 1:

Because, ah, besides the previous prohibition of metaken, there's another prohibition, because it looks like a transaction. A transaction means that one is consecrating to Heaven, and this one is consecrating for the kohen, also a type of transaction. Both prohibitions, what's the practical difference? There are two reasons not to do this. Perhaps there's a practical difference? Okay.

Prohibition of Tithing Animals on Shabbat**Speaker 1:**

And one may not tithe animals, one may not make ma'aser behemah. Why? **A decree lest one mark with red paint**. There's a procedure that after the animal passes through... ma'avir tzono tachat shivto, one marks with red paint, one writes with a certain... one makes a sign, a red magic marker, one writes on the animal which became the animal that must be tithed. This also may not be done.

Permission to Consecrate One's Pesach Offering on Shabbat**Speaker 1:**

But he says what one may do: **And a person may consecrate his Pesach offering on Shabbat**. A person on erev Pesach that falls on Shabbat may consecrate his Pesach offering. Or not specifically erev Shabbat, simply a person may consecrate a Pesach offering on Shabbat. **And likewise his chagigah on Yom Tov**. We're talking here about erev Pesach that falls on Shabbat, **because it is the mitzvah of the day**, it's a mitzvah to do today, and the rule is it's only a rabbinic decree, and in such a case they didn't decree.

Discussion: Why is Consecrating the Pesach Offering Permitted?**Speaker 2:**

No, I think this is the reason why the Sages didn't decree, or perhaps because it's a mitzvat hayom it's not a business transaction. When a person, in reality he's doing his business now, he's deciding what should be ma'aser, what should be hekdesch. But he's preparing a sacrifice for now, it doesn't look like a business transaction. It could be that simply the Rabbis didn't decree, but I think perhaps there's such a principle "ein shevut bamikdash," I don't know.

Speaker 1:

Perhaps we don't need to get to that, because today everyone takes an animal and makes it a Pesach offering, he's not engaged in business transactions. When a person sets aside nine for me, the tenth is for Heaven, that's a type of business transaction. A person makes his ma'aser on Shabbat, he's doing business. He's doing here, he's going through with his accountant how much to pay, he's going through with his father how much to pay in ma'asrot. But he takes an animal that's his, he's not engaged in business transactions.

Speaker 2:

But consecrating an animal is also a certain financial decision. For Heaven you come to serious knowledge. Because the Pesach sacrifice is part of the mitzvot of the day. It doesn't look like fixing up business.

Speaker 1:

Okay. But seemingly the simple thing is because in such a case the Sages didn't decree.

Prohibition of Sanctifying Mei Chatat on Shabbat

Speaker 1:

No, **just as one may not consecrate**, just as one may not consecrate something for Heaven, **so one may not sanctify mei chatat**. One may not prepare mei chatat on Shabbat by pouring water into the ashes of the red heifer.

Speaker 2:

Yes, interesting.

Speaker 1:

Why? Because one takes something that's chullin and makes it for holy purposes.

Speaker 2:

Because it's called hekdeschah.

Speaker 1:

Yes, it's called hekdeschah. One is sanctifying the mei chatat. But one may not consecrate. So simple, simple. One can say other answers, but this I think is simple, simple.

Law of Separating Terumot and Ma'asrot on Shabbat After the Fact

Speaker 1:

Now, just as they learned earlier... now, because when can you say that it's part of... just like in judging on Shabbat... I don't know who makes the mei chatat, I don't know who. Okay.

One who separates terumot and ma'asrot on Shabbat or Yom Tov, what happens with this act? It's like this, **if done inadvertently**, if he did it inadvertently, it's like they learned other laws, **if inadvertent he may eat immediately**, he may eat the tithed things. **If deliberate he may not eat until after Shabbat**, just like all other rabbinic prohibitions done on Shabbat.

And almost like a correction of doubts, it became tithed. We don't say that like some act it doesn't work.

Speaker 2:

Yes.

Speaker 1:

And likewise one who consecrates or evaluates or makes a cherem on Shabbat, one who consecrates or evaluates or makes a cherem on Shabbat, whether inadvertently or deliberately his actions are valid. He accomplished it.

Needless to say on Yom Tov. Yom Tov is certainly so. Why? Yom Tov is generally easier in matters that have to do with food, with sacrifices.

And likewise one who transfers to his fellow on Shabbat, his acquisition is valid.

Permission to Tithe Demai on Shabbat

Speaker 1:

Further, **tithing demai**. What happens with demai? Demai is different from tevel, because it's not that before one removes the ma'aser it's not fixed, and now it's fixed. Because demai one can eat in pressing circumstances. As we see in many places in the Gemara. But demai is not really forbidden, because most likely it's been tithed.

One may tithe on Shabbat.

Speaker 2:

We're taking out to chullin.

Speaker 1:

Yes, but no, it's definite. But something that's definitely tevel, one may not.

Speaker 2:

And perhaps this is the answer to the question you asked earlier, why one who is only a doubt, if tevel is ma'aser, why may he not tithe on Shabbat. It's permitted, because one can eat it lechatchilah. Unless someone says that it's so far that there's no comparison either, but if someone is only concerned lechumra, then it's permitted.

Speaker 1:

Yes.

Law of Designating Terumat Ma'aser of Demai or Ma'aser Ani of Certain Produce

Speaker 1:

Ah good. **One who designated terumat ma'aser of demai or ma'aser ani of certain produce** – again, if someone designated terumat ma'aser of demai, this means that one already said, he said about one of the apples, this should be the terumat ma'aser from demai. That means from demai we say that he took terumat ma'aser, he took terumah from the ma'aser. Or another ma'aser, that someone had certain things that definitely weren't tithed, and he tithed, but he didn't remove the portion that goes to a kohen, or the ma'aser ani that goes to a poor person. **He may not take them on Shabbat**, one may not remove it from where it lies, separate it on Shabbat. **And even though he designated a place for them before Shabbat**, even if he designated a place, that means for example everything is lying on the table, and the apple lying in the corner, the rightmost apple is terumat ma'aser or ma'aser ani. **And they are known and**

placed beside the fruits, and one sees it, this piece is the terumat ma'aser, he still may not take it from there and place it elsewhere on Shabbat.

But one doesn't give it to the kohen on Shabbat. So the taking, even though you might think the taking is nothing, it was already ma'aser beforehand, I only moved it a bit, but still they decreed because this looks like the visual act of removing it.

And if there was a kohen or poor person accustomed to eating at his place, if the kohen or the poor person are accustomed to come eat meals at his place, or simply come to him to eat, **these may come to him and eat**, they should come to his home and eat this, because this also isn't the way of ma'aser. This is the way of having guests.

Provided that he informs the kohen that what he's feeding him is terumat ma'aser, and informs the poor person that what he's feeding him is ma'aser ani. But he should inform the kohen that what he's giving him is ma'aser or terumah. Why?

Halakha 4 (continued) — Informing the Kohen and Poor Person; Halakha 5 — Forbidden to Draw Lots; Halakha 6 — Accounts and Secular Documents on Shabbat

Halakha 4 (continued) — Obligation to Inform the Kohen and Poor Person

Speaker 1:

Because this also isn't the way of giving ma'aser, this is the way of having guests. **Provided that he informs the kohen that what I'm feeding you is terumat ma'aser, and informs the poor person that what I'm feeding you is ma'aser ani.** But he should inform the kohen that what he's giving him is ma'aser or terumah. Why?

This isn't a law of Shabbat, this is presumably a law or in... ah, he should inform him so there won't be a prohibition of... I remember that the Rambam explains that this is a prohibition of misusing terumah. He makes it for his own, exactly, he uses it for himself, and he lets the other be his guest. But you're doing it for yourself, you're also not making a guest that the other doesn't know. A mitzvah to give to the kohen or to the poor person, not to use for your own meal where you happen to invite the poor person.

We see that a person has a great tendency to show off to his guests. And today also in Middle Eastern culture it's very strong, other cultures. That when a guest comes, he must be a chef. Like we had last night, he breaks a barrel with a sword to show the breadth. Here also, he invites him to himself. No, here I say, he has pleasure that he shows the breadth. He gives him essentially something that's coming to the other. The pleasure is permitted, what's not permitted is that he shouldn't know at all, as if you're using... you're inviting guests, when I have guests they eat with guests from my own food, not I give them the food. That means not a gift, guests is not a gift. One must make the meal a gift, because if I invite guests to my meal, they eat from my meal, it's my meal, not their meal. They shouldn't show off my meal. So also there's such a deception such a... No, this isn't that, this is exactly like he's using ma'aser for his pleasure. Not for his pleasure, for his meal. It happens that there's a guest there, he also eats from it, but yes, it's difficult. Every time I was a guest, the guest eats from it, but it's my food. The kohen or the poor person should already understand at night that this is a trick he's doing.

Speaker 2:

Okay.

Speaker 1:

Just like he's accustomed to eat bread in the evening.

Speaker 2:

No, accustomed to eat bread in the evening is simply so. He's doing another mitzvah, hospitality. There's a mitzvah of hospitality.

Speaker 1:

It makes sense, the kohen and the poor person are those who don't have the money.

Speaker 2:

Yes, the kohanim, Levites, didn't receive the inheritances, and the poor. So sometimes they simply take from a person a favor, a meal, and sometimes they take the ma'asrot. But they need to say. Here everything is from the law of ma'asrot he must tell him, not from the law of Shabbat, from the law of ma'asrot.

Speaker 1:

Okay. Another thing that one may not do.

Speaker 2:

There's still a novelty here, that one might think that from the law of Shabbat it's better he shouldn't say, because there's perhaps a prohibition of ma'asrot, a person would say, "Keep quiet, because it will look like he's giving ma'asrot on Shabbat." No, as another law you must say.

Speaker 1:

Yes.

Halakha 5 — Forbidden to Draw Lots

Speaker 1:

Further, **it's forbidden to draw lots.** Not means not distributing portions, it's another thing. Drawing lots means a lottery, a lot. One may not make a lottery, or play with dice. One may not gamble on Shabbat. Also not during the week, but here we're talking about Shabbat.

Playing with dice, selling, it's a type of... I won't rely on this. Everyone should ask their local halachic authority. Because he speaks longer, he can rely. I'll explain the learning. The learning is such a way that they say that playing with dice is permitted, but during the week. Shabbat is not permitted, because it's buying and selling.

During the week one doesn't do it because it's not buying and selling, because it's asmachta, theft. It's not buying, it's only selling. You don't receive, you only give. Also it's not selling. We're not talking about all these things. Selling, ah, playing with dice is selling, or does it say here? Anyway, on Shabbat one may not, because it's buying and selling.

Here he's talking even making a lottery for a permitted matter. Ah, here he'll now say what one may and what one may not. This is when he plays with other people. But at home on Shabbat one does such, "Who gets the bigger piece of challah?" One makes such a game of who should get a bigger portion or a smaller portion. This isn't called buying and selling. This is a way how one plays at home. Distributing portions, building, **a large portion versus a small portion.** I know, he holds his hands behind his back, who will get with the right hand? And there is the bigger plate, the smaller snack. Large portion versus small portion. He's not particular, because these are

people who live in one house, and it's not buying and selling. When it's buying and selling, the person who became lucky, he receives more assets. Here you're like his son and members of his household, it's one domain. You can eat a bit more anyway. It's only part of a game.

Speaker 2:

Okay.

Speaker 1:

Right?

Speaker 2:

Yes, I know, it's really a game, but you wouldn't be particular. It's not really, he's selling him his piece against his, that he makes an acquisition. The father decides who will get the bigger piece of meat.

Speaker 1:

Okay. Very good.

Halakha 6 — Accounts on Shabbat

Speaker 1:

More things. **It's forbidden to calculate accounts that are needed for tomorrow on Shabbat.** One may not make any accounts on Shabbat. Accounts that are needed for tomorrow on Shabbat. Right. It means, calculating things. Whether you come to forbid, to forbid calculating old things, or to forbid making accounts for the future.

On the contrary, **a decree lest one write**, because he'll write. Accounts one writes. On the contrary, **accounts that have no need, it's permitted to calculate.** Accounts that have no need at all, one may. Simply for interest, to pass time. A person may calculate **how many se'ah of grain he sent to so-and-so**, how many se'ah of grain one even gave out last year. Or **how many dinarim...** a certain year, not from now. Not from now, from that year, but... because now is relevant for now, for taxes, for accounts. But as simply information. Or **how many dinarim he spent on his son's wedding**, this is interesting, this is from all the conversations, and this is still the conversation that's spoken even today at kiddush. How much did, I know, the great young man spend at the wedding.

Speaker 2:

The lawyer himself, yes.

Speaker 1:

Yes, yes. And so forth. And idle talk that has no need at all, there's no idle talk in this. Accounts that have no need at all, there's no idle talk in this.

And likewise accounts of a mitzvah, and likewise accounts of a mitzvah in general. The Rama doesn't want to tell you that one may. Such goodness, he doesn't want to say that one may. He has mercy on you that you conduct yourself so weekday-like, it's a weekday thing. But it's not a prohibition. During the week one doesn't need to speak idly, but from the perspective of Shabbat it's not worse on Shabbat, it's not worse than simply Shabbat. Right?

Speaker 2:

Okay.

Speaker 1:

This is actually what the Rama means with this interesting language.

Speaker 2:

Yes, I think so. Yes, clear, clear. It could even be that on Shabbat specifically there's an extra prohibition of being occupied. Ah, so that the blessing of Shabbat shouldn't be lost like the blessing of the weekday. Perhaps later he'll take someone to the next level, who knows? But it's not clear.

Speaker 1:

We find that when one is engaged in the needs of his son, one may. Someone needs to talk with his son, or I don't know what, he needs to talk with a young woman, he must talk with that person, he may. One must use common sense. But it's like during the week, he doesn't want to say one should do it.

Secular Documents on Shabbat

Speaker 1:

What is **reading secular documents on Shabbat?** One may not read secular documents on Shabbat. What does the term secular documents mean? Not clear. Not documents of... He says that the Rambam interprets this term secular documents, documents of buying and selling. We're still talking here about buying and selling. But it can also be simply news, it can also be included. In the commentary on the Mishnah the Rambam says that it means everything except the books of the Prophets or their commentaries.

Alright. Hedyotot, simply, books that weren't written by Jews who had divine inspiration.

"So that it won't be like the weekday and he'll come to erase." Ah, because he reads secular documents, he reads the things of buying and selling, he'll want to erase. But it's interesting the language "so that it won't be like the weekday," just like a minute earlier he said "weekday thoughts." Here however is something more than the usual "lest he write."

It could be that this goes together, because he'll read the secular documents which makes him enter a weekday mindset. You have such "so that it won't be like the weekday," it shouldn't look like it's the weekday, "and he'll come to erase." Why doesn't he simply say "lest he erase" like "lest he write"?

There is, and before in secular documents he'll indeed write. There isn't.

Speaker 2:

Yes, but why does he say the language "lest he erase"? Earlier he said "lest he write," why does he say "lest he erase" here? He says the language "so that it won't be like the weekday and he'll come to erase." Why doesn't he simply say "lest he erase," like earlier he said?

Speaker 1:

Laws of Shabbat: Secular Documents, Canceling the Beit Midrash, and Laws of Rescue from Fire

No, I think that this is the problem, that the secularness itself is also part of the problem. If he reads nonsense on Shabbat, he starts erasing. If it were holy things, he could also erase, he could also erase a sefer (book), but he doesn't erase, because he sees holy Torah, and the Torah is fitting for Shabbat. You read the news and you start erasing, it starts to bother you, so I'm holding now because it's interesting because he just believed like weekday thoughts, here he says again, "shelo yihiyeh kechol" (that it should not be like weekday), something he has a problem here with weekday topics. It seems that the Rav means to say two things, either because it's not Shabbat-like, and also "veyihyu lachem kodesh" (and they shall be holy to you), and if "shelo yihiyeh kechol" alone, he would have

written it later, when he speaks about the holy Shabbat things. Either because it is weekday and "veyihyu lachem kodesh," because he doesn't want to make it difficult, why does one need to erase, one may erase, one can also "veyihyu lachem kodesh," this is a weekday thing that leads one to erase, because if someone reads a Chumash, he won't erase a piece of Chumash, "I already knew it, I already know this piece," that one must erase a mark. If I read the news, sometimes there was a story, he has a paper, okay I don't know this piece anymore, one marks it, one goes to the next piece... which is no longer relevant, one marked it so one can't write on the spot new things. Therefore there is "kotvin umochkin" (they write and erase), one doesn't light on it. So the house speaks, it's made for someone to erase. I say therefore that it's something that one reads once, one erases it, one goes further. So I would... it could perhaps be that he means that the "shelo yihyeh kechol" is such an extra reason, not so. Not so. With that.

Speaker 2:

Okay.

Speaker 1:

Okay, it's certain that he's not speaking about the general way, the fact of the general way. It wouldn't be a great practical difference, I say. According to this, if "veyihyu lachem kodesh" is the thing, then what is there, there's no "mechikah" (erasing) the newspaper that he reads, the question doesn't begin, there can be other questions of "bittul Torah" (neglect of Torah study), or that it's not Shabbat-like, not a question of "kotvin." The Rambam's commentary on the Mishnah says the text speaks well that it means newspaper, that it means may I erase? There are two interpretations in the Rambam's commentary.

Speaker 2:

Aha.

Speaker 1:

The Perush HaMishnah seems yes. It doesn't say. In the Perush HaMishnah it says all that is among the writings for a prophet, it's mainly all "kerovim beshabat" (close on Shabbat), and even if there are wisdoms like these. It comes out... I think, one didn't read a "rusto" on Shabbat, or one held that they are writings for a prophet. "Karov lenavi" (close to a prophet). Right, it could be that this is yes, an interpretation has to do with this. It could be that it has to do with how strongly a person values something. If a person very strongly values a certain subject, he will never erase. But the "Yisrael Achronim" (later authorities) one must know, we're not speaking here about a Chumash. No one is so... no one values Sefer HaRitva so much that he doesn't erase. It's not a matter of need, no one was... erased? But it was that they made a mistake. But in the Chumash it doesn't matter even if one holds it's a mistake.

It means, one can indeed think here that a person who has a practice that he writes notes on all books, aren't there people whose all books are written on?

Laws of Shabbat: Secular Documents, Canceling the Beit Midrash, and Laws of Rescue from Fire

Law: It is forbidden to read writing that goes under images and under portraits on Shabbat

But now there is a certain... we're not speaking here about holy or... no one values books of Aristotle so much that he doesn't

erase. It's not a prohibition of throwing away, no one said that he woke up. Erased? Rather... it's based on. That they made a mistake and... good. But... in the Chumash one doesn't make it out, even if one holds it's a mistake.

But it means, we can indeed think here, that a person who has a practice that he writes notes on all books... there are people whose all books are written on! Perhaps he didn't read there except the books that he has enough respect for and he will never erase there! I never heard that by mistake he wrote a truth, because the Jew usually lies in learning, and he lies on Shabbat... truth, truth, truth... Shabbat-like things, and he goes with his package in one! It's different! In general, I hold... and on Shabbat they throw out the book! I go with the righteous who... or do they write on a book "shtutim vehavalim asur lomar" (nonsense and vanities are forbidden to say), like that, or do they give it a throw out from the house? On Shabbat one writes house, and one it is out...

That today when one goes with a package on Shabbat, and because when one goes with the package, that one can be lenient with various such things that he goes with not mentioned. Okay, I think it out. No, no laws. Anyway, let's go because... just my opinion that with a package one may do more things? Let me ask the local "morei hora'ah" (halachic authorities), if that is I. Okay, but further. But what does the Rav say. No, he doesn't say leave. Okay, but ask. Queen how "murikah." Yes. It says so they are covered? What one only knows very far things that one can, that the person counts his archives for "perusim beiven," what a person has a "kena nahar," a table with now, he needs to count tables. He may count everything. Table number, table number. A volume a writing, and one shouldn't do it, as you know, by a catering one writes on which table who sits where, one may not give, one may not reduce.

Interesting, people who run a large operation on Shabbat, very often one must remember these laws, someone who does catering or something on Shabbat, they are very often stumbled. Right, today so. Yes. Right, but if "ashivat chachamim" (the Sages' opinion) needs to find a solution. There is a solution. Look, but if "ashivat chachamim," and "ela tavlu," "ela kotel," from a note, one must read it "bekol ram" (aloud). But perhaps someone who has it in a manner that is not the example to be loud, a screen, is another question. But yes, I don't know.

Another law, "asur likro" (it is forbidden to read), another thing that one may not read on Shabbat. **"Asur likro bichtav haholech tachat hatzurah vetachat hadiyuknot beshabat"** (It is forbidden to read writing that goes under an image or under a portrait on Shabbat). Words that one writes under an image or under a portrait, it means under a statue, if someone goes once to a museum, there lies a small plaque or a small piece, and it says the description of the painting, of the thing. It seems that this was also the practice in the times of the Gemara. And this is also called "shtarei hedyotot" (secular documents).

First the novelty is, you shouldn't think, you know, just something short, it only says there a few words, it's not called "shtarei hedyotot." It's also called "shtarei hedyotot." A person could have thought that the words under a picture are like an explanation of the picture, it's like looking at a picture. No, it's like looking at a writing. That's the point, yes?

I don't know, I'm not clear. If someone has a custom that on Shabbat he doesn't read newspapers, but pictures of righteous people, how righteous people light candles and check for chametz, also a great thing. Yes, but you may not read which righteous person it is. You remain in the dark. No, pictures means here pictures of non-Jews. Ah, I don't know. Any pictures. Okay. Also about "shtarei hedyotot."

Law: It is forbidden to read Ketuvim on Shabbat during the time of Beit Midrash

Not only that, but **"afilu likro bichtuvim beshabat bish'at beit hamidrash asur"** (even to read Ketuvim on Shabbat during the time of Beit Midrash is forbidden). He says a new thing. Once we're already speaking about... it's not like with rabbinic prohibitions of labor. But once certain Ketuvim have been forbidden, that certain things one may or may not read on Shabbat, he says so, one may not read Ketuvim, meaning Ketuvim in the Torah, yes, Prophets and Writings, Tanach, on Shabbat, during the time of Beit Midrash. During the time when the community learns Torah, learns Oral Torah.

Beit Midrash means when there is a lecture. Beit Midrash, not Beit Knesset (synagogue). Beit Midrash is the place where one learns. We already learned last week, Beit Midrash is not a father's place where one learns. Beit Midrash means when one makes a lecture. But in Yiddish, the language of the Sages, "midrash" means a lecture. So during the time that the Rav gives a lecture, what is called "bish'at beit hamidrash," then one must go to shul to hear the lecture.

You shouldn't say, "Now I'm in the middle of reading Chronicles, and one doesn't know what. Very not relevant here. Yes. No, in Beit Midrash. They don't say in the middle of Beit Midrash. Beit Midrash doesn't mean a place, Beit Midrash means a lecture. I speak at the lecture, that one waits for him to come to the lecture. Not that he should sit at home and read.

No, **"shelo yomar"** (lest he say) ah, this nullifies the matter of learning holy writings. **"Shelo yomar 'elech veekra,' 'ani eshneh beveit hamidrash'"** (Lest he say "I will go and read," "I will study in the Beit Midrash"). It's even things that are holy, for example, at Mincha or at Shacharit, when it's the time that it says on the note that the Rav will give a lecture at six o'clock, one may not learn then. Why? Because a great one didn't come. Therefore, everyone will sit at home and miss the lecture.

The point is this: We want that on Shabbat a Jew should conduct himself in a Shabbat-like manner, he should learn Torah and so on. All secular writings we've already forbidden with "shtarei hedyotot." But there's still a way that a person can get out of coming to the lecture and learning, because "ah, he's now learning Job." No, no, no. Come to the Beit Midrash, not everyone should sit at home and read. Come to the Beit Midrash and hear the Rav's lecture.

And "ah, you know better, you can learn by yourself"? Yes, but the second problem, everyone sits at home, they miss the lecture. This is indeed "bittul beit hamidrash" (canceling the house of study). You're not only not being in the Beit Midrash, because you're learning, but you're going, because you don't come, the lecture will be canceled, because everyone has other excuses.

Very important to know, when there is a lecture on Shabbat afternoon, the Sages made a rabbinic prohibition to learn Ketuvim on Shabbat afternoon, because then is the time when

there is a lecture. The same thing when there is a lecture, he said, one may not even learn at home. It's a rabbinic prohibition to learn, because it's part of the lecture.

Because not because you, certainly you learn something better than the lecture, no problem. But when you cancel the lecture, it's "bittul beit hamidrash." It's not "bittul Torah," it's "bittul beit hamidrash." You destroy the Beit Midrash. It's a completely different thing. Okay, already. Until here the lecture on why one must come to my lecture.

Law: If a fire broke out in a courtyard on Shabbat — Laws of Rescue

Let's learn further laws of fire. Another whole topic. Already. The next is what is the law of fire, extinguishing. We spoke about extinguishing and lighting, two labors. We're now going to learn what one may not do as extinguishing rabbinically.

The Rambam says so: **"Naflah delikah bechatzer beshabat"** (If a fire broke out in a courtyard on Shabbat) - a fire happened in the courtyard on Shabbat. From where does it fall? From heaven. No, "naflah delikah" usually means, that once there was, there are places where there is fire, one must have it, and in an oven lies fire. It falls down from the place where it lies, and it starts burning on the floor, or on the table that lies on the floor. Okay, I think such things with "naflah delikah." It means that a piece of wood fell from the oven, and it started burning.

"Naflah delikah bechatzer beshabat," so, extinguishing one certainly may not. So what does the person now start to do? He starts, he wants to rescue as many things as possible from the courtyard, things that are valuable, they shouldn't be burned.

He says, **"Echad matzil kol mah sheyesh bechatzer lechatzer acheret shebo eruv"** (One rescues all that is in the courtyard to another courtyard where he made an eruv). This means, apparently, if a person made a... even if one made an eruv. This means so, if one made an eruv, one may carry from one courtyard to the other in the same alley. So apparently the person could have rescued all his things, because one may carry.

But one says no. Why? **"Gezerah,"** (a decree) that if he goes to rescue everything from the courtyard, he enters into a strong mindset that he's now rescuing, that he's a rescuer, he's one who rescues from fire. He will rescue more, he will say, "What's another piece? Let me extinguish." He will forget that there's a prohibition.

"Gezerah shema yechaveh. Gezerah shema yechaveh hadelikah kedai sheyatzil," to rescue, **"mipnei she'adam bahul al mamono"** (because a person is anxious about his property). A person is anxious about his property, a person has a great bias for his money, or he loses himself when it comes to money, his money, his property. Because even if he starts with a... he says, "No, I'm an honest Jew, I will never extinguish, I will only rescue all things." But once you're in a mindset of you're now rescuing your property, "adam bahul al mamono," and he will extinguish fire.

"Lefikach," (therefore) so what did they say, one may not everything, what yes? **They made it so, "lefikach gazru shelo yatzil ela mazon shetzarich lo leotah shabbat, vechelim shetzarich lehishtamesh bahem beshabbat, uvegadim sheyachol lilbosh"** (Therefore they decreed that one should only rescue food that he needs for that Shabbat,

and vessels that he needs to use on Shabbat, and clothes that he can wear). Only the food that he needs for that Shabbat, and vessels that he needs for that Shabbat, and clothes that he can wear.

Interesting, clothes they were a bit... that one can wear. This means, he can wear now, during the act. Not what he can wear during Shabbat, like vessels needed for Shabbat. We'll already see. Okay, because later he will explain more.

What he takes, because when he does this he removes his mind from the anxieties, he removes his mind from all other things, he only thinks about now Shabbat. Someone who has a grave, he won't come to extinguish. I think it's very good, because when a person thinks about what he needs to rescue because he needs it on Tuesday, he's completely removed his mind from Shabbat, because he thinks the whole time about Shabbat. Even when he rescues, he thinks about Shabbat.

The Rambam doesn't say specifically that, the Rambam says that he removes his mind, he thinks now simply that the Sages don't want to forbid that the person should remain even without Shabbat, but that he will remain a poor and destitute person, he won't have even one vessel more for his house, that doesn't bother the Sages who forbade.

Question: How could the Sages make such a stringency?

I wish I understood how the Sages thought, or it must be that they lived in some other sort of world, where his property is less, he has two more vessels. Not like today that a person has a house that's worth half a million dollars, and it can't be that on this they made the decree. Therefore there still remains the rabbinic prohibition of extinguishing, which then one must know.

We already spoke that in general today one is more lenient with extinguishing, because somewhere it's a danger, and also because we live among non-Jews, and we don't want again the stories in the "Semichot Chachamim" (ordination of Sages) that he burned a whole city in Frankfurt because... yes, because his intention or something. No, yes, true, one doesn't conduct the laws today, one does conduct to extinguish even rabbinically, one does rabbinic labor, one extinguishes.

But I say that we're not learning now practical law. Practical law stands in Mishnah Berurah that one should be careful with this law, when there's a fire one extinguishes, one doesn't make any cleverness. This everyone wants to know so practically. But now we're learning theoretically, I want to understand the Rabbis. What is wrong?

Yesterday we learned, we learned that the Sages permitted to say to a non-Jew, to a non-Jew one may "al tomar lo kabeh ve'al tomar lo al techaveh" (don't tell him extinguish and don't tell him don't extinguish), one may say to the non-Jew even "mishum chibah eino mafsid" (because of affection he doesn't lose), they learned in the laws of "amirah lenochri" (telling a non-Jew). Why? Because "adam bahul al mamono" they permitted. Well, why "adam bahul al mamono" did they make such a crazy wild stringency that he should despair of all his property?

Therefore it seems to me that it can't be that it speaks of such a modern house where a house is worth half a million dollars, and the property that a normal person has in his house is worth I don't know how much money, and he will become homeless and I don't know, he needs to speak with insurance,

I don't know. Once it was a normal thing, there's a fire, there's a fire, it wasn't spoken of this.

Laws of Shabbat – Saving from Fire: Food, Clothing, and Sacred Writings

Discussion in Logic: The Reality of the Halacha

It could be that because of this he says the word "**in a courtyard**", he's not talking about a house. A house is burning, yes, a house, the entire walls, everything is burning. But in a courtyard, it could be that there's a fire in a courtyard, that's what courtyards are about. But the first way to explain the matter of pikuach nefesh (life-threatening danger), even if one was afraid they would kill him etc. No, I think it must be that it was something normal. It was normal... One can say, it must be that the halacha is such, that one can tell a person, let it burn out.

In short, in other words, he is losing food, understand, that, in the home he has food for another whole week. Not that he has food, his entire fortune and his entire life lies there. On this does it say he is losing his entire fortune?

Laws of Shabbat – Saving from Fire: Food, Clothing, and Sacred Writings

Discussion in Logic: The Reality of the Halacha

Speaker 1: Yes, a house, the entire walls, everything is burning. He says "courtyard." You can say our courtyards, the reason why it says courtyards is because... But I want to say the matter of even if he is... Sometimes people didn't guard at all from the matter of matzah and the like. No, I think it must be that it was something normal, it was normal... It must be that the halacha... that one can tell a person, let it burn out.

In short, in other words, he saves food for three meals. That means, in the home he has food for another whole week. Not that he has food, his entire fortune, his entire life lies there. On what does it say such a thing, understand?

Speaker 2: Yes, yes, yes.

Speaker 1: It's not worth believing. One sees that there's a great obligation. And also there is a law that for a mitzvah a person must give up to a third of his property. Will you say that because of a rabbinic enactment he will lose everything he has? Not because of a rabbinic enactment, the Sages themselves, they were people. The Sages never... One learns all the laws of Shabbat, the Sages never leave a person stuck with something. A small distress and he's already permitted. Here, the Sages told him to lose his entire fortune?

A sick person who is not in danger may transgress all rabbinic prohibitions. And not only that, if someone's house is burning today, it's much worse than a sick person who is not in danger. It can't be, it must be that it's talking about a manner... We don't live in the world where the halacha was said.

So, this is how it seems to me logically. But they were already permitted anyway. Also today there's something that... I don't know if one sees it strongly clarified. Today it's accepted that smoke is very very dangerous. So a block away there's a person who has asthma now dying. Today there's a real reason that a fire is always a real danger.

Speaker 2: Okay, okay, in any case.

Speaker 1: So let's learn the historical halacha, what it was at the time when they conducted themselves very strictly.

Speaker 2: No, it's not a historical halacha, it's the halacha as it stands in Shulchan Aruch. We need to know, we should make order with today's reality.

The Approach of Maharam Schiff

Speaker 1: So because the Rambam says it's... So the Maharam Schiff says this, he finds me an approach where the novelty of the Mishnah Berurah or the Rema is not relevant, he's only permitting.

Speaker 2: Aha, I know what, because anyway he will indeed burn his house.

Speaker 1: Just know, it won't be from this either, he feels he's desecrating a pikuach nefesh of that one... But here it's also very difficult what he says "and if they didn't make an eruv." Even if he didn't make an eruv, even if he didn't make an eruv, we're still only talking about a rabbinic prohibition, yes?

Speaker 2: So there's no difference.

Speaker 1: It's not a reshut harabim (public domain), but he can call out, yes. Here he is the Master of the Universe, he can call out here himself?

Speaker 2: He can call out here himself, yes.

Speaker 1: It's not simple that he has no way.

Speaker 2: Okay.

Halacha 21: Food for Three Meals

Speaker 1: So, what does he save of food? The Gemara asks, the meals there that one needs for that Shabbat, what is the definition? The Gemara says this: **If a fire broke out on Friday night, he saves food for three meals**, he still needs to have for all three meals. **What is fit for a person for a person, what is fit for an animal for an animal.**

Speaker 2: For an animal also needs to have three Shabbat meals? Everything!

Speaker 1: And what is nice, crown and man and Joseph, and even for the end of Shabbat.

Speaker 2: Ah, he means to say for the people three meals, and for the animals what is fit for the animals, yes, okay.

Speaker 1: What is nice, because perhaps one needs to say here only one eats three meals a day, but on Shabbat one eats... No, we learned that normally one eats two meals, on Shabbat one eats three meals.

Speaker 2: Understood, okay.

Speaker 1: And even for the end of Shabbat, in the morning, **at Mincha time he saves food for two meals, and at Mincha he saves food for one meal.**

Speaker 2: Oh shoot.

Halacha 22: One Vessel – The Definition of Carrying Once

Speaker 1: **In what case are these words said? When saving in one vessel that is large**, so then he needs to bring out three meals, or he has a vessel that is truly large, but in the same vessel he needs to make two trips...

But if he takes out one vessel at once, as long as he takes it only once in one vessel, once even if it's for several meals, it's permitted.

Speaker 2: That's what we had earlier by the laws of the chovel (one who injures), it's permitted if he thinks he's taking out...

Speaker 1: He moves down, he says once, one action with one vessel.

Halacha 23: Examples of One Vessel

Speaker 1: For example **a basket full of loaves**, he has a whole basket full of, a lot, a basket, I don't know what a vessel, full of breads, even for several meals. **Or a circle of pressed figs**, a whole wheel of pressed figs (which has enough for several weeks), **a barrel of wine** (even for several lives).

Another thing: **It was taught, and he spreads out his tallit, and gathers whatever he can take out**, he spread out his tallit, he put in there what he can, **and takes them out full**, yes.

Speaker 2: But he may only once?

Speaker 1: Once he fills his meal, also it's permitted.

Halacha 24: Standing for Others – Come and Save for Yourselves

Speaker 1: Ah, now one can learn, also like endless things that we learned earlier by the obligations, indeed. Instead of only one person he can bring back three meals, he calls out to the whole world, he says **standing for others, come and save for yourselves**, come save for yourselves, and each one saves, as much as he needs.

Discussion: The Homeowner Must Give Permission

Speaker 2: Oh, one vessel... standing for others, it doesn't say standing for others, he told a servant for others...

Speaker 1: Okay, it's how much...

Speaker 2: But such the tutors, let's see how we settle with them after Shabbat. First it talks for everyone, each one takes also three meals or according to what will start it is, or one vessel that picks even a large thing, a loaf of bread, now his, it would have been ownerless, now one ownerless. If the owner is a good person, he says yes, it's truly mine, it's ownerless, but I don't want it, I want to give it back to you, with the understanding, after Shabbat, payment sometimes. After Shabbat he asks him, but work for his benefit, I dragged it on Shabbat to those things.

Discussion: Payment for Shabbat – An Important Discussion

Speaker 1: For one thing it's payment for Shabbat, you don't have payment for Shabbat why. Payment for one thing of work and on the other, no place for mixing, one is turning here an approach which is generally permitted to drag. It's only there is a rabbinic prohibition for the homeowner, to take more than what he needs, but the second person has no prohibition at all, perhaps they may take payment for Shabbat, it's interesting, but payment for Shabbat has to do with doing a melacha (prohibited work). Payment for Shabbat is an extra thing.

Speaker 2: Understand, payment for Shabbat is on doing something. But you did nothing. What did you do? And what you did? Each time when one carries on Shabbat, he does something that is permitted on Shabbat, and that's it. I understand so. And also this there is a problem of payment for Shabbat. Understand my question? What they learned about payment for Shabbat is a baby set?

Speaker 1: Yes.

Speaker 2: One does also nothing, one may not. If it's outside, if it's with some work etc. Not really. Understand my question?

Speaker 1: I understand what you're asking, yes. Payment for Shabbat is something an important question. It can, because it's not... Payment for Shabbat is something that is similar to maaser money, to something similar to receiving payment. This is something that happened once. Something I don't understand. Because it's thought that perhaps because... Before the Gemara says that this doesn't go on this at all. This is one thing of work goes on this.

Speaker 2: Why may each one? Why does one give to the other?

Speaker 1: Because it's not a prohibition at all, anyway. But it seems it's interesting.

The Rambam says that the permission that people may save food, is only if he said. But people don't go and save from someone else's fire on Shabbat.

Speaker 2: Why not?

Speaker 1: Because he begins with you have permission to save. I think why because he thinks that the permission with you is because he has that the other one will give it back to him. No, but it looks here like only then is there permission to save food for three meals only. He doesn't say that when there's a fire in a fire each one may come in. If each one may only, one can't obligate a second to give more, because he's not the owner of the property, he's not the homeowner.

Speaker 2: Ah, that's the point. But according to you it should say "standing for others."

Speaker 1: Ah, that's what it means. Okay. Perhaps one needs to read it with a cholam? There's no vowels here, it says courtyard.

Speaker 2: What do you mean?

Speaker 1: Yes, simply standing. Ah, I'm saying that it seems certain that the homeowner calls because he hopes they'll give it back. That's why the next halacha stands. Because they won't give it back. Or simply, they're hungry, they want more bread.

Halacha 25: Clean Bread vs. Unclean Bread

Speaker 1: Okay, another halacha. **If he started with clean bread, he doesn't go back and take unclean bread**, he can't leave good bread for Shabbat. But the opposite, yes, **if he started to take unclean bread**, which he took not good, that means mixed yes, that means with the bran and the like, **he goes back and takes**, he can say, "I want for Shabbat, I want for Shabbat a better quality", and he may do it. If he's smart, he does the opposite, because...

And what they are careful about what they eat on Yom Kippur eve of Shabbat, that they save on Yom Kippur what is needed for Shabbat, and are careful on Shabbat eve. Why? Because he could have already prepared. He could have prepared on Yom Kippur eve, and he could have already prepared on Yom Kippur eve, and he could have already eaten on Shabbat. But one who makes Shabbat, he is careful, why? Because he doesn't eat on Yom Kippur, he didn't have to prepare. And there's no need to be careful for Shabbat and Yom Tov, why? Because on Yom Tov he could have already prepared. So all these claims are on the food that he needs to worry about now, not on all the property. No.

Speaker 2: Here you see clearly but that for Shabbat even he goes down to eat the person, not that he will have to make a distribution and go to the...

Speaker 1: Yes, we're talking here about the person whose loss is the circle of pressed figs. The novelty is that he may keep the whole circle. We're not talking here about a case of millions.

Speaker 2: Okay.

Halacha 26: Saving Clothing – He Wears Whatever He Can Wear

Speaker 1: What about saving his clothing? What is with clothing? It was said earlier that he may save his food what is needed for Shabbat, and clothing what he can wear. What does he say? **He may wear whatever he can wear, and carry and wrap whatever he can, until he reaches a settlement.** He puts on as much as he can.

Here there's a greater stringency, that with clothing he wasn't permitted at all to carry out with his hands, only worn, in the manner of clothing, so that he may carry in a reshut harabim (public domain).

Speaker 2: Okay, because the prohibition is, the whole prohibition is... But the other things he may take in his hands. He doesn't need to bite into the bread, I don't know what.

Speaker 1: True, true, true. It's interesting. He doesn't take this as a stringency. And also he does for the other things, and for life until he goes out, and each one. Why does one go away from this? Because he can say how much clothing he needs for Shabbat, but here there's a greater leniency. He sees that in ancient times people didn't change clothing at all on Shabbat. Who changes clothing on Shabbat?

Speaker 2: Yes, still, that's for heavy Shabbat afternoon, or whatever, people change. Especially it's now on Shabbat, how you change let's say people.

Speaker 1: But here there's a leniency, there's also a stringency that he needs to put it on and go out like that, not he can't carry in his hands. But he may yes, as much as fits on him, that means like everything that he goes now to go on Shabbat.

Discussion: Question on the Rambam – It Doesn't Say He Can Take Off and Put Back On

Speaker 2: It doesn't say in the Rambam also that he can take it off and put it back on again? It's if not according to the Mishnah, the Rambam doesn't say what the halacha is. For example, by food it doesn't say whatever he can eat, a person is a great thing, everything as much as he can push in on Shabbat. One doesn't say so. What he can eat, he can eat. One talks, one takes three meals, one doesn't see how much a normal person can push in on Shabbat. The same thing is here, how much he can put on. In ancient times there were such gluttons.

Speaker 1: Yes, and how much one needs, one doesn't know something that it's a problem.

Speaker 2: Ask probably Ben Drusai, if once there weren't gluttons. Ben Drusai made rare his steak things.

Speaker 1: Okay, whatever, and go learn more.

Speaker 2: And also for the clothing one can say come and save for yourselves, and each one, each and every one flees according to his ability, and takes out and his permission in his hand. And the same thing, it's to accept ownerless things, and can have the same law as the food, that if they want they can give it back and take money for it.

Halacha 26 (Continued): Saving Sacred Writings

Speaker 1: Another thing that one may save, very important. Besides that one may save his food and his clothing, one may also save sacred writings. All sacred writings that are in the courtyard, one may take to another courtyard even if they didn't make an eruv. Here sacred writings is even worse, the food and the clothing one needs to do with an eruv. But the sacred writings one may even without an eruv, but on condition that they not be brought three partitions to one direction. As long as there's no eruv, there's no eruv chatzerot (courtyard eruv), but partitions it has yes, it has three partitions to one direction, it's only missing the eruv chatzerot, the shitufei mevoot (alley partnerships), that one may. But which sacred writings? That is already a karmelit (semi-public domain) for example one wasn't allowed, one only saved there where one may truly, which is only a stringency.

And it is that they be written in Assyrian script and in the holy tongue. The sacred writings must be written in Assyrian script and in the holy tongue. But if they were written in any language, or in another script, or in another language, or in the form of script and they didn't take it out, and even if there was no eruv. Because it has no sanctity, and then it has no sanctity.

The Rambam now says, in any language to read in it, even on weekdays.

Laws of Saving Sacred Writings from Fire (Continued) – Writings That Are Not in Assyrian Script and the Holy Tongue, A Torah Scroll That Was Erased, and the Case of the Scroll

Sacred Writings That Are Not Written in Assyrian Script and the Holy Tongue

Speaker 1: One is only permitted there where one may truly, which is only a stringency. **And it is that the sacred writings be written in Assyrian script and in the holy tongue.** But if it's written in any language, it's an Artscroll book, or in another script, or in another script, or in another language, or in another form of script, **one doesn't save them, and even if there was an eruv there.** Because it has no sanctity, then it has no sanctity.

The Rambam now says, **and on a weekday it's forbidden to read in them**, even on weekdays one may not read the sacred writings that are in another language. Why? Simply because one may not. One may not read Artscroll, I don't know.

We learned that even Kriat Shema (the Shema prayer) one can say in any language. One can't have a siddur (prayer book) in any language? A sacred writing, a Chumash (Pentateuch), a Torah scroll. Ah, sacred writings, he's talking here about a Torah scroll. But what is indeed the simple meaning? We learned even about the Megillah (scroll of Esther). Ah, the Megillah is indeed not valid if it's not written in the holy tongue. Okay.

But it's interesting, one fulfills Kriat Shema in another language, but when it's written in another language it has no sanctity at all? Okay.

It is forbidden to read them, rather one places them in a place of refuse and they decompose on their own. It's not clear, one needs to learn this in other places. I see that it says in Kol Kisvei, it's written next to the law about saving from fire. He says, one doesn't need to save it.

Speaker 2: Yes, yes, that it shouldn't burn, it doesn't need to burn. Doesn't need to, meaning. Yes.

Speaker 1: Greek theoretically would have had sanctity, but the Rambam already wrote in Hilchos Sefer Torah that today there is no Greek in the world, therefore he doesn't say the law. So says the Maggid Mishneh, that it's true, the intention is, according to the approach that the Rambam rules, Greek would indeed have needed to have sanctity, but the Rambam doesn't bring the law because he already said once that it doesn't exist.

The simple explanation is according to this, because one may not save any... only a Sefer Torah one would be permitted to save.

Discussion: Why One May Not Save Other Writings

Speaker 2: Why may one not save any other writings? It's forbidden - dvarim shebichtav i atah rashai lomram al peh (things written may not be said orally).

Speaker 1: That was a Chumash, one sees in the Rambam one may place a Chumash on... it doesn't say "therefore." But the Chumash was also written in Ashuris.

Speaker 2: Like today our books are not in Ashuris.

Speaker 1: Our books also have Ashuris, that's not the question. Ashuris only means the other language, not the other... I don't mean that this is the law. I understand, it must be that the lines are straight, not that this makes it Ashuris. But if for example with our Yiddish, you will write Yiddish handwriting language, it's not kesav lashon hakodesh (script of the holy tongue).

But the commentators say, the Rishonim say, that this is only in their days when one would actually err in the law of dvarim shebichtav i atah rashai lomram al peh. Today when one has already been permitted to write everything, therefore one may already permit everything.

But according to the Rambam it comes out very sharp, that one may not read kisvei hedyotos (secular writings) one may not read, kisvei kodesh (holy writings) that are not in Ashuris. In total, the only thing, either you can go to the beis medrash to hear the shiur from the rav, or you can read a Sefer Torah, a kosher Sefer Torah, the entire Hilchos Sefer Torah. This one learns, not something else. And a Mishnayos one may also not write, a siddur one may not write all these things. It's forbidden.

The law is from then. On what indeed doesn't the Rambam say in the law? Because the Rambam brings in the law... I mean to say, the Rambam after one was permitted... it doesn't say in the Gemara that one later permitted all these things, one needs to make the calculation oneself. But the Rambam, it's clear that perhaps the Rambam would have thought according to old laws, I don't know. Let's finish the laws further.

Written with Dye and Red Paint

Speaker 1: **Since they are written with dye and red paint**, it's not written with the regular ink that is kosher, that is strong, that is black, that is permanent. Plain sikra is a red paint that holds strongly. **But since they are written Ashuris and in the holy tongue, one saves them.** It doesn't need to have all the laws of Sifrei Torah, it only needs to have the laws of Sifrei Torah of Ashuris in the holy tongue, which makes it Ashuris.

The Margins of Books

Speaker 1: **The margins of books above and below**, the margins in books, the top.

Speaker 2: Yes.

Speaker 1: Like between parsha and parsha, like between page and page, where one leaves empty space. Like at the beginning of the book, like at the end of the book, like at the end of the book they leave like at the end of a Sefer Torah, the Rambam says how much one leaves at the end of a book and then further. One measure of Elokim.

What are we talking about here?

Speaker 2: If it's cut off?

Speaker 1: You're asking a good question.

Speaker 2: Or not. Yes. It must be, because it's connected. The sanctity is established, one must let it burn. It's an interesting question. Why shouldn't one cut it off? It needs to be there. Yes. A Sefer Torah is kosher. If it was cut off. It still has sanctity. Yes. Why should someone have such a thing? It belongs to the Sefer Torah. One sees, that one was to, I don't know. It doesn't make sense. Ah. Ah. Ah. Ah. According to Tzion. The Rav said, how. The Maggid is the Maggid.

Speaker 1: The Rav adds that it must be cut off, because if not it's not calculated, it doesn't make any sense. One doesn't need to cut now, only to save the kosher ones. Okay.

Blessings and Amulets

Speaker 1: The blessings and the amulets. The blessings and the amulets. If someone wrote a siddur, he wrote the blessings with the names. Or, he wrote the blessings with names, even verses with names, and writes names, and many matters of Torah he writes in the verses, one counts the formulas precisely, and one doesn't save them from the fire, they have no sanctity, it's not important, here it's forbidden to write at all.

Today when one writes further the same law, and yes, not afterwards in the Chulkas Meivin, one sees regarding amulets, it comes out here to say that on amulets there is no prohibition of erasing the Name, as I am obligated to write the amulet. Anyway, if there is a verse or the Name in it, there is already erasing the Name from writing the amulet. Okay, but earlier we learned it that one may carry the amulet, you understand, in a public domain, if it's an amulet from an expert one may carry it, but burned, it should be burned, okay.

A Sefer Torah That Has Eighty-Five Letters

Speaker 1: A Sefer Torah that has eighty-five letters, it's worn out, it's a Torah that is worn out, many letters are missing, it's already completely invalid, but if there are 85 letters it's from a... but it's invalid completely, but the 85 letters are complete words, **even if among them is "yegar sahadusa"**, which means words that are not in the holy tongue, **and likewise if there is in it a parsha that doesn't have eighty-five letters, it has letters**, if there is a parsha, if there are 85 letters that's a measure of a parsha. A measure, even if it's not a complete parsha, but so much has remained. Or if a complete parsha has remained, even if it's a small parsha, "Vayavo Amalek" is a small parsha. **Or it has mentions of the Name**, the parsha has names, like the parsha of "Vayomer Hashem el Moshe leimor", there are two verses in the parsha.

Speaker 2: Two verses, yes. The shortest parsha, yes.

Speaker 1: The parsha of "Sefer pnei atzmo", about the different appearances. Yes, but it's a parsha. It's a parsha verse.

And one saves it from the fire. Once it's a complete parsha, even if it's short, or even if it's not a complete parsha, but 85 letters have remained, there is importance, sanctity, and the law is one saves it from the fire.

The Case of the Book

Speaker 1: The margins one may not save, but the case of the book one may. Very interesting. The margins were cut off. The case is also separated from the book.

Speaker 2: No, the case is not cut off from the book. It's taken out from the case.

Speaker 1: One may not save the margins. Okay, I understand that one may not save cut-off margins, even if they were corrected.

But it's actually very interesting that the Rambam stands in you in Yoreh Deah, the Rambam said that one may not save one's own book from the fire. It's very strange. The law is built on the fact that it has no sanctity, but one may not read. As he says, even on a weekday one may not read in the Torah that is not written in Ashuris. Why doesn't the Rambam say anything? I don't know. It requires investigation. One needs to think indeed what the Rambam's matters of fire are a great wonder.

Okay, until here the shiur.