

Laws of Shabbat Chapter 9 (Auto Translated)

English

Auto Translated

Shiur Overview

Summary of Shiur – Rambam Hilchos Shabbos Chapter 9

General Introduction

Chapters 1-7 of Hilchos Shabbos were general topics (general melachos, punishments, erev Shabbos, sick person). Chapter 8 began going through the melachos — each melachah with its ikkar, toladot, and shiur. The first ten melachos of "seder hapat" (zoreah, choresh, kotzer, me'amer, etc.) were covered in Chapter 8. Chapter 9 begins with ofeh.

The Rambam himself doesn't bring the concept "seder hapat" — he just gives the list. Rav Rabinowitz tried an explanation for why ofeh is separated into a new chapter, but it wasn't very convincing. The simple sevara is that ofeh has more details and the chapter would have become too long.

Halacha 1 – Ofeh k'grogeres; ofeh, mevashel, mechamem mayim, mevashel sammanim

The Rambam: "One who bakes a k'grogeres is liable... and anyone who cooks foods or boils spices or heats water — all are like ofeh, and all transgress the av melachah of ofeh." Shiur mechamem mayim: enough to wash a small limb. Shiur mevashel sammanim: enough that it should be suitable for the thing it's being cooked for (such as enough to dye a small garment).

Explanation: Ofeh is the av melachah, but mevashel foods, mevashel sammanim, and mechamem mayim are all "like that same thing" — not toladot but the same av. The shiur for foods is k'grogeres; for water — enough to wash a small limb; for sammanim — enough that it should be suitable for what it's being cooked for.

Chiddushim and explanations:

1. **Distinction between "like" and "toladah":** Here we see the distinction clearly. Cooking water or cooking foods is the **same action** as baking bread — just with a different name. It's not a toladah (which is a different action that stems from the av), but literally the av itself under a different name. This is parallel to zoreah where noteh ilan (planting a tree) is also like zeriah, not a toladah. **The principle:** The name of the av melachah is not precise — "ofeh" means any way that one makes a raw thing cooked, just as "zeriah" means any way that one makes something grow.

2. **Shiur k'grogeres — why not k'zayis?** By Shabbos melachos the shiur is k'grogeres and not k'zayis (as by mitzvos of eating). The Rambam said earlier that a grogeres is one-third of an egg, which is slightly more than a k'zayis. The Ra'avad says this is only approximate. It's suggested that it's halacha l'Moshe miSinai (from the verse in Bechukosai about shiurim), but it remains unclear. A second suggestion: by mitzvos of eating, k'zayis is the minimum of "eating," but by Shabbos it's not about eating but about "significance" of the

melachah — which is a different standard. The point remains unresolved.

3. **Shiur mechamem mayim — enough to wash a small limb:** By heating water we look at washing (rechitzah) and not drinking — the shiur is enough to wash a small limb.

4. **Shiur mevashel sammanim:** "Sammanim" can mean spices, medicinal items, or dye materials (tzovea). The Rambam's language "enough to dye a small garment" shows it's talking about dye. The shiur is much less than a grogeres, because sammanim are concentrated — a small amount is already significant for its purpose. **The shiur by sammanim has nothing to do with the general shiur k'grogeres — it only has to do with what one is cooking it for.**

Halacha 2 – Bishul beitzah b'tzad meicham; toladot ha'or; hadachah b'chamin; toladot chamah; bishul achar bishul

Hanoten beitzah b'tzad meicham

The Rambam: "One who places an egg next to a meicham so that it should become nissgalgel and it became nissgalgel — is liable."

Explanation: Someone who places an egg next to a hot meicham (not on the fire itself) in order that it should become somewhat cooked (nissgalgel = it turns differently than a raw egg), is liable for mevashel/ofeh.

Chiddushim:

1. **"So that it should become nissgalgel and it became nissgalgel" — what does the condition mean?** If someone places the egg with intention that it should become **fully** cooked (not just nissgalgel), and it only becomes nissgalgel — is he liable or not? Apparently yes, because earlier it was learned that when someone intends for two shiurim and only one shiur happens, he's still liable.

2. **Two possible explanations:** (a) "So that it should become nissgalgel" is practical — it describes what happens by a meicham (next to the meicham there's only enough heat for nissgalgel, not for complete cooking), not a condition in intention. (b) Perhaps the Rambam wants to say that even when one only wanted such a minimal level of bishul, one is already liable.

Toladot ha'or

The Rambam: "One who cooks with toladot ha'or is like one who cooks with fire itself."

Explanation: Whoever cooks through toladot ha'or (heat that comes indirectly from fire, like a pot that was heated by fire) is as if he cooks on the fire itself — a Torah-level obligation.

Chiddushim:

- Two chiddushim are identified: (1) toladot ha'or is like or itself, (2) the shiur of bishul — even nissgalgel (an egg that's

only partially cooked) is already called bishul for an egg. The shiur of bishul is not one general shiur for all foods, but **each food has its own shiur** of what's called "cooked."

Hadachah b'chamin — maliach yashan, kulis ha'ispanin, dag dak v'rach

The Rambam: "One who rinses in hot water an old salted item, or kulis ha'ispanin, or a very thin and soft fish — the deficiency of hot water is its completion of cooking."

Explanation: When one rinses with hot water an already-salted thing (maliach yashan), or a certain fish (kulis ha'ispanin), or a very thin soft fish — this pouring of hot water is the completion of cooking of that food.

Chiddushim:

1. **Each food has its own shiur:** For a regular food, hadachah b'chamin is not enough, but for a food that cooks quickly (like maliach yashan or dag dak v'rach) this is already completion of cooking.

2. **Question whether this speaks even of kli sheni:** The Acharonim bring that it's not clear where the shiur stops — whether it must be kli rishon or even kli sheni.

3. **An even greater chiddush than toladot ha'or:** Here we're talking about an action that's even further from fire (a "grandchild" of or — the fire heats the water, the water is removed, and then one pours it on the food). And also, the action itself is not a full cooking — it's only a hadachah, a small action, but for this food it's called completion of cooking.

Toladot chamah — hamefakei'a beitzah b'begeg cham / chol she'ucham meichamas hashemesh

The Rambam: "One who cracks an egg... on a hot garment, or in sand that was heated from the sun" — is exempt from Torah law, but "they decreed upon them" — it's forbidden rabbinically.

Explanation: Whoever cracks an egg on a hot cloth or hot sand that was heated by the sun (toladot chamah) — is exempt from Torah law because it's not toladot ha'esh, but it's forbidden rabbinically because one can confuse it with toladot ha'esh.

Chiddushim:

1. **Toladot chamah is not toladot ha'esh.** The Torah melachah of mevashel is specifically cooking with the power of fire (heat from esh). Heat from the sun is a separate category.

2. **Chamah itself (directly in sun):** The Rambam doesn't bring explicitly that it's permitted, but according to the logic it must be permitted even rabbinically. The reason for the decree is that toladot chamah can be confused with toladot ha'esh. But chamah itself (directly in sun) is not exchanged with esh itself — we view it as happening by itself, "the sun does it, you did nothing."

3. **[Digression: microwave/chemicals]** Cooking according to Chazal is specifically cooking with the power of heat/fire. If one cooks with chemicals or microwave — that's a separate question (mentioned but not elaborated).

Chamei Teverya

The Rambam: "And similarly one who cooks in Chamei Teverya and the like" — is exempt from Torah law, but forbidden rabbinically.

Explanation: Cooking in natural hot springs (like Chamei Teverya) is exempt from Torah law because it's not heat from

fire, but forbidden rabbinically.

Chiddushim:

- Chamei Teverya doesn't get hot from the sun — why is it included in toladot chamah? The principle is that **everything that's not heat from fire (esh) is included in toladot chamah** — it's a natural heat, not from human fire. The reason for the decree: if one cooks in Chamei Teverya, one will err and come to cook in toladot ha'esh.

Bishul achar bishul / davar she'ein tzarich bishul klal

The Rambam: "One who cooks something that was already fully cooked, or something that doesn't need cooking at all" — is exempt.

Explanation: Whoever cooks an already-fully-cooked thing, or a thing that doesn't need cooking at all — is exempt, because no change occurred in the food.

Chiddushim:

1. **"Something that was already fully cooked"** — this is the concept of "bishul achar bishul," when a food is already fully cooked and one cooks it again.

2. **"Something that doesn't need cooking at all" — strong question:** What does this mean? An apple can be eaten raw, but one can also cook it (compote) — does that mean "doesn't need cooking"? The conclusion is that "something that doesn't need cooking at all" means something where the cooking **changed nothing** — one can't see on it that it was cooked, no change occurred. Various examples are tried:

- **Orange juice** — if one cooks it, it doesn't become better, but warm orange juice is something different than cold.

- **Salt water** — a better example: one can make salt water with hot or cold water, the heat doesn't really do anything.

3. **"Exempt" means exempt but forbidden.** The principle: anything that's not cooked is only forbidden rabbinically because of "lest one stir the coals." By mitzamek v'yafeh lo there's a concern, by mitzamek v'lo yafeh lo even that concern isn't there. The Rambam says "exempt" and one must check the specific situation whether there's a concern.

Halacha 3-4 – Multiple people cooking together

First case — b'vas achas (with coordination)

The Rambam: "One placed the fire and one placed the wood and one placed the pot and one placed the water and one placed the meat and one placed the spices and one stirred — all are liable for mevashel, for anyone who does something from the needs of cooking is mevashel."

Explanation: Six-seven people each did a separate action for cooking. Each one is liable for mevashel, because every action from the needs of cooking is included in mevashel.

Chiddushim:

1. **The principle of bishul — multiple actions:** The melachah of mevashel consists of multiple actions, and each one is an act of bishul in itself. This is different from other melachos like zeriah, where one can't divide the action among ten people (placing a kernel in earth is one action). By bishul however, since it requires multiple steps, each step is an act of mevashel.

2. Question: noten es ha'or and noten es ha'etzim — why not liable for mav'ir? The one who lights fire or adds wood should apparently be liable for mav'ir, not (or not only) for mevashel. The answer: The Rambam apparently holds that since he does it as preparation for cooking, it's an act of bishul. It could be that he's liable for both (mav'ir and mevashel), for example by chatas he would have to bring two chata'os. Rashi argues that noten es ha'etzim is liable for mav'ir, but the Rambam sees it differently — since he brings it to the pot, this is already mevashel.

Second case — without coordination (b'zeh achar zeh)

The Rambam: "But if one placed the pot on an unlit oven, and one placed the water, and one placed the meat, and one placed the spices, and one lit, and one placed the wood, and one stirred — only the last two are liable."

Explanation: When one places a pot on a cold oven, pours in water, places in meat — nothing was done, because there's still no fire. Only the last two — the one who adds wood (so the fire should be strong enough to cook) and the one who stirs (hegiss) — are liable.

Chiddushim:

1. Question on the distinction between the two cases: In the first case the "noten es ha'or" is liable, even though the small fire alone wouldn't have been able to cook the pot of soup. In the second case the "noten es ha'or" is not liable (only the noten es ha'etzim). This is apparently a contradiction.

2. Answer (from one of the commentators): The first case speaks when all do it **b'vas achas** — in coordination, a "team play" where each does his part together. Then we look at the result — between all the people a cooked pot of soup was made, and all are liable. The second case speaks when each does his part **without coordination**, one after the other. In such a case, the noten es ha'or — if the next person doesn't come and add wood, the fire would go out, it wouldn't be able to cook. Therefore he's exempt. It's noted that the distinction (b'vas achas vs. b'zeh achar zeh) is "a whole construct that doesn't stand" explicitly in the Rambam, and it's somewhat difficult.

3. Hegiss — simply liable: Stirring on the fire is simply liable for mevashel, because there's already a fire and he stirs the food.

4. Exempt but forbidden by the first actions in the second case: The people who placed the pot, poured water, placed in meat — are exempt but forbidden. It can be forbidden for other reasons too (for example raw meat is muktzeh, lifnei iver lo titen michshol).

Halacha 4-5 — Shiur bishul: k'grogeres, half-cooking, meat on coals

Meat on coals — combining from multiple places

The Rambam: "One who placed meat on coals — if a k'grogeres was roasted on it, even in two or three places, he's liable."

Explanation: If one places meat on coals, when a k'grogeres becomes roasted, even in multiple places together, one is liable.

Chiddush: The shiur k'grogeres doesn't need to be in one place — one combines together from two-three places on the

meat.

Half-cooking = liable

The Rambam: "If a k'grogeres wasn't roasted on it, but the whole thing was cooked half-cooking — he's liable."

Explanation: When there isn't a k'grogeres roasted, but the whole meat became half-cooked (chatzi bishul), one is also liable — because half-cooking (ma'achal ben Drusai) is already fit to eat in pressing circumstances, or for certain people. The concept "half-cooking" is compared to "rare" steak — "na" in lashon hakodesh.

Nisbasha chatzi bishul from one side

Chiddush: If a thick piece of meat was only half-cooked from one side, one is exempt. The sevara: two deficiencies together — (1) only half-cooking, and (2) only from one side — makes it not fit for eating. Even ben Drusai, who used to eat half-cooked things, didn't lower himself so much to eat only from one side of a piece of meat. He ate whole pieces of meat that were half-cooked, not pieces that were only cooked from one side. But if the piece of meat is half-cooked on both sides, one is liable because it can be eaten.

Hidbik pas b'tanur b'Shabbos — rodeh pas

Explanation: If someone inadvertently placed bread in an oven on Shabbos, there's a question whether one may remove it before it becomes baked, in order not to become liable for baking.

Chiddushim:

1. Problem of rodeh pas: There's a rabbinic prohibition of rodeh pas (removing bread from an oven), as learned earlier by erev Shabbos that one may only be rodeh his shiur of three meals. But here we're talking about a different situation — he placed it in on Shabbos itself, and he wants to quickly remove it in order not to transgress the prohibition of stoning for baking.

2. Question of mekalkel: Perhaps he's anyway a mekalkel (because if he doesn't remove it, it will burn), and a mekalkel is exempt? The answer: This is not mekalkel, because for a moment it does become baked before it burns. Furthermore, we see that Chazal permitted to remove it before it bakes — this proves there's a concern of liability for melachah, not just mekalkel.

Halacha 9 — Toladah mevashel

The Rambam: "One who melts any type of metal at all, or softens the metal until it becomes like wax, this is a toladah of mevashel. And similarly one who melts dung or wax or pitch or zefes or kopher or sulfur, this is a toladah of mevashel. One who bakes earthenware vessels until they become pottery, is liable for mevashel."

"The general principle: whether one softens a hard body with fire until it becomes soft, or softens a soft body until it hardens — he's liable for mevashel."

Explanation: Toladah mevashel includes: (1) melting metals, (2) melting wax, fat, pitch, zefes, kopher, sulfur, (3) baking earthenware vessels until they become pottery. The principle: whether making a soft thing hard through fire, or making a hard thing soft through fire — one is liable for mevashel.

Chiddushim:

1. **Language "matech" and "matechos":** "Hamatech" (melting) and "matechos" (metals) come from the same root — matechos means something that can melt/be melted.

2. **Why is this called toladah and not av:** The essence of mevashel is by food (ofeh/mevashel as it stands in the 39 melachos). When one does the same with non-food items (metals, wax, earthenware), it's a toladah — because it's the same power of fire that changes the texture of something, but not by food.

Gozez — av melachah (Halacha 10 approximately)**Introduction — order of melachos**

Here begins a new series of melachos — from catching an animal (hatzad tzvi) to making garments/sefer Torah. The order is: hatzad (catching), shechitah/hafshata, gozez (shearing), and then making garments. Gozez comes after hatzad tzvi, because before one can shear one must first catch the animal. By sheep the animal remains alive (one just shears off the wool), but by hide one needs a dead animal.

The av melachah

The Rambam: "One who shears wool... even from their hide... is liable."

Explanation: Gozez (shearing) is an av melachah — cutting off wool or hair from an animal (alive or dead), or even from a removed hide.

Chiddush — even from the hide: One is liable even when one cuts off hair from a removed hide (not just from a living or dead animal itself). Separating the wool from what's in the hide is also gozez.

Shiur gozez

The Rambam: "Enough to spin from it a thread whose length is like the width of the sit doubled." "Enough to stretch from the thumb of the hand to the finger before it when spreading between them with all one's strength, and it's close to two-thirds of a zeres."

Explanation: The shiur of gozez is enough wool/hair to spin a thread that's as long as a double sit. A sit is the distance from the thumb (bohen) to the second finger (etzba) when one spreads them out with full strength. This is approximately two-thirds of a zeres. A zeres is three tefachim, so a sit is approximately two tefachim, and a double sit is approximately four tefachim.

Chiddush: The shiur is based on practical usefulness — less than this is not a significant thread and one can't do anything with it.

Toladah of gozez — feathers from a bird

The Rambam: "One who plucks a wing from a bird..."

Explanation: Pulling out a feather from a bird is a toladah of gozez. A feather by a bird is like hair by an animal. This is not the av melachah itself because a feather is not hair — it's a different type of thing, but it's similar to gozez, therefore it's a toladah.

Spinning on a living animal

The Rambam: Someone who does spinning on the hide of an animal while it's still alive — this is not the normal way.

Explanation: One can do work on the material while it's still attached to the living being, but this is not the way of melachah.

Chiddushim:

1. **The daughters of Israel by the Mishkan did spinning on the goats while they were still alive** (as explained in Rashi). This was a special excellence of their wisdom.

2. **Question:** We learn all Shabbos melachos from the work of the Mishkan — if they did it that way there, this should be a Torah-level melachah!

3. **Rashi's answer:** Only for an **expert** is this his way — for him it's normal. For a simple person it's not his way. The Rambam speaks of a simple person.

4. **Tosafos disagrees:** Even an expert — **his opinion is nullified**, it's not the normal way at all.

5. **Another answer:** By the Mishkan not all spinning was done this way — there were others who did it in a normal way. The main melachah we learn from the normal spinning, not from this special way.

6. **[Digression: question about talush v'lo min hamechubor]** Perhaps the concept is that when one cut it off, it first received the name of proper material.

Toladot gozez — cutting hair, nails, mustache, beard

The Rambam: "One who removes his hair or removes his nails, or removes his mustache or beard — this is a toladah of gozez and he's liable."

Explanation: Cutting hair, nails, mustache or beard is a toladah of gozez.

Chiddushim:

- **Interesting point:** By gozez wool one wants what one cuts off — one wants the wool. But by removing nails one **doesn't** want it — one throws it away! One cuts it off because one **doesn't** want to have it. Therefore it's called toladot gozez. The sevara is: he wants to be presentable — that's also a purpose of the melachah.

With a tool vs. by hand — by hair and nails

The Rambam: "And this is when one removed them with a tool. But if one removed them by hand, whether for himself or for another — he's exempt."

Explanation: One is liable only when one cuts with a tool. With the hand (tearing) one is exempt but forbidden.

Chiddush: By hand is not the normal way — therefore one is only exempt (but forbidden rabbinically).

Chotech yabeles (wart)

The Rambam: "One who cuts a wart from his body, whether by hand or with a tool, whether for himself or for another — is exempt."

Explanation: Cutting a wart from the body is exempt but forbidden — it's not called gozez.

Chiddushim:

1. **Beis HaMikdash:** Shevus (rabbinic prohibition) is permitted in the Temple. Therefore, a **kohen** who has a wart that prevents him from doing the service — **one may remove it by hand, but not with a tool**. By hand is even less similar to melachah.

2. **Yeveishah (dry wart):** When the wart is already dried out (like a dry tree that doesn't send out sustenance) — then even

with a tool is permitted for a worker in the Beis HaMikdash.

3. **For a regular person (not in the Temple):** Even dry is forbidden — they forbade everything.

4. **[Digression: question about blood]** When one cuts a wart sometimes blood comes — is there perhaps also a prohibition of chaburah? It's not resolved, just mentioned.

Shiur gozez by hair

The Rambam: "One who removes hairs with a tool — how much is he liable? Two hairs."

Explanation: The shiur for liability by cutting hair is two hairs.

Chiddush — loket levanos mitoch shechorot: Someone who pulls out white hairs from among black ones (because he doesn't want to look old) — **even one is liable**, because each individual hair is significant to him, each one bothers him. The Rambam also brought this concept of levanos mitoch shechorot by **lo silbash** (it's mentioned that the Zohar speaks of this).

Tziporen shefarshu ruban / tzitzin shel or

The Rambam: A nail where most of it is already off, or pieces of skin (tzitzin shel or) where most is already off:

- **Parshu k'lapei ma'alah u'metzaeres oso** (it scratches, bothers) — **permitted to remove by hand, but not with a tool. And if one removed it with a tool — exempt.**

- **Eino metzaer oso — even by hand is forbidden.**

- **Lo parshu rubo** (most is not yet off) — **even if it bothers him, it's forbidden to remove it by hand. And if one removed it with a tool — liable.**

Explanation: One needs **two conditions** together for it to be permitted by hand: (1) parshu rubo, (2) metzaer oso. When both are present — by hand is permitted, with a tool is exempt. When one is missing — with a tool one can even be liable.

Melaben — av melachah (Halacha 9 approximately)

The Rambam: "One who whitens wool or flax or sheni and similarly anything like them that's normally whitened, is liable. What's the shiur? Enough to spin from it one thread whose length is like the full width of the sit doubled."

Explanation: The av melachah of melaben is cleaning/washing wool, flax, or sheni (three types of materials from animals) as part of preparation for material. The shiur is enough wool to make one thread that's like the full width of the sit doubled — double the width of the sit, which the Rambam explained earlier as four tefachim.

Chiddushim:

- The Rambam brings three types of materials — wool, flax, sheni — and then expands with "and similarly anything like them that's normally whitened," which means all things that as part of preparation for material one needs to clean them.

- The Rambam doesn't say here explicitly "four tefachim" but uses the term "like the full width of the sit doubled" — but it comes out the same shiur.

Toladot melaben — mechaves (Halacha 10)

The Rambam: "One who launders garments is a toladah of melaben and is liable. And one who wrings out the garment until he removes the water in it is mechaves and liable, for wringing is from the needs of laundering just as stirring is from the needs of cooking."

Explanation: Washing laundry (already finished garments) is a toladah of melaben. Wringing out water from a wet garment is also mechaves, because wringing is part of laundering, just as stirring is part of cooking.

Chiddushim:

1. **Distinction between av and toladah:** Melaben (the av) is when one cleans raw material (wool/flax) as preparation for material; mechaves (the toladah) is when one washes already finished garments — an already finished material. Both are liable.

2. **Sechitah as part of laundering:** The Rambam's proof from stirring is very interesting — just as stirring is not lighting the fire or placing in the pot, but only stirring, and yet it's part of cooking, exactly so is wringing (squeezing out) only the last step of laundering, but it's liable. A parable of a washing machine that has different steps — putting in water, putting in soap, wringing — and wringing is one of the steps.

3. **Question: sechitah not for laundering:** If someone's garment became wet (not through laundering) and he wrings it out because it's uncomfortable — is that also wringing of laundering? It's implied from the Rambam's language "for wringing is from the needs of laundering" that it must have something to do with cleaning, not just wringing. But one must see what's by rabbinic law. The discussion remains unclear on this.

4. **Distinction between wringing a garment and wringing fruits:** Wringing a garment (toladot melaben) is not the same as wringing fruits (toladot dash). By dash we're talking about removing liquid from its place of growth — a liquid that's contained inside. Both are called "wringing" but they're two different melachos.

5. **Sechitah by hair and leather:** (from Rashi) By hair wringing applies because although each hair is like a small piece, because it's a bunch of small pieces, there are small places where water can settle. But by leather it's "water resistant" — water goes on top of the leather but doesn't go in, therefore "one is not liable for wringing it." The distinction is that leather is very condensed, as opposed to wool/garment which has places where water can enter. Laundering by hair can perhaps be yes if one finds a way to make a garment from hair, but wringing doesn't apply.

Menafetz (Halacha 11)

The Rambam: "One who beats wool or flax or other types of fibers, is liable. And what's the shiur? Enough to spin from it one thread whose length is four tefachim."

Explanation: Menafetz means beating out/combing wool and flax as part of preparation — making straight, separating out. The shiur is enough for a thread of four tefachim.

Chiddushim:

1. **Toladot menafetz — gidim:** Menafetz is not only by wool/flax. G

gidim (sinews) are also used to make things (for example by a sefer Torah one sews with gidim). When someone combs out gidim "until they become like wool in order to spin them" — until it becomes like wool in order to be able to spin — this is toladot menafetz and he's liable.

2. The Rambam didn't have other examples of menafetz except the toladah with gidim. It's noted that combing hair is not called menafetz.

Tzovea (Halacha 12)

The Rambam: "One who dyes a thread whose length is four tefachim, or wool enough to spin from it such a thread, is liable. One is not liable unless it's a dye that's permanent. But a dye that's not permanent at all, such as one who passed red paint or vermilion on iron or copper that dyed it — is exempt, for it's not permanent, and anything that's not a permanent melachah on Shabbos is exempt."

Explanation: Dyeing a thread of four tefachim (or enough wool for such a thread) is liable, only with a dye that's permanent. A dye that doesn't hold at all (like dyeing iron/copper which doesn't absorb) is exempt because it's not a permanent melachah.

Chiddushim:

1. **Tzeva she'eino miskayem — exempt but forbidden:** "Exempt" means exempt but forbidden rabbinically. A disposable/erasable marker would be in the category of exempt but forbidden.

2. **The mechanism of "eino miskayem":** The Rambam's example is iron/copper — he puts on dye but it doesn't stay because the metal doesn't absorb. "Ma'avir l'sha'ato" — it covers for a moment but soon falls off.

3. **Toladot tzovea — making dye:** The one who makes the dye itself (not the one who dyes with it) is a toladah of tzovea. Example: "One who placed kalkantos into mei afatza so that it all became black" or "one who placed istis into mei karkum so that it all became green." This means mixing two things together that makes a new color.

4. **Shiur of toladot tzovea:** Also by making dye the shiur is "enough to dye a thread whose length is four tefachim" — enough dye to be able to dye a thread of four tefachim.

5. **Karkum:** It's identified as a spice (possibly kurkuma/turmeric) that has a very strong orange color.

Toveh (Halacha 13)

The Rambam: "One who spins [a thread] whose length is four tefachim from anything that can be spun, is liable."

Explanation: Spinning — taking loose pieces of material and making a thread — is liable when the thread is four tefachim long, from whatever material it may be.

Chiddushim:

1. **Why doesn't it say "rochav shtei etzba'ot"?** The Rambam says here only "four tefachim" and leaves out the earlier language of "like the full width of the sit doubled." In the Gemara it says "K'rochav shtei etzba'ot" and the Rambam explained this earlier. It's not clear why he leaves it out here.

2. **"From anything that can be spun":** By spinning there isn't the distinction that we had by melaben (where hair doesn't apply). By spinning anything that one can spin — wool, flax, hair, and even **notzah** (feathers) — is liable. This is a broader category than melaben.

3. **Toladah of toveh: harotzeh leved (felt making).** Leved/felt is a material that's not spun or sewn, but compressed pieces (condensed) — like the lining inside a blanket.

4. **Shiur by leved: b'ovi beynoni** — the Rambam must specify the thickness because by felt there's no actual thread. One calculates: if this material were a thread, it would come out to a length of four tefachim in a medium thickness (not too thin, not too thick).

5. **The Ra'avad's objection:** The Ra'avad doesn't understand why leved is a toladah of toveh. He thinks it's more fitting as toladot boneh (because one condenses/presses together). But the Rambam looks at leved as a thick thread — a material that works similarly to spinning.

Melachas meisach (Halacha 14 approximately)

The Rambam: "The way of weavers is that they first stretch out the threads along the length of the cloth and its width, and two hold it from here and from there, and one beats with a rod on the threads and arranges them next to each other until they're all warp and not weft."

Explanation: The process of weaving: first one stretches out all the threads along the length (shesi), two people hold from both sides so it should be taut, and one arranges them evenly. This is called **meisach** — the stretching/preparing of the warp threads.

Chiddushim:

1. **What does the word "meisach" mean?** Several possibilities are suggested: (1) from the language **mosach pesach** — setting up/spreading out; (2) from the language **sukkah/sechach** — a covering; (3) from the language **masach** = covering. The Rambam says that masach is a language from Scripture.

2. **Connection to masechta:** A masechta of Gemara is perhaps named from this word — like a spread-out cloth.

3. **Meisach = shesi, oreg = erev:** Meisach is the stretching out of the warp threads (length), and oreg is the inserting of the weft threads (width). Meisach is a preparation for oreg — two parts of the same process.

4. **The Rambam treats meisach and oreg together** — which is interesting, because he places two avos melachos in one halacha, because they're basically parts of the same process.

Toladah of meisach

The Rambam: "And one who evens out the threads until they're properly arranged — this is toladot meisach."

Explanation: The one who beats/evens out the warp threads so they should be straight and orderly (so that one can insert the weft between each thread) — is a toladah of meisach.

Chiddush: If threads become connected/tangled, one can't insert the weft, therefore this straightening is part of the

melachah.

Melachas oreg — shiur

The Rambam: "Enough to weave two fingers is liable. And similarly one who weaves two threads in the width of two fingers is liable, whether one weaves at the beginning or if it was partially woven and he added to the weaving the measure of two threads. And if he wove one thread and completed the garment with it, he's liable."

Explanation: The shiur of oreg is two threads in the width of two fingers. This applies whether at the beginning or in the middle. But when one finishes the garment with the last thread, one is liable even with one thread.

Chiddushim:

1. **Shtei etzba'ot** (half a tefach) is the minimum shiur of a piece of garment that has significance — different from the shiur of a thread (four tefachim).

2. **Chut echad at the end:** When it's the last thread that finishes the garment, one is liable even with one — because that's the completion of the melachah.

Arag b'sfas hayeri'ah

The Rambam: "One who weaves at the edge of the cloth two threads in the width of three batei nirin, is liable."

Explanation: When one weaves at the edge/border of the cloth, the shiur is different — two threads in the width of three batei nirin.

Chiddush: At the edge of the cloth one needs extra work to finish/secure. The shiur here is smaller than two fingers, because this is similar to **weaving a small belt** — a small special garment (a belt or something small).

Toladot of oreg/meisach

Chiddushim:

1. The Rambam brings various toladot: **oseh nafah, kevarah, salah** — all sorts of things that work through a thread structure (shesi v'erev).

2. **Mitah mechavalin** — a bed that goes with rope is also a toladah, because one inserts rope into a framework, similar to shesi v'erev.

3. **[Digression: modern question]** A bed with springs — is this similar to mitah mechavalin? The spring comes already made, but the inserting of two springs together can be similar. Also a window screen is mentioned as a possible parallel.

Toladah of oreg — medakdek / kolel nimin

Explanation: The medakdek (chotem) — separates between batei nirin, he prepares the threads for weaving. Also, hakolel eser nimin — one who braids nimin (pieces of material) — this is toladot oreg.

Chiddush: The medakdek is approximately the same work as by the masach (previous stage), only he does it at the next stage of weaving. The shiur of shireh (leaving threads at the end) is meshayer kelim b'orech shtei etzba'ot — connected to specific vessels (small garments).

Melachas habotzei'a

The Rambam: "Hapotzei'a two threads is liable. Botzei'a is one who separates the woven — he takes apart what's already woven. One who wants to separate weft from warp or warp from weft, this is botzei'a and liable. And this is when he doesn't ruin but needs to fix. And this is when he needs those threads to weave from them very light garments."

Explanation: Botzei'a is the opposite of oreg — just as soteir is the opposite of boneh. Oreg means weaving, botzei'a means taking apart what was already woven. The shiur is two threads. The obligation is only when he does it al menas lesaken — not when he's just ruining.

Chiddushim:

1. **Botzei'a like botzei'a es hapas:** The word botzei'a is compared to breaking bread — one takes apart, one tears apart.

2. **Only al menas lesaken:** The Rambam emphasizes that the obligation is only when he's not ruining the garment, but he does it in order to fix. For example, when the warp didn't come out well, one needs to take apart the threads before one puts in the weft. It's not necessarily an old garment — it can be in the middle of making a new garment.

3. **Ma'acheh — putting back together:** Ma'acheh means one puts back together — like brothers (ach = brother). The process is: one has two pieces that don't fit, one tears (botzei'a) from both sides, and then one weaves them back together. When he makes them together — that's botzei'a al menas lesaken. When he just takes it apart — he's only transgressing botzei'a (without the fixing aspect).

4. **Soteir es hakli al menas lesaken — toladah of botzei'a.**

Keli'ah — toladah of oreg

Chiddush — distinction between keli'ah and arigah: Arigah is with shesi v'erev (warp and weft), keli'ah is without shesi v'erev — it's braided like a braid (plait). It's approximately the same idea but without the warp-weft structure.

Potzei'a — toladah of botzei'a

Potzei'a (undoing a braid) is a toladah of botzei'a, with the same shiur — two threads.

Until here Chapter 9.

Full Transcript

Rambam Laws of Shabbat Chapter 9 — Baking, Cooking, and Heating Water

Introduction — Structure of the Chapters in Laws of Shabbat

Speaker 1: Today we are learning Rambam, Sefer Zemanim, Laws of Shabbat, Chapter 9.

The Rambam is in the middle of going through briefly all 39 melachot. In Chapter 8 he enumerated for us... That is, the first four chapters were general matters, such as general principles of melachot, general principles of punishments for the melachot, general rules about what one may do on erev Shabbat, what one may do for a sick person. In Chapter 8 he began to go through quickly the 39 melachot. When I say quickly, I mean that he doesn't give a chapter for each one of the melachot. He goes over each melachah, the basics of what the melachah is, what the toladot are, and what the shiur is.

And we've already gone through the first ten melachot of bread, of making what is called "seder hapat." From zoreah, from planting, we learned all kinds of melachot, avot melachot and toladot of zoreah, choresh, kotzer, me'amer, etc., and now we're at the last of the melachot of pat, ofeh.

Discussion: Why Did the Rambam Divide Ofeh into a New Chapter?

Speaker 1: Why indeed didn't the Rambam finish until there is already a baked bread in the previous chapter? It could be that he didn't want the chapters to become too long, I don't know.

Apparently, apparently ofeh has more details. Which chapter isn't so long? All together, the chapter is twenty. Yes. Ofeh apparently is a bit longer. It seems that the Rambam wasn't particular that there should be some... The Rambam didn't bring the word "seder hapat," he only gives the list. Yes. He tried to say some explanation, Rabbi Rabinowitz, but it wasn't very convincing in the previous chapter. He wanted to say that ofeh is somehow different from all the others. It could be simply that it's longer, there are more details.

Law 1 – One Who Bakes a Grogeret is Liable

The Rambam's Language

Speaker 1: Okay. The Rambam says like this, he begins with the main thing: "**One who bakes a grogeret**" - the shiur of a grogeret. Just as many melachot of Shabbat we've discussed, the shiur is like a grogeret, for which one is liable. Almost all - grogeret is the minimum of food. Something that one prepares as food, grogeret is a shiur of food that fills half a cheek. When a person takes a shiur... the minimum that one needs to take is a grogeret.

Discussion: Why Grogeret and Not Kezayit?

Speaker 2: Yes, it's regarding the shiur of how much one eats regarding Yom Kippur.

Speaker 1: Right, but it's different from, for example, all shiurei achilah where there's a mitzvah to eat is always the shiur of a kezayit. A grogeret, the Rambam said, is not the same as a kezayit, it's a bit more than a kezayit.

Speaker 2: Right.

Speaker 1: Do you remember?

Speaker 2: I don't remember.

Speaker 1: What is indeed the explanation? Why did they go from the usual shiur which is kezayit?

Speaker 2: I think these things are halachah l'Moshe miSinai, and one learns it from there.

Speaker 1: Grogeret regarding Shabbat? I don't know.

Speaker 2: Halachah l'Moshe miSinai from which one learns from that verse in Parshat Bechukotai that it's regarding shiurim.

Speaker 1: Yes, but I don't remember about that, perhaps.

Speaker 2: Okay.

Speaker 1: Um... okay. I think that... It could be that it's a different way. When there's a matter that one must eat something, the minimum of eating is an achilah, but that doesn't yet mean it's a significant shiur. It's not the same thing. I don't know, what I'm saying doesn't make sense.

Speaker 2: Why isn't it about significance? We see here very minimal shiurim.

Speaker 1: I think it must be significant for the thing, for example to fulfill. It's something different. I feel that it's different, I don't know how to say it.

Speaker 2: One must eat something, the minimum of eating means a kezayit. It's not the simple meaning that one must eat something, right? It concerns you now. It's not a mitzvah of eating or a prohibition of eating that one should say it's a kezayit. It says that it's something different.

Precisely, why is it different? Why does it become specifically a grogeret?

Speaker 1: Did the Rambam say how much a grogeret is versus a zayit?

Speaker 2: He said earlier, yes, in the previous chapter. No, he said what a kebeitzah is. If we would have a simple rule that a kezayit is half an egg or a third, according to the calculation that the Rambam holds.

Speaker 1: Could it be that a grogeret is not necessarily larger than a zayit?

Speaker 2: Grogeret is one third of an egg.

Speaker 1: So he says in the previous chapter. The Ra'avad says it's only approximate.

Speaker 2: And a zayit is one of how many? How many zeitim is an egg? It doesn't say here. The Rambam said also, do you remember how he said kezayit here? Or... not long ago we learned it in Rambam, what does kezayit mean, right? He said kezayit... maybe I'm wrong, maybe about kebeitzah. Kebeitzah he said by embryos, when we learned then. Right, but about kezayit he wasn't explaining? I don't remember him explaining. So I don't know. Okay.

Mevashel, Mechamem Mayim, and Mevashel Samanim – Similar to Ofeh

Speaker 1: Let's go further. One who bakes a grogeret is liable. Now the Rambam says, the next piece the Rambam says like this, that ofeh, the melachah is called ofeh, but it's not simple that all other kinds of ways of cooking or baking that aren't ofeh are a toladah, rather it's similar to the same matter, and it's also the same av melachah. The term is called ofeh.

Here it's very clear what the difference is between similar and toladah. Because cooking water is the same thing as baking bread, it's just that it has a different name. And bread is called baking. It's a different action.

Speaker 2: Yes, I think we also had a similar thing, that for example, as I saw, zoreah is roveh v'noteh ilan, it's the same thing, it has a different name. It's so that one shouldn't think that the av melachah is the name very specifically zoreah, specifically ofeh, no. Zoreah means every kind of way that one

makes something grow. The same thing ofefh means every kind of way that one makes a raw thing become cooked.

Speaker 1: So he explains, ofefh is pat, ofefh usually means baking bread, but the same thing is if one throws in a food, one cooks a wet food, one cooks, or samanim, if samanim need to be cooked, spices, or one who heats water, one who warms up water, it's all similar to eating, it's similar to the same thing, and all transgress with ofefh.

Shiurim – Heating Water and Cooking Spices

Speaker 1: But shiurim is yes unique, each kind of baking one must look what the shiur is for that. By bread we discussed, how much bread is considered normal and significant? A piece of bread that is as large as a grogeret.

What about water? What about washing? Water that one heats, the shiur is **one who heats water enough to wash with it a small limb**. It turns out that heating water, one looks more at something for washing than for drinking. He doesn't say a small cup of hot water.

How much? Enough that is significant to wash a small limb of a person.

And the shiur for cooking spices, unlike cooking foods which is a grogeret. He doesn't actually say cooking foods, in a general way cooking foods is a grogeret. Cooking spices is less than a grogeret, because spices - a person cooks just a drop, because spices - a small drop is enough for a whole pot of soup, so spices is much less.

Discussion: What Does Samanim Mean?

Speaker 1: Samanim means dyes, things that one uses for dyeing, so say all the commentators presumably here. Just as one learns by the ketoret. No, samanim is... aha. It says Joseph's samanim. Yes, it says by medicine, but here it's talking about... The Rambam says that the shiur is **enough to dye a small garment**. Could be the Rambam means a building, or samanim of... let the Rambam... let them tell me that one cooks something that's not for eating, or for medicine, or for... means that one cooks for medicine, one grinds for medicine. Samanim usually means one cooks for... well? Dye. To dye. Attention, there is also called samanim.

Speaker 2: Okay, in any case, when one cooks samanim it's usually... one doesn't eat the samanim as it is, or one doesn't use it as it is, one uses it for something, to prepare dye, or to prepare a food, so the shiur is less, **enough that it should be suitable for the thing that one cooks it for**. How much, let's say, I go back to my, let's say that samanim means spices, how much pepper does one need to spice a soup? One needs very little, but that's significant enough for the matter, because samanim - a small bit of it is significant. Or regarding dye, a small bit of a strong dye is significant. Could be more, I don't know, one must know what the shiur is, I don't know, it doesn't say here regarding the... I think the word is less, much less than a grogeret. You don't need a grogeret of pepper, you need a drop of pepper to spice a grogeret. It could also be that grogeret isn't any... it's not a difference, it has nothing to do with the shiur of a grogeret. The shiur only has to do with why one makes it, right? Yes.

Law 2 – One Who Places an Egg Next to a Heater

The Rambam's Language

Speaker 1: The Rambam says further, what happens... the next law, Law 2, the Rambam says, what happens when usually cooking or baking one understands that one places

something on the fire or one places something in the oven. But what happens when one does it in a different way that it should become very hot?

One who places an egg next to a heater, an egg we've already learned cooks quickly. If one places an egg **next to the heater**, next to a heater, a vessel with which one heats hot water, he does it **so that it will become roasted**, that the egg should become a bit cooked, what is called a loose egg, which becomes... the sign of how one knows that the egg is already a bit cooked is that it spins in a different kind of way than a raw egg which doesn't spin, that's why it's called nitgalgel. It has nothing to do with cooking that it should become completely hard and everything. One doesn't have enough just a heater, next to the heater, but next to the heater is enough that it should make the egg a bit cooked **so that it will become roasted. And it became roasted, he is liable**.

Discussion: What Does "So That It Will Become Roasted and It Became Roasted" Mean?

Speaker 1: He says here, the word is when he placed it for that. If he placed it because he wants it to become completely cooked, and it only became nitgalgel, he hasn't yet finished the melachah that he wanted. Yes? Because he says here "so that it will become roasted and it became roasted". If he didn't place it so that it will become roasted, his intention isn't considered. If a person wanted the egg to become completely cooked and it only became nitgalgel... but it doesn't work that way. We learned explicitly, I think in a previous chapter, about if one intends for two shiurim and it becomes a smaller shiur, he is still liable. So what does "so that it will become roasted and it became roasted" mean? I don't know, perhaps it's practical. That this is why nitgalgel must be, some cooking must happen. But... but... so that it will become roasted is if when he placed it that it should only be cooked nitgalgel.

Or perhaps he wants to say that when he placed it that it should only be cooked so that it will become roasted, gilgul hachaim, but if he would have placed it that it should be cooked more than that, if it became nitgalgel it wouldn't be accepted. That certainly can't be correct. It could be the opposite, even just...

Law 1 (Continued): Cooking with Derivatives of Fire, Derivatives of Sun, and Hot Springs of Tiberias

Cooking with Derivatives of Fire – "One Who Cooks with a Derivative of Fire is Like One Who Cooks with Fire Itself"

Speaker 1:

If a person wanted the egg to become completely cooked, and it only became nitgalgel, but it doesn't work that way. We learned it explicitly, I think, in a previous chapter, about if one intends for two shiurim and it becomes a smaller shiur, he is still liable.

So what does "cooked a shiur that it will become roasted" mean? I already know, perhaps it's practical. This is why nitgalgel must be, some cooking must happen. But... but... "cooked a shiur that it will become roasted" is to exclude what? Only what then? That it should become fully cooked? How... how... so you must have it not cooked? How... when he places it that it should only be cooked not nitgalgel, when it's nitgalgel he is liable. But if he would have placed it for a... that it should become more cooked than that, and nitgalgel wouldn't have been enough, that certainly can't be correct. It

could be the opposite, even just nitgalgel is already... One can say like this, let's understand the law.

The Innovation of the Law

The question is, what is the innovation of the law? The law, the innovation is that not only in the fire, but also the side of the fire, which is called derivatives of fire, one is also liable. But it could also be that there's another innovation, that there's like a shiur. What is the shiur? The Rambam himself says how he cooks it in such a... so an egg, even nitgalgel, also means cooked. Perhaps that's another innovation that's in the law.

Perhaps it's simply practical, that it doesn't get cooked next to the heat, you know, melekheth machshevet. And the language is somewhat interesting to me.

The Rambam's Language: "One Who Cooks with a Derivative of Fire is Like One Who Cooks with Fire Itself"

Okay. He says, why is one liable in such a case? He didn't place it on the fire, he only basically cooked it through something that is hot from the fire. The answer is, **"One who cooks with a derivative of fire is like one who cooks with fire itself"**. When one cooks in the derivative of fire, that means the heat that is next to the pot, is already second-hand, it's no longer the heat from the fire. The fire heats the pot, the pot heats the egg. But according to halachah there's no difference between cooking on the fire or not cooking on the fire.

Washing in Hot Water — Old Salted Fish, Spanish Colias, Thin and Soft Fish

For the same reason he says another similar law, and likewise, usually washing something with hot water doesn't yet cook, but something that gets cooked quickly, he says like this, **one who rinses in hot water**, when one washes off, he rinses off with hot water, **old salted fish**, a thing, for example a little fish, I don't know, a little fish or something that one has already made that it should be cooked through salting, it's already fit to eat through salting, but one wants to now refresh it, he says that one takes a piece of fish, one salts it so it should keep long, and afterwards one gives it a wash with hot water so it should get a bit... become a bit refreshed, become a bit cooked.

Or Spanish colias, or one cooks off some kind of spice, what does Spanish colias mean? He says that it's a fish. Another kind of fish. Another herring like that. Another kind of fish that cooks quickly, **and a very thin and soft fish**, that is a thin, soft fish, what is a herring, I don't know. The point is that it gets cooked. What? The point of the thin and soft means to say that anyway it's easy to cook. Because it cooks easily, it becomes with a bit of hot water, a usual thing with the lightest hot water still doesn't get cooked. But this thing is liable, because this thing means this is already cooked. **Pouring hot water on it, that is the completion of its cooking**, the pouring on it the hot water, that is the cooking.

The Principle: The Shiur of Cooking is Not One General Rule for Everything

Cooking, one doesn't always look at it as a general rule, that there should be one shiur for everything, rather each food one looked at each food what kind of cooking it needs. A difference when one would say, pouring hot water on a food is still not enough, but for this food it's enough, that means cooking for this thing, **and likewise all similar cases**.

Discussion: Keli Sheni or Keli Rishon?

Speaker 2:

So the hot water means even a keli sheni or something like that?

Speaker 1:

It's an endless question, there's no difference if it's a keli rishon or... The acharonim bring, they don't know clearly when it's stopped, what is something that is prepared from cold water is not cooked, it must be somewhat warm, right? It's not clear.

Analysis: Derivatives of Fire and Derivatives of Heat — Which is the Greater Innovation?

In any case, so here you also see that this is similar to the egg. He says like this, it seems that derivatives of fire is also, but derivatives of heat is also the second innovation. That is a greater innovation. That is things that are easier. If a thing, you can say the opposite, a thing that doesn't get cooked with derivatives of fire ever, it needs a whole fire, one doesn't transgress just like that, because nothing happens. It's the...

On the contrary, the innovation is that derivatives of fire is a greater innovation. You can say that it's more than derivatives of fire, it's a grandchild of the fire, yes? Because this is on the fire and this touches the thing that's on the fire. This is already after taking off from the fire, you pour the hot water.

Here is the second point, that it's not complete, I don't know how I call it, it's not even any cooking, it didn't become hard, it's a rinsing in hot water, that's the completion of cooking, it's a small action, but that's called the completion of cooking of this kind of food, it comes like that.

Discussion: "Something That Has No Substance"

Translation

But a davar she'ein bo mamash (something insubstantial), when we see commentators say that the Rambam means to say that anything that increases steam, if one puts in something that cooks quickly, it's a davar she'ein bo mamash. I don't know, because all these things that were enumerated have something to do with fire. A davar she'ein bo mamash that has no fire at all, perhaps we'll say that one will find other ways to cook.

Speaker 2:

No, davar she'ein bo mamash means that it was on the fire.

Speaker 1:

No, not on the fire, it's a type of chamin (hot food).

Speaker 2:

No, toladot (derivatives), not the fire, it was heated from a fire, and one places it on that.

Speaker 1:

Okay, now we've learned that toladot chamah (derivatives of the sun) is... In short, we've seen here that cooking specifically means cooking with heat, with heat from fire. It's an interesting thing, because one can say that fire is a melachah (forbidden labor) of mavir (kindling), cooking is how it works. But it doesn't look that way, it looks like the cooking that Chazal (our Sages) speak of is cooking with the power of heat. If someone cooks with chemicals or with a microwave, one needs to know.

Bishul B'toladot Chamah — "One Who Cracks an Egg on a Hot Garment or on Sand That Was Heated by the Sun"

But the next halachah will be, what happens if someone cooks not with heat from fire, but with heat from the sun. He says

this: **hamafkei'a beitzah** (one who cracks an egg), if someone cracks an egg. Mafkei'a means he takes out, he takes the egg out from the shell where it's contained. He cracks it **on a beged cham** (hot garment), on a garment that is hot, **o b'chol she'hucham** (or on hot sand), or on hot sand, **she'hucham meichamat hashemesh** (that was heated by the sun), which is hot from baking in the sun. But during travel, even if it gets roasted on the way, the heat from the hot garment or the boiling sand, the Rambam exempts.

The Distinction Between Toladot Ha'or and Toladot Chamah
Why? According to the previous calculation he should have been liable, because it's certainly not directly on the fire. He says, but the previous halachah was, one cooked it toladot or (derivatives of light), in something that became hot from the sun, I mean, excuse me, from the fire. But this became hot through the sun, toladot chamah (derivatives of the sun), grandchildren of toladot ha'eish (derivatives of fire). That which becomes hot through the sun is not called toladot ha'eish, he doesn't call it, he doesn't view it as if it was cooked in fire.

Therefore it's exempt, one doesn't transgress biblically. But **gazru alav** (they decreed upon it), the Sages did decree regarding toladot ha'or, just as they decreed regarding toladot chamah, they also decreed regarding toladot or.

Discussion: What About Chamah Itself?

The Rambam hasn't yet told us what happens when he cooks not in toladot shemesh (derivatives of the sun) but in the sun itself. The sun bakes very strongly, and he places it under the sun. Does this mean it's permitted, because it's not toladot chamah but chamah itself? That one can't compare it to toladot ha'eish?

The Rambam must hold it's permitted. He takes it as if it happens by itself. The sun does it, you haven't done anything. He places it. The point is what's written here is that a toladah, toladot chamah can be confused with toladot ha'eish, and therefore they decreed. But the sun itself isn't confused with the fire itself.

So the Rambam doesn't bring that it's permitted. It should come out that it's permitted, because he doesn't say that it's forbidden. That's how I remember it, but it's not written here explicitly.

Cooking in Chamei Teverya

Okay. Yes. The Rambam says further, "**v'chein hamevashel b'chamei Teverya v'chayotzei bahen**" (and so one who cooks in the hot springs of Tiberias and the like), and "v'chayotzei bahen" means in other places too, not only chamei Teverya, but where there are hot springs, it's also the same thing, exempt. It's biblically exempt, because it's in the category of toladot chamah, or toladot nature, I don't know, creation makes it become hot, exempt, but it's rabbinically forbidden apparently for the same reason, that this is like toladot chamah.

Discussion: Is Chamei Teverya Actually Toladot Chamah?

The chamei Teverya doesn't become hot from the sun. I don't know exactly how nature works why certain springs are hot, but I don't think it has to do with the sun. Does it have to do with the sun?

Speaker 2:

Let's look in the Gemara about the... Do you want to ask about that?

Speaker 1:

I can hear that the next one with gezeirah (decree) should be because of toladot, and one cooks in any other situation, in any other hot water that is hot for another reason, one will make a mistake with toladot... toladot ha'eish. In a toladah. In a toladah. It's not the point that it's certain that chamei Teverya is scientifically toladot chamah. It's a toladot chamah, we view it that one cooks with the hot water, one will cook with the hot water.

Halachah 3: Bishul Achar Bishul / Davar She'eino Tzarich Bishul

The Rambam says that cooking means food that wasn't ready and it becomes ready through heat. But "**hamevashel achar davar shekvar nitbashel kol tzorko**" (one who cooks after something that was already fully cooked), if it's already completely cooked and he only makes it hotter, "**o davar she'eino tzarich bishul klal**" (or something that doesn't need cooking at all), or a thing that doesn't need to be cooked at all and he just cooks it, exempt, because nothing happened, no change in the food apparently, yes? Nothing happened, no change, it was ready before.

Discussion: What Does "Davar She'eino Tzarich Bishul Klal" Mean?

Speaker 2:

Do you know an example of a "davar she'eino tzarich bishul klal"?

Speaker 1:

You mean something that's already completely cooked? Something that doesn't need cooking. But one needs to know, it's a way of eating a cooked apple, I don't know. "Davar she'eino tzarich bishul klal" means that the cooking accomplished nothing, nothing changed.

Speaker 2:

For example? Food that's already cooked, I understand. That's called in Yiddish "bishul achar bishul," for example?

Speaker 1:

Yes. But what's the meaning of "davar she'eino tzarich bishul klal"?

Speaker 2:

"Davar hane'echal kmo shehu chai" (something edible as it is raw) it's called in the...

Speaker 1:

Yes, but it raises a good question, if someone cooks an apple, one can eat an apple raw, but one can eat it as compote. What should we say that this isn't called cooking? Apparently we're speaking when no change happened, and one can't see from it that one cooked it. Like water that one cooked and it cooled down. Water is... it's now cold again.

Speaker 2:

No, it's not relevant, because when one cooks it one is liable.

Speaker 1:

But perhaps this refers to such a thing... I don't know, I don't have anything on my mind now. It sounds funny, what could he be thinking? I don't know, he cooks orange juice.

Halachah 3 (Continued): Details in Measurements and the Act of Cooking

Discussion: "Food That Doesn't Need Cooking at All" — What Does That Mean?

Speaker 1: Apparently we're speaking when no change happens, one can't see from it that one cooked it. Like water that one cooked and it cooled down, it's now cold again.

Speaker 2: No, that's not relevant, because when one cooks it one is liable.

Speaker 1: But perhaps this refers to such a thing, I don't know, I don't have anything on my mind now. It sounds funny, what could he be thinking?

Example: Orange Juice

Speaker 1: Someone cooks orange juice and he's going to drink it afterwards. The orange juice hasn't changed at all, it didn't become better. If he drinks it now hot it's like hot water.

Speaker 2: No, we're not speaking in a way that... Okay, then he had some benefit from the... Tell me an example where you made no change at all. A thing where the cooking makes no change in the food.

Speaker 1: Orange juice, someone cooks orange juice. Orange juice isn't better when it's cooked, and no change happened, nothing changed. It became warm, one may not warm.

Speaker 2: Warm water is a different kind of thing than cold water.

Speaker 1: I would drink warm water like cold orange juice.

Speaker 2: There are people who prefer warm orange juice, I admit they prefer not to, I'm not very certain.

Speaker 1: It's not, but it's not worse than water, it can't be.

I don't know, what does "food that doesn't need cooking at all" mean? Something one eats raw. I don't know, I'm trying to think what we're talking about. I don't see here any... I'm missing something.

Example: Tea

Speaker 2: You said a good thing, tea. Let's say if someone has a type of tea that you can put in cold water and drink it, it becomes very good, and you can put it in hot water and drink, there's no difference. "It so happens to be" he poured hot water on it. I don't want to rule now, I need to know about tea. But it could be that this is already something that doesn't need cooking at all.

Speaker 1: Yes, usually tea is permitted because... He makes salt water.

Example: Salt Water

Speaker 2: One can make salt water with hot water or with cold water.

Speaker 1: Ah, that would have been a better example.

Speaker 2: Yes, by tea usually one says that it's already cooked or not, the Rebbe should deal with the question. But a thing where the heat does nothing. It does do something, that which one puts in the... As you say, the salt water and the water. But it would dissolve it a bit faster, perhaps.

Speaker 1: No, okay.

Exempt But Forbidden

Speaker 2: It's exempt, exempt but exempt means exempt but forbidden. How do I know exempt but forbidden? Because they already learned earlier the sugya (Talmudic discussion) of mitzamek v'yafeh lo (reduces and improves).

Speaker 1: Ah, there wasn't an issue of a concern lest one stoke.

Speaker 2: But everything that isn't cooked is only forbidden as lest one stoke. It could actually be exempt but forbidden, because if there's some concern, and something is better if it's mitzamek v'yafeh lo, if it's mitzamek not v'yafeh lo there isn't even that. But about this he says exempt, and one must check the specific situation, yes, whether there's any concern.

Halachah: Several People Who Cook Together

Speaker 2: Here the Rambam is going to tell us an interesting halachah, a novelty that exists by the melachah of cooking. They learned earlier, in one of the first chapters, that when two people do a melachah together it's like this: if only one of them could have done it alone, the second person is just a helper and not really doing. Here we're going to see a halachah that has to do with this, such a type of halachah. The Rambam says, what basically the halachah is, that cooking has in it multiple actions. Therefore, multiple people can be liable for the same action of making something cook.

The Rambam's Words: When the Pot Was Already on the Fire

He says this: **echad natan et ha'or** (one gave the fire), one kindled fire, and the second came, he added to the wood, he added wood so the fire should be better. **v'echad natan et hakederah** (and one placed the pot), the other person afterwards placed on it the pot, and afterwards came the next person and poured water into the pot, and afterwards the next person put meat into the pot, **v'echad natan et hatavlin** (and one put in the spices), and one added the spices to the meat lying in the pot. And came the last person **v'heigis** (and stirred), and mixed the pot. So one, two, three, four, five, six people did actions here, but each one of the actions is essential. If one of the people had been missing, the pot wouldn't have been a good stew, it wouldn't have succeeded. Without the fire, or without the wood that should make the fire burn long, or without the pot, each one made it so the stew could happen. **Kulam chayavim mishum mevashel. Kulam chayavim mishum mevashel.** (All are liable for cooking. All are liable for cooking.) Why? **Shekol ha'oseh davar mitzorchei habashul harei zeh mevashel.** (For anyone who does something necessary for the cooking, behold he is cooking.)

Discussion: Why Not Liable for Kindling?

Speaker 1: One must understand, the people who are *noten et ha'or* (giving the fire) and also *noten et ha'etzim* (giving the wood), apparently they should have been liable for *mavir* (kindling), more than for cooking, no? Or perhaps for both?

Speaker 2: Why? Placing, you mean he places a piece... He says he brings it so it cooks, that's what it means, and he places it in the place where one needs, on the oven. He didn't kindle a fire.

Speaker 1: Perhaps it could be even if he did kindle a fire, he kindled a fire in order to cook, it could be that he's liable for both. He brings a burning thing. Even if he did do kindling, it could be he's liable for two, for example by a sin offering he would have had to bring two sin offerings, because the kindling here is a preparation for the cooking.

Speaker 2: Yes, so he actually brings that Rashi argues that the *noten et ha'etzim* (one who gives the wood) is liable for kindling. But the Rambam doesn't look that way. The Rambam looks like it could be that kindling depends on whether he

kindled the fire or not. But here, since he brings it to the pot, this is already cooking.

Speaker 1: So basically what the Rambam here tells us is that by cooking there applies a principle that to cook a pot of chicken soup, as it says here, one can use multiple people to do actions, and each one of them did an action that is essential for it to be cooked.

Unlike for example by planting, putting a kernel in the ground, apparently it's not applicable. Someone finds a way how ten people should be planting, I don't know how they'll be liable, because planting means putting a kernel in the ground. That's shnayim she'asuhu (two who did it). That means they're not doing the same action.

The Second Case: Natnu Ha'or B'sof

Speaker 1: I just want to say further, this is only if one did it in the manner as he said, that the first person kindled the fire and so on. But if one did it differently, someone first placed the pot on the oven, and the oven isn't yet kindled. And someone poured in water, and afterwards someone put in the meat and flesh, and someone put in the spices. The last person went to kindle a fire. I don't want to say he's the last person, but someone went and kindled a fire. Afterwards someone went and put wood so the fire should burn well. And afterwards came someone v'heigis (and stirred). Who will be liable here? **Only the last two by themselves**, only the last two people are liable. Because when a person places an empty pot on a cold oven, he did nothing. Someone pours water into a cold pot, he did nothing. Someone puts a piece of meat into a cold pot of water, he did nothing. And the same thing further. When does doing begin? Doing begins from when there's a serious fire. Not when there's or (light), that I need to understand. But from the wood, at least.

Speaker 2: No, I would perhaps have said at least from the or. But you see that the or is still a small fire, from the or alone cooking wouldn't have happened yet.

Speaker 1: Yes, but in the previous halachah we said that that one is also liable.

Speaker 2: Ah, why the noten et ha'or? Noten et ha'or is the only thing I'm puzzled about. But one can hear, the rest I can hear, because once one pours water into a pot that's already cooking, or that's going to cook, that's already on the fire, you do some action of cooking, pouring water into a burning pot.

I understand that. But the or I need to understand actually. If you say that the fire isn't strong enough, the fire alone wouldn't have been able to cook yet, why is he liable?

Speaker 1: So the one who gave the or should be exempt, and only the one who gave the wood should be liable.

Speaker 2: In the previous case.

Speaker 1: In the previous case he should be exempt.

Speaker 2: Right. So what's the answer?

Speaker 1: For some reason, there it's different.

Answer: All at Once vs. One After Another

Speaker 2: One of the commentators I saw says that the first case the Rambam speaks when all do it all at once. They do a team play, they get together, each one does a part of the action. We view that in the end the result was that among all six-seven people there was a cooked pot of soup, they all did it. In the second case we're speaking when each one did his thing without coordination. And in such a case we see that only the

last two people made it so it could actually happen a soup. Because even the noten et ha'or, if the next person doesn't come and put wood, it would have gone out, the or wouldn't have been able to do anything. Even not gone out, but it's a small fire, it wouldn't have been able to cook the pot of soup. Makes sense?

Speaker 1: I hear, but it's an issue that one must add a whole construct that isn't written.

English Translation

Speaker 2: Yes, but the distinction that's missing... yes, it's a bit interesting.

Note: Or means fire

Speaker 1: By the way, it's not or (light), or is brightness, or is fire.

Speaker 2: Ur Kasdim.

Speaker 1: Ur Kasdim, or "ba'urim kavdu et Hashem" (honor God with lights).

The difficulty with the distinction

Speaker 2: Yes, I don't know. Heating is simple, because there's already a fire and he stirs up the fire, just as every heating is liable for cooking. But the one who places a se'ah on top of a hide is actually a bit interesting. The distinction between them... what would make sense is if by both it said he's exempt, or it says by both that he's liable. That here it's different is a bit strange to me.

Let's elaborate a bit on the ruling about the hide. The hide itself is very weak without the bone afterwards. And the novelty is that when they work in coordination, the first person places the hide and the other person places the bone, it's all one big cooking. Unlike when there isn't... it's a somewhat difficult law.

Exempt but prohibited in the second case

Speaker 1: So, also all this is only exempt, right? That means one may not do this. Or may one? Without coordination one may. One may place a hide alone on the fire. We're not talking here about a person who does it for no purpose. We're talking about when he intends that he's saving a lost item, I don't know what, lifnei iver (before the blind), he will surely help commit a prohibition. It could be that it's a prohibition because of raw meat which is generally muktzeh. I mean, there are other reasons why... okay. Yes.

Details in the laws of the measure of cooking

Speaker 2: So, here the Rambam will give us details. He said that the measure of cooking is like a dried fig. The Rambam will give us details about this measure.

Like a dried fig in two or three places

The Rambam says thus: "**If one placed meat on coals,**" if someone placed meat on coals, "**if a piece of it was roasted,**" if a piece of the meat, there where it touched the coals, became roasted, "**even in two or three places,**" even if it's not in one place a whole measure of a dried fig, but in other places on the meat, all together is like a dried fig, even in two or three places, he is liable because he cooked the required measure.

The whole thing was cooked half-cooking

What happens "**if it wasn't roasted like a dried fig, but the whole thing was cooked half-cooking,**" the whole meat became somewhat cooked, but it's still not fit to eat, it's

still half-cooked, he is also liable. Why is he also liable? Half-cooking means ma'achal ben Drusai, it's already somewhat fit to eat. One doesn't need to use the term ma'achal ben Drusai. Half-cooking, it's already fit for certain people to eat, or one can already eat it in a time of need, he's liable.

Speaker 1: It's called "rare" in English, no? One eats steak that way, when it's only half-cooked.

Speaker 2: Well, in lashon hakodesh (Hebrew) it's called na (rare).

Speaker 1: Could be.

Speaker 2: Well. Yes. But, if it was cooked half-cooking on one side, but if the meat only became half-cooked...

Mevashel - Continuation: The measure of half-cooking (ma'achal ben Drusai)

Speaker 1:

Half-cooking means ma'achal ben Drusai. It's already somewhat fit to eat. One doesn't need to use the term ma'achal ben Drusai, half-cooking. It became, it's already fit for certain people to eat, or one can already eat it in a time of need, he's liable.

It's called "rare" in English, no? One eats steak that way when it's only half-baked. Well, in lashon hakodesh it's called "na." Could be, yes. Well. Yes.

Novelty: Cooked half-cooking on one side

But if it was cooked half-cooking on one side, but if the meat only became half-cooked, but also not the whole piece of meat, but a small piece became half, I mean, let's say a dried fig's worth became half-cooked on one side, but only from one side, he's exempt, because one still can't eat it. No one will eat only from one side of one piece of meat. When there's a piece that you can take out, that piece is already a piece that's big enough, that piece... I don't want to say that piece is connected to other pieces of meat that aren't. But if there's no way to eat it, because you can't divide the meat only from one side, it's a thin piece of meat, one side yes and one side no, you'll actually know.

If it's a thick piece of meat and it was cooked half on one side, if it's half and it's only on one side, no one will eat it. If it's half the whole thing, one can eat it. But two deficiencies, it's half and it's on one side, it's not... even if the person eats half-cooked, he won't eat it because it's only cooked on one side. The glutton ben Drusai who used to eat when it was half-cooked, he didn't lower himself that much. No, he eats whole pieces of meat, he doesn't eat... with a fork, he eats the whole thing before. I mean not. Avraham, may his memory be for a blessing.

Speaker 2:

So. The new law, exempt until it's all baked. Exempt until... when does he become liable? When it became at least half-cooked, and one cuts it then. Or a dried fig fully. Yes. It's an extra... one can make an extra section about this.

One who stuck bread in an oven on Shabbos - removing bread

Speaker 1:

We learned earlier about bread, why is it enough that one side becomes crispy, is the baking finished? What happens? A person forgot that it's Shabbos, and stuck bread in an oven on Shabbos, he put bread in an oven on Shabbos. A cry went up, what should one do now? If one takes it out, one can still save

him from the sin of baking, from becoming liable, if one takes it out from there before it becomes cooked.

But there's a problem, baked... there's a problem, there's a rabbinic prohibition of removing bread, as we learned earlier, that if one put it in before Shabbos, one may only remove the amount for three meals, yes? Because removing bread is a prohibition. It's not a big prohibition, it's a weak prohibition, it's a rabbinic melachah (prohibited labor), but it is a prohibition. And regarding this we learned earlier that if one forgot before Shabbos and it will become burnt, one may only cut off as much as needed for the meal, because it was permitted that way.

And here we're talking about something else, he put it in on Shabbos, and he wants to quickly take it out so he won't transgress the prohibition of stoning for baking.

Discussion: Is this mekalkeil (destructive)?

But perhaps it's not exactly so, because it will be mekalkeil (destructive), if he doesn't take it out, he's not allowed to take it out, he'll automatically be mekalkeil, because he'll let the bread become completely burnt, no?

Speaker 2:

So, first it's not baked at all, it's not mekalkeil.

Speaker 1:

Why isn't it mekalkeil? If he put it in the oven, it became burnt, it became burnt. What was the moment that was... that's not mekalkeil. If it's not fit, it's obvious that it's not... no, I think it's not, because we see that it was permitted to remove it before it's baked, before it becomes baked, so he won't transgress a melachah.

Speaker 2:

Yes. The Rambam doesn't say that one simply may not, I don't know. Earlier also it wasn't clear. What was written earlier? The Rambam hasn't yet explained the rabbinic order, he spoke later that we're talking about the prohibition that bread is forbidden. Earlier he spoke as another matter, that if one put it in before Shabbos when one may not, one may only remove that measure, for the rest it will be fully baked, all Shabbos before it's finished and burns, and afterwards one may. Right. So it's not clear that one may not at all. In any case, the Rambam, until now we don't know that one may not. Okay. Yes.

Law 9: Toladot (derivatives) of cooking

Speaker 1:

So, the Rambam says further, about toladot (derivatives). Until now we've learned the av (primary category) of cooking and similar to cooking, that means cooking, baking, it's all the same thing. Now he'll say toladot of cooking.

The Rambam says, "**One who melts any type of metal at all**" - it's interesting, metals, when one makes metals it's the same language, melting. It's an active noun from the noun metals. I don't know. What he means he's talking about, he makes it melt, right? Metals isn't melting, it's something that can melt. Yes.

If someone makes any metal melt, one heats it up, as we learned yesterday, when one heats up gold, one breaks in a bit of metal. So when one heats up a type of metal so it should become soft, "**or one softens the metal until it becomes a coal, or makes the metal until it becomes like a coal, this is a toladah of cooking**" - it's a derivative of cooking.

It's not cooking itself, usually cooking is food. A derivative of cooking is any thing that has an advantage from cooking it, from making it hot.

"And similarly one who melts wax" - that's wax, yes? Okay. **"or fat or pitch or resin or gopher or sulfur"** - that's sulfur, yes, sorts of chemicals that one makes melt and one can use like an oil or I don't know what. He says, **"this is a toladah of cooking."**

"And similarly earthenware vessels" - in order to make pottery one takes pieces of earth and one cooks and bakes it strongly. **"One who bakes earthenware vessels until they become pottery, is liable for cooking."**

General rule: What is a toladah of cooking

"The general rule" - what does cooking mean? **"Whether one softens a hard body with fire until it becomes soft, or softens a soft body until it becomes hard"** - someone took a soft thing and made it become hard through fire, like earthenware should become pottery, or the opposite, he took metal and he made it become soft, he is liable for cooking, because he changed the texture of something so it should become changed through the power of cooking. That is a toladah.

Discussion: Why is this called a toladah?

Speaker 2:

The power of fire, this is a toladah, why? Because it doesn't have food. Seemingly, the main fire is when it's food, that's the whole distinction, right? Or perhaps it's the same, the same manner, one receives the same punishment, only the Sages established the 39 melachot by baking and cooking. I just want to know why this is called a toladah, and earlier it's called a... similar to that melachah. Yes.

Law 10: Goez (shearing) - primary melachah

Speaker 1:

So then, now we're going to the new categories of melachot, from beginning to take from an animal until the animal becomes dressed in a garment, a Torah scroll. So the first is... shearing. Does it start with shearing? Doesn't it say before shearing trapping? Not before shearing?

Speaker 2:

Trapping a deer. And here? Look in the previous chapter.

Speaker 1:

No, that's not... that's when we make garments, so that's... ah, garments. But that one does... what does it mean seen? Excuse me, not garment. A garment catches a deer, one needs to be a trapper. That one does with living creatures. One takes the shearing from the living creature, and one shears it. That one does with animals that remain alive. Thank God, doesn't need to be dressed. The wool remains alive. Ah, right. Hide, one needs a dead animal. It's great suffering to pull off hide. A pelt one cuts off. Hair one cuts off. Um.

Shearing - the plain meaning of the melachah

Shearing. What does one do to make garments? This is the order of making garments. The Rambam says. What is the primary melachah? Shearing, wool, or similar, someone cuts off wool, or another sort of hair. From an animal, from a living creature. No difference between a living animal or a dead animal, or from an animal, **"even from their afterbirth."** Even if you cut it off, even if it's not from cut-off hide, from a cut in the hide, that you flayed the whole animal, and now one

needs to separate the wool from the membranes or whatever is in the hide.

Speaker 2:

No, the hair. The hide, yes yes. The membranes are the parts or what you find in the hair itself. I'm saying, cutting off the hair from the hide on which it's connected, yes yes, liable.

The measure of shearing

Speaker 1:

This is the primary melachah. **"And how much is its measure? Enough to spin from it a thread whose length is like the width of a sit doubled."** If one cut off enough wool or whatever sort of wool, that one can make from it a small thread. What does a small thread mean? That is as long as a double sit. Sit means how much space there is between the first finger, the thumb, and the next finger, yes, the index finger.

The Rambam will say it. How much is the sit? **"Like the width of a sit doubled,"** two times such a sit. How much is a sit? **"Enough to stretch from the thumb of the hand,"** how much it takes to stretch from the thumb, the big finger, **"to the index finger next to it,"** to the index finger, the second finger, **"when one opens between them with all one's strength,"** when one opens it completely. And how much is that? **"And it is close to two-thirds of a zeret."** That's two-thirds of a zeret. A zeret is the middle finger. A zeret is three tefachim (handbreadths). In short, it's close to two-thirds of a zeret, about two tefachim it comes out. And two of that is four tefachim.

Speaker 2:

Very good. So this is the measure that one uses when one works with thread. Less than this means it's not a significant thread, this means it's already a significant measure. Yes. It's not yet a significant covering, but it's nothing. One can do nothing with less than this.

Good.

Toladah of shearing

Speaker 1:

What is the toladah of shearing? The Rambam says, **"One who plucks a wing from a bird,"** someone tears out a wing from a bird. He tears off a wing from a fowl. It means they also have a feather, or a feather can mean actual hair. A feather is the hair of a... he tears out. Is he...

Toladah of shearing - feather from a chicken

Speaker 1: Not so important perhaps to explain. One can't explain anything with less than this. Yes. So.

And what is the next in the order? The Rambam says, one who plucks a wing from a fowl. Someone tears out a... a feather? A wing means a wing. Yes, a wing. He tears off a wing from the fowl. It means also a feather, or a feather can mean... a feather is the actual hair. A feather is the hair of the fowl's covering. Not cutting it off. Because he tears out the feather, he is... even if he breaks a oven from it. I mean, it's another side. He tears out a feather from the fowl. Also no feather when it says doesn't mean little wings, it means feathers and such.

This is called the toladah of shearing. This is a toladah. Why isn't it the primary? Because this isn't hair. This is a feather. It's something else... similar, it's a toladah of shearing.

Spinning on a living animal

Speaker 1: The Rambam says further, what happens if someone... not he cuts off the hide from an animal, but he has the animal, and he works on the animal, he makes produce, he makes a long braid, I don't know what he does on the hide, so it's ready to cut off. In this manner the daughters of Israel made spinning on the goats, it says there in the verse, that they made the curtains, they began working with the merchandise, when it was still on the living creature. It's still on some manner, you see that it's some thing that one does sometimes. Exempt in a normal manner, not in a normal manner, it's not so ready in merchandise.

For someone who doesn't want to... but it's also not liable as spinning, as shearing you're certainly not, but as spinning yes. But this doesn't mean merchandise, generally one played with the hair of the animal, like someone makes nice sidelocks, and someone makes hair of an animal that still lives, one can make with the hair one side. But this isn't the normal way. So the normal way is that one is exempt, what was mentioned, that one used to, it says spinning on goats there's a dispute between Rashi and Tosafot, it could be that Rashi says that one who is a great sage, one who can do this, he should be called a craftsman, for him it's a normal way. But Tosafot argues that no, that one who isn't, that someone who does so is batel da'ato (his opinion is nullified), it's not the normal way.

It could be that the women by the Mishkan did it specifically because they wanted to be able to do it on Shabbos too, they wanted to be able to arrive even faster.

Speaker 2: No, but one learns... seemingly it was difficult for me, because one learns all the melachot of Shabbos from the work of the Mishkan. If one did so there, that should have been forbidden there.

Speaker 1: So according to Rashi it works out, because if it was called sufficiently important garments in the matter of the Mishkan, it would have been called a measure of spinning and weaving, it would have been called spinning, it's a question.

Translation

Rashi says there, if he does it like an expert, someone who is an expert, for him this is normal, but for a normal person this is not normal. So Rashi says, it's just not normal for a simple Jew who can't do this. And the Rambam also speaks of a simple Jew. The Rambam doesn't say the distinction. Apparently it's truly not a melacha in its proper manner, but one must know what the women did there in the Mishkan, what is the meaning of this.

Speaker 2: No, but one must say that it's not the proper manner.

Speaker 1: Yes, true, because the question is indeed valid. But the Rambam doesn't say that it's not the proper manner.

Okay. Another tolada (derivative) of shearing. I don't know if it's a question on the Mishkan. I don't know if in the Mishkan there was a problem with something detached but originally attached, I don't know what. If it was removed, then it received the status of kosher merchandise. They spun the wool on the goats, and they cut it off when they already had cut wool.

Speaker 2: Again, spinning, shearing, and all these melachos (labors) are learned from the Mishkan. If in the Mishkan they used to do it this way, one must say that there were others who did it differently.

Speaker 1: Not everything was done this way. There was a certain situation of spinning that was done in this manner, not all spinning in the Mishkan was done this way.

Okay.

Speaker 2: Besides the goats there was also more. There was the tachash hide and all these things that are mentioned there.

Speaker 1: The Rambam says this about other toladot. Other toladot of shearing.

Speaker 2: What was just said was point A. You mean the wool, the fibers that came.

Speaker 1: Yes, true.

Tolada of Shearing – Removing One's Nails and Hair

Halacha 8: Removing One's Nails and Hair – With a Tool is Liable, By Hand is Exempt

Speaker 1: The Rambam says this, another tolada. Usually shearing means a part of preparing merchandise. When a person cuts off his hair, or "**one who removes his nails,**" someone cuts off his nails, or his hair, or he cuts his mustache, his sideburns, or his beard, "**this is a tolada of shearing and he is liable.**" This is a tolada of shearing and he is liable.

It's very interesting, because usually shearing is because he wants it. Removing one's nails is because he doesn't want it, he throws it away immediately. It's very different from shearing. But the Sages say it's called a tolada of shearing. Actually no one calculates it, because he wants to be neat, he cuts off the nails because he doesn't want to have nails. Very interesting that it's called shearing, because shearing is because one wants it, not because one cuts it off to throw it away.

Okay. But it's a tolada of shearing and he is liable.

But this is specifically... But "**this is when he removed them with a tool.**" This is only if he cuts it with a tool. It seems that then it's the proper manner. "**But if he removed them by hand,**" if someone cuts off, he pulls out with his hand hair, or he tears off his nails with his hand, "**whether for himself or for another,**" he does it for himself or for someone else, he is exempt. Exempt, apparently forbidden, but exempt. Because it's not the proper manner. Yes.

Cutting a Wart – Exempt but Forbidden

Speaker 1: Yes. "**And likewise,**" another thing that is not a tolada, it's exempt. Something that you might have thought is a type of shearing, you might have thought it's like removing one's nails, but no, it's not. "**One who cuts a wart**" if someone cuts off warts "**from his body, whether by hand or with a tool, is exempt, whether for himself or for another,**" because this is not called shearing.

But it's forbidden. Only in the Temple it's permitted. And because it's permitted in the Temple, things that are only rabbinically forbidden are permitted in the Temple, yes, shevut (rabbinic prohibition) is permitted in the Temple. Therefore it's permitted "**to cut a wart.**" But one cannot bring a wart, a wart is a blemish on an animal.

Ah, so... a Kohen, he says, a Kohen, "**if it's on a Kohen,**" he cannot perform the service if he has a wart, one must remove it. One may remove it by hand, but not with a tool. What does this mean? Although by hand is exempt, it seems that by hand is even less the proper manner. Yes, one can do it by hand, yes, it seems they should not do it with a tool which is similar to a razor. Among Sephardim there is a distinction between hand and tool, here there is no such distinction.

This is all a wart that is still fully attached to the body, that is still alive, still moist. But if it dried out, this is like what we learned yesterday about a tree that has already dried out, it no longer sends out any sustenance, then even with a tool is permitted for a worker.

Speaker 2: How, does this apply to the Temple, or does this apply to everyone? People other than Kohanim? No, for a worker.

Speaker 1: No, this applies to the Temple.

Speaker 2: What does "for a worker" mean?

Speaker 1: Usually in the Temple he must do it by hand, then, if it's dry, he may even use a tool.

Speaker 2: Ah, but dry doesn't help, for a person everything has been forbidden, even dry.

Speaker 1: That's what it says here in the Rambam at the start.

Speaker 2: They say that when one cuts there at a wart usually blood comes, so it could be that he was already intending for the blood.

Speaker 1: No, I'm saying it could be that it's always forbidden, he's exempt but it will also be forbidden because it's a prohibition of making a wound. I don't know. Not always does blood come, yes? Okay. It's been a long time, God forbid.

Halacha 9: Measurements of Shearing – Two Hairs, White from Among Black

Speaker 1: What is the measurement of shearing? Of the shearing, he already said the measurement of making shoulder straps. But what is when someone cuts his hair, how much is the measurement? **"One who removes hair with a tool, how much is he liable? Two hairs."** Two hairs is always an important measurement of hairs, one becomes an adult with two hairs.

"And if he plucks white from among black," if the person is in the midst of going through... The Rambam didn't accept... Did the Rambam bring white from among black when we spoke of "you shall not wear"? I don't remember. Yes, I think so. The Zohar says it, it's written somewhere. **"And if he plucks white from among black,"** then one doesn't need two hairs, **"even one he is liable,"** because he wants to remove each hair, because it bothers him. Even one is significant. Yes.

A Nail That Most Has Peeled Off / Strips of Skin

Speaker 1: Now, nails. We also discussed nails, if one tears off a nail, is that shearing? The Rambam says this, but in this category, **"a nail that most has peeled off,"** where most of it has already fallen off, but there are still **"strips of skin,"** or **"strips of skin that most has peeled off,"** which are pieces of skin that have almost completely come off, but are still connected. So, **"if they peeled upward and it bothers him,"** that means upward, meaning it catches on the garment, because it's now become such a protruding situation, or on the skin, something bothers, it bothers him, then **"it's permitted to remove it by hand."** That means, he sees that shearing it's not, because most has already peeled off, so it's only a rabbinic prohibition, so when there's pain, it's permitted to remove by hand, **"but not with a tool. And if he removed it with a tool,"** he is exempt.

"And if it doesn't bother him, even by hand is forbidden." The permission of by hand is only when it

bothers, if it doesn't bother one may not even by hand. **"And if most hasn't peeled off,"** if most of the nail or the skin hasn't torn off, **"even if it bothers him it's forbidden to remove it by hand. And if he removed it with a tool,"** he is liable.

That means, there must be two conditions: it must be both that most has peeled off and that it bothers him, and then by hand is permitted and with a tool is exempt. If one of the conditions is missing, meaning it's not that most has peeled off even though it bothers, then with a tool he is even liable. Right? Yes.

Primary Melacha: Whitening

Halacha 10: Whitening – Cleaning Wool and Linen

Speaker 1: Now, we're going to see the next primary melacha, which is called whitening. Whitening means cleaning the wool and linen, washing the wool and linen so they become suitable. Now, the Rambam says, what is the main prohibition of whitening? The primary melacha of whitening is **"the whitener,"** one who makes white, he washes off, whether it's wool, whether it's linen, whether it's sheni, three types of merchandise, three types of wool from animals that one makes merchandise from, **"and likewise all similar things,"** all things that one must wash, **"liable."** Wool and linen grow. And likewise all similar things that are customarily whitened, any thing that as part of the preparation so it will become, so one can make merchandise from it, one must clean it, is liable.

"What is its measurement? What is the measurement of how much wool to wash?" It's the same measurement that was learned **"enough to spin from it one thread. How long should the thread be? Its length like the full width of the sit doubled, the length should be like the full width of the sit doubled,"** which the Rambam said earlier is a length of four tefachim. He doesn't say the number here, but that's how it comes out. He only says the term here.

Halacha 11: Tolada of Whitening – Laundering and Wringing

Laundering – Washing Clothes

Speaker 1:

What are the tolados of whitening? The Rambam says, **"One who launders clothes, one who washes laundry, this is a tolada of whitening and he is liable."** This is a tolada of whitening and he is liable. Meaning although it's not whitening that was done in the manner when one prepares the merchandise, it's a finished product, it's just being cleaned, the cleaning is also liable.

Wringing – Squeezing Out Water

Speaker 1:

The Rambam continues, **"And one who wrings out the garment until he removes the water that's in it, wringing, if someone makes wet, if someone's garment is wet and he squeezes out the water, squeezing out the water is a type of laundering, this is laundering and he is liable, for wringing is for the purpose of laundering, just as stirring is for the purpose of cooking."** Even if you look at it as this is already after one has already done wringing, it's just to finish, but you also see with stirring, the stirrer didn't light and didn't cook, but it's a part of finishing the cooking. Just like laundering has different steps, so washing, look in your washing machine, you'll see it has different steps. One step is water is put in, one

step is soap is put in, one step is it's wrung out. So wringing is a part of...

Discussion: Wringing Not for the Purpose of Laundering

Speaker 2:

So the wringing of a garment that's spoken of here is actually when he does it as laundering. If it became wet and it's uncomfortable for him to wear it, apparently it should be a different type, it's not wringing of laundering.

Speaker 1:

No, that's not. Because he wrings his garment because there's water in it, he wants out the water. He doesn't want to clean the garment with this, it's not part of laundering.

Speaker 2:

I don't know, one must know. Not clear to me. So there is what one is doing, as you brought, I see that he brings that they are somewhat unclear.

Speaker 1:

It's implied, if the Rambam says that it's for the purpose of, it means that if it had been cleaned before, or something must have something to do with cleaning, not just wringing out into the world. But one must see, perhaps among the Rabbis there is indeed, one must see what was learned from the Rabbis about this.

Discussion: Wringing a Garment versus Wringing Fruits

Speaker 2:

It's true that we also had the matter of removing moisture from its place of growth, we had it yesterday as threshing. But this is something different from wringing.

Speaker 1:

No, because the water is not fruits.

Speaker 2:

Yes, because that is in its place of growth, that is moisture that is contained, that is related to moisture, and he removes it.

Speaker 1:

It's similar, but it's a different melacha. Both are called wringing, but it's not the same.

Speaker 2:

Right. Yes.

Speaker 1:

Our wringing is grapes, whatever, grapes and olives with grapes, and here the wringing is a garment. Not the same thing.

Wringing with Hair and Leather

Speaker 1:

There is one wringing with hair. **"With hair there is no wringing."** It means, laundering will perhaps be yes if he finds a way to make a garment of hair even. But wringing doesn't apply, why? Physically, because it doesn't absorb. So he brings from Rashi.

"And likewise the law for leather that one is not liable for wringing it." Also leather is not liable for wringing, because on leather it's like water resistant. It goes on top of the leather, but it doesn't go into the leather.

It's a bit interesting, because if one looks deeply into things, one sees that... No one goes in and looks deeply. Okay. Yes. Who wants to look deeply here? Every thing you can ask. This

is not science. We're talking about very simple halachot. No one wants to hear what's hard to understand.

But every small fiber is like a hair. Only because it's a bunch of pieces of fiber, there are small spaces where the water can settle. That's wringing. Leather is very condensed. True. That's actually the distinction. What is the simple distinction? What is the reality that there's a distinction? What do you want, technically, scientifically it's the same sort of matter. Not from this, not from that did the Torah speak. The Sages said the halacha this way. Very good.

Halacha 12: Beating – Beating Out Wool and Linen

Speaker 1:

Now we're going to see the next halacha. The next halacha, yes. Beating means beating out the wool and linen as part of the preparation. Making straight, a bit combing out, a bit distributing. Combing out, yes, okay.

"One who beats the wool or the linen or other types of fibers, is liable. And what is its measurement?" Also the same rule of weaving that was said, **"one thread its length four tefachim."** In all garments the measurement is a thread and its length four tefachim. When one makes threads for garments, yes.

Tolada of Beating – Sinews

Speaker 1:

What is the tolada of this? Because beating is sinews. Sinews are also used to make things with them. Like with a Torah scroll one sews it together with sinews. With sinews one can also make types of merchandise. **"And one who combs out the sinews until he makes them like wool, in order to spin them, in order to be able to spin with the sinews, this is a tolada of beating and he is liable."** So this is a tolada of beating.

He didn't have an example of beating, other examples. Not every halacha has... Combing out the sideburns is not called beating, it doesn't seem so here. It's not written. Yes. It's not written such a thing. Now. Okay. Now we'll continue, yes? Dyeing? What happened here? Dyeing. Ah, dyeing. One who paints. The Rambam says this. Ah, there is dyeing, sorry.

Halacha 13: Dyeing – Coloring

Speaker 2:

Dyeing means one who makes other people into heretics.

Speaker 1:

Okay, in short, he paints. Yes, he dyes. Painting is not the right word. He dyes, yes, he makes colored, colors, yes.

"One who dyes a thread whose length is four tefachim," meaning he colors a thread. The measurement of a thread we already know, four tefachim. **"Or he doesn't dye a thread, but he dyes a piece of wool from which one can make such a thread,"** meaning the wool is enough to be able to make from it a thread of four tefachim, **"this is possible to dye from such a thread, is liable."**

Permanent Dye – Dye That Holds

Speaker 1:

The Rambam says, what kind of paint is liable? The Rambam says, dyeing means strong paint. If he paints with something that is not permanent, it's not called. **"One is not liable for dyeing unless it's a permanent dye, a paint that holds. But a dye that doesn't hold at all, but if he uses a dye**

that doesn't hold at all, such as if he passed red paint or vitriol, how does one say that word, on iron or copper that he colored," and we know that this won't hold, and it will come off from the iron and copper, paint doesn't absorb, "exempt, for it doesn't pass for its time," he indeed covers it with the paint, but in one or two it comes to nothing because the paint will fall off.

Speaker 2:

As you say, passing is not dyeing, but it's not. Ah, it's not lucky. He puts it on and it doesn't stay. "And anything that is not a lasting work on Shabbat, is exempt."

Speaker 1:

So, but this is exempt. It's exempt but forbidden. That means, a disposable, meaning an erasable marker or such a thing, is exempt.

Halacha 14: Tolada of Dyeing – Making Dye

Speaker 1:

Translation

What is a tolada of dyeing? A tolada of dyeing is when you make the paint. Yes, ah, making paint. **Ha'oseh eizeh tzeva, when someone makes the color of the paint.** Yes, if someone makes paint, that goes to make the worldly. **Harei zeh toldos tzovei'a v'chayav.** What is toldos tzovei'a? He makes paint. Paint is nothing, paint is water. **Keitzad has he said, shenasan kilkantus l'soch mei aftza, she'na'aseh hakol shachor.** Kilkantus is the paint, and the aftza is the water, the base which can become black. She'na'aseh hakol shachor, everything becomes black. **O shenasan istis,** another type of ink, **l'soch mei karkum,** another type of base, another type of water that receives the paint, which now becomes the paint, **she'na'aseh hakol yarok, v'chein kol kayotzei bazeh.**

Interesting, because in the Rambam it says, I don't know if kilkantus, aftza, if these things were active. The Rambam brings the leshonos from the Gemara. Yes, I think yes. It was afterwards. Yes, the Rambam said afterwards, I remember he said afterwards Sefer Torah, one should make from this. I don't know. It's not archiv to them. Karkum isn't kurkuma? It's a sort of spice, it's a very strong orange. Cumin? Cumin, yes. Something one of these things. In short, it's a spice, something a thing. Okay. V'chein kol kayotzei bazeh.

V'kamah shi'uro? How much is the shi'ur of dyeing? Kedei litzbo'a chut arba'ah tefachim. Enough paint that one can dye from it a thread of four tefachim is the full dyeing. Also by preparing the paint, that is the same shi'ur.

Halacha 15: Toveh – Spinning

Speaker 1:

Now, the next melachah is hatoveh. Someone who... how do you say in Yiddish toveh? Spin. Spin. Ah, not weaving. He takes loose pieces of merchandise and makes it become a thread, yes? **Hatoveh orech arba'ah tefachim.** Here he already doesn't say rochav shtei etzba'os, he already goes to four tefachim. Right, he already also left the... I don't know why. I don't know why. The Rambam said, I remember in the Gemara it says k'rochav shtei etzba'os, and he said this is explicitly stated, he says this is only because... I don't know why he says, I don't know why he means. Perhaps I need to learn this Rambam twice, I'll tell you what he means. Okay.

Hatoveh orech arba'ah tefachim, v'chol davar hanitzrach. That means, when he says that one makes from this thread, as he said, wool, flax, whatever anything else. Ah, he says that here there is no difference between earlier he said that on hair it's not malbein or on other things. He says that toveh is anything that you can make toveh, so I need toveh. It's basically explaining the thing "**mikol davar hanitzveh**", there's no difference what. It's wool, it's flax, it's hair, it's feathers.

What is notzah? Notzah is a... can you say that notzah is actually a feather. Feather for example isn't gizah, but toveh yes there is. **O yesh omrim gedilin v'chol hayotzei bahen chayav.**

Toldos Toveh – Ha'oseh Leved

What is the tolada? **Harotzeh leved.** Someone makes felt, **harei zeh toldos toveh v'chayav.** Leved is the felt, yes? Not a... it's a merchandise that isn't... like the inside of a comforter, which is just condensed little pieces. It's just compressed together. It's not like one thinks yet. Leved, yes, or as he says, the felt is called that. It's not real spinning. The lining, the lining inside of a coat, or what, you see that it's a weaker merchandise, it's not a sewn merchandise, it's condensed small pieces of feathers or what.

V'hu sheyalebed davar she'efshar litvos mimenu orech arba'ah tefachim b'ovi beynoni. How much is the thickness? Length he said, the thickness is **b'ovi beynoni.** Because here is a chiddush, because usually a thread one doesn't need to say, a thread is a thread. But here, because it's not a thread, it's a fake thread, he needs to calculate that if it would have been a thread, it would have come out to... davar... yes, approximately.

Speaker 2: Ah, ovi beynoni doesn't mean a thread? You need to have... what is that beynoni I don't know now.

Speaker 1: A regular thread, not a very thin thread, not a very thick thread, a regular thread. Okay.

Hasagas HaRa'avad – Is Leved a Toldos Boneh?

But the Ra'avad doesn't understand what is toveh, he holds that perhaps it's from the toldos boneh. The Ra'avad doesn't understand the halachah. On that level. He doesn't have a tevuah. He says for sure that tevuah. The Rambam looked, that he makes a thread! Just such a thick thread.

What is a thread? All compressed. A thread is you see. It's another way compressed. That's compressed. And usually one makes a thread after from the thread with the rest a garment. He made... the Ra'avad is somewhat not agreeing. He doesn't understand why this is called toveh. He says and would have thought that it's more like making a case. Ah. It's that boneh. Could be. He takes a small piece made from one thing. Ah. Okay, still a bit unclear.

It's regarding hazard, one needs to know, each mill needs to be lost in the person, according to the Rabbanim until the oved on de'os, and according to the Ra'avad until the oved on de'os. Ah. Ah. Very complicated, and nerves.

Melaches Oseh Shnei Batei Nirin

And when once one does this, that one puts in the thread into the beis hanirin... it's not so complicated! Today there is also such a thing, and a sewing machine that anyone has ever seen, and it says so for what isn't shnei, but in order to things one puts in a loop, it should hold the shtei and the erl... but what means the oseh? Oseh doesn't mean the one who makes the

machine or who puts in the thread in the machine... chayav... when it sees also toldos...

Toldos Oseh Shnei Batei Nirin

What are the toldos? Says the Rambam that to make a ship is also like this, you have for example the wooden base of the ship, which to this you need to connect ropes and pull it to the other side, is exactly the same as putting thread into another machine and pulling it, so oseh, nafa, kevara, sala, simchah, all these sorts of things that one makes that work through having ropes, shtei v'erev, oseh srak.

He has oseh srak mitah mechavalim, or also a bed one makes the same way from merchandise from ropes or retziyos, two ways a retziya toldos, oseh nirin, Moshe ya'aseh shnei batim, b'echad mikol eilei chayav, he weaves two ropes, he weaves a bed that goes with rope so is two, chayim kol oseh shnei batim, b'davar she'osam, chayim will be the example of when one does against neyineh?

Discussion: Questions on Today's Beds and Screens

Speaker 2: I know, for example a today's bed that goes with springs, so if one puts two of them, is one chayav because it's not woven? It's something similar, it's enough solid, it looks similar. Do you understand what I mean?

Speaker 1: I don't know what I mean. It wasn't made like that, the spring comes already made, but... I don't know, I'm just asking, it's a problem.

But I just want to say, this is the idea. Any other thing, a screen of a window, let's say it was made like this, the screen comes already made, but... this is the idea, this is something a...

Melaches Meisach V'Oreg

And now we're going to learn the next two things, which is oreg and meisach. The Rambam is going to explain first what is... here he's going to explain.

Explanation of Derech Ha'orgim

He says, **derech ha'orgim, shemotchin hachutim techilah b'orech hayeri'ah uv'rochbah**, that one stretches out threads, ropes, on the length and on the width of the thing that one wants to sew, the yeri'ah. What is the yeri'ah? The yeri'ah that will be on a wooden table. The yeri'ah means the merchandise that one is going to make.

Ushnayim ochazin zeh mikan v'zeh mikan, two people grab it, **v'echad shovet b'shevet al hachutim, umsadrans zeh b'tzad zeh, ad sheyihyu chulan shtei v'lo erev**. First one stretches on one side, that means for example the length of the garment one puts all threads on the length of the garment. The two people grab it from two sides it should be tight, and afterwards one goes to do the opposite way, the shtei, the erev. The shtei means the length, when one needs to add it.

Definition of Meisach

Umsichas hachutim, what is the meisach? **The pulling out the threads in order to weave, that is called hansachas meisach.**

What is this with the word meisach? **Masach pesach sha'ar hechatzer?** One sets up, simply meisach means like this. Perhaps from the language of sukkah? Like he makes a sukkah? Perhaps it's like one pours something, misuch, even masechis. Like pouring? It can mean sliding, spreading out the threads? I don't know.

Speaker 2: What does he say? Someone says here, there are those who say that a maseches Gemara is named after this, that it's like a spread out thing, which becomes like a yeri'ah, it's like one... I don't know. What does that mean?

Speaker 1: Masach, he says that it's a language in the pasuk, masach language of covering. A covering. But he says that it's language of sechach. No, language of covering, language of sechach, like... well, you cover, this is a yeri'ah, well. Sukkah... he says that masach is a language of the pasuk. Okay. Now, that is meisach.

Yes. And not kofel hanose? Ah, what means not kofel hanose? On the other side, not kofel, one doubles it. It means one starts... ah, one makes now that it should become into a merchandise through putting in the threads the opposite way. **"Hameisach l'hachnis bo erev b'shtei"**. Uhm, then it's called oreg. So the oreg is a meisach... in short, it's both the same things. A meisach is the shtei, and oreg is the erev. Opposite, yes? No, this is the shtei and this is the erev. But meisach clearly depends on the stretching, the making straight, and so on.

Chiyuv Meisach V'Oreg

"Hameisach chayav, v'hu melachah me'avos melachos". It's a bit interesting the language, because the Rambam here put in two melachos at once. He's going to learn now meisach and oreg at once, because it's basically part of the same process. After he says that meisach is chayav, it's one of the melachos, he says, we're going to talk about oreg. In case he's going to say namely about oreg, but oreg one already knows what oreg is.

Toldos Meisach — Hashaveh Es Hachutim

What does he say toldos of meisach? Says the Rambam, **"v'hashaveh es hachutim ad sheyusekanu v'yesudaru yafeh"**. The one who knocks on the threads and makes them straight, that each shtei should be straight in its place, because one needs afterwards to be able to put in the erev between each thread. If threads become connected, it won't be a good sewing together. The pulling out... ah, now I understand that the pulling out is a preparation to put in the erev. It's two parts of the same thing.

"Harei zeh toldos meisach". If someone knocks on the threads that it should be straight, one should be able to finish the weaving, is in toldos melaches ha'oreg.

Shi'ur Meisach V'Oreg

Umah shi'uro? Kedei li'arog shtei etzba'os chayav. What means? Ah, shtei etzba'os, a half tefach. No, four tefachim it needs to be for a thread, a thread. But here is the minimum of making a piece of garment that one can something that will be ready, is shtei etzba'os. It's different.

V'chein ha'oreg shnei chutim b'rochav shtei etzba'os chayav. This is already the next av melachah of oreg, that it becomes **bein she'orgen b'techilah**, whether he just started to weave, **uvein shehayah miktzas arug**, there was already a woven garment, **v'hosif al arug shi'ur shnei chutim**. When he added on the weaving the measure of two threads. **V'im arug chut echad v'hishlim bo habeged, chayav.** That means, usually in the middle or in the middle he needs to make two threads, but when it's the last thread, I understand this is the last thread, there's nothing more, he's chayav even with one thread.

Arug Bisfas Hayeri'ah

Arag bisfas hayeri'ah shnei chutim b'rochav shloshah batei nirin, chayav. He was weaving, and by the corner of the yeri'ah, of the merchandise, **shnei chutim b'rochav shloshah batei nirin, chayav.** So, apparently the meaning of this is like this, that means, usually when one says that it needs to be... usually when one says that it needs to be two etzba'os, it means in the width of the entire garment. Here, by the corner, one needs extra to take the shtei v'erev, one needs to sew something on the corners.

Yes, or **mah zeh domeh? Li'arog tziltzul katan b'rochav shloshah batei nirin,** that means, it should be considered such a new small garment, even if it's not the width of the entire garment. That's how I understand, he means here something different. Or he means that it's not wide, and even rochav batei nirin means even not two etzba'os. Usually it needs to be two etzba'os, here isn't two etzba'os, but this is the way, one makes by the end such a... how do you say? Such a finish, such a thing. So this is chayav, like a tziltzul katan.

What is a tziltzul? A belt? Something a... what does it say here tziltzul? Something a small garment. Okay.

Toldos Oreg — Hamdekaydek

What is the toladah of oreg? A mekaydek. A mekaydek is a seal, mafriid bein batei nirin. He makes that this should be able to... Okay. It's approximately the same as the shovet of the ma'aseh rechem. Now he does it at the next step. Harei zeh toldos oreg.

Lachein, hakollel eser nimin — someone who braids nimin, pieces of merchandise — **harei zeh toldos oreg.**

V'hashirah meshayer kelim b'orech shtei etzba'os. Fine good. He brings here that this is only by a Moslem head and by the father who... Fine good.

Melaches Hobotze'a

Definition of Hobotze'a

Speaker:

The next melachah is habotze'a, which I think is the opposite of oreg, like soser and boneh. Oreg means to braid, botze'a means to take apart what one has already braided in order to be able to fix.

Hobotze'a shnei chutim — if someone takes apart, like botze'a es hapas, one takes apart a bread — he tears **shnei chutim, chayav.**

What means? Says the Rambam explains: **Botze'a hu hamafrid es ha'arug.** There is weaving, but one needs to sometimes separate it, because one didn't sew it well. In order to... means, sometimes unfortunately the shtei wasn't made well, before one puts the erev one needs now to take apart the

two pieces of shtei or what. **Mi sherotzeh erev min hashtei o erev shtei me'al ha'erev, harei zeh botze'a v'chayav.**

Condition for Chiyuv: Al Menas Lesaken

Speaker:

He says, the chiyuv is however only **v'hu shelo yekalkel, ela yeshavreinu lesaken.** Not that someone has an old garment and he is botze'a. On the contrary, only we're talking when he has a new garment, he's in the middle... not necessarily an old one. I mean to say, when he's in the middle of fixing and the botze'a is... he says, he says: **v'hu sheyitzterech l'osan hachutim li'arog mehen begadim kalim biyoser.**

Ma'acheh: Putting Back Together the Garments

Speaker:

What does one do? Ma'acheh means one puts it back together, like keshet, someone is ach, it becomes back like brothers. A fixer, a mender. Ma'acheh, he makes them become like brothers, yes? A klum biyoser, even small... begadim kalim, even just a small garment, **shebotze'a v'achar kach chozer v'organ.**

He says that what do I do with the two garments that I don't feel are one? I tear them. I open a bit from here, I open a bit from there. Now I can put them back together. When he makes them together, that is botze'a al menas lesaken, that's the meaning. When he takes it just, he's only over on botze'a.

Toldos Botze'a: Soser Es Hakli Al Menas Lesaken

Speaker:

A soser es hakli al menas lesaken is a toladah of botze'a. That means kli'ah is a toladah of oreg, which we will learn.

Kli'ah — Toldos Oreg

Speaker:

What is the difference of kli'ah with arigah? Because arigah is with shtei v'erev, and kli'ah isn't shtei v'erev, it's braided like a braid. It's approximately the same idea.

Potze'a — Toldos Botze'a

Speaker:

And potze'a is a toladah, and the shi'ur is like botze'a, the same shi'ur. And he needs what is the shi'ur? Shnei chutin, which we learned. Okay.

End of Chapter 9

Speaker:

Until here is Chapter 9.