

23 Nissan 5780
April 17, 2020



Shabbos Daf 42

Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamot of

Moshe Raphael ben Yehoshua (Morris Stadtmauer) o”h

Tzvi Gershon ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for their neshamot and may their souls find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

The Gemora asks: Do you mean to say that Shmuel in fact concurs with the opinion of Rabbi Shimon (that the performance of something unintended is permitted on the Shabbos)? But Shmuel said: One may extinguish a piece of burning metal that is in a public domain so people will not be harmed by it, but one may not extinguish a piece of burning wood in a public domain. And if you should think that he holds in accordance with Rabbi Shimon, [it should be permitted] even by wood as well!? [The prohibition of extinguishing a fire on *Shabbos* only applies to wood that burns, not metal that glows. The Chachamim forbade burning metal on *Shabbos*, but the Chachamim suspended their restriction when the burning metal could harm someone. Burning a piece of wood is considered a *melachah sheainah tzrichah legufah*, an act of labor that is not performed for a specific design. Shmuel forbids burning a piece of wood in the public domain, as Shmuel holds like Rabbi Yehudah who forbids the performance of a *melachah sheainah tzrichah legufah*.]

The Gemora answers: In respect to what is unintentional he holds with Rabbi Shimon; but in the matter of work which is not needed per se, he agrees with Rabbi Yehudah. (42a)

- 1. Ravina said: Therefore, one may carry a thorn in a public domain if he moves it less than four *amos* at a time, and in a *karmelis*, even more.**

¹ The reason for this leniency is two-fold: first, since the cup is for drinking, the person does not want the cold water to be too hot, so he will pour enough cold water into the cup to endure

[Based on the idea that there is no rabbinical prohibition of burning metal when there will be harm to the public, one may move a thorn found in the public domain to the side, provided that he move the thorn less than four *amos* at a time. If the thorn was found in a *karmelis*, an area that does not qualify as a public domain, one may move the thorn even more than four *amos* at a time, as a *karmelis* is only a Rabbinically instituted domain.] (42a)

- 2. There is a dispute if one may place cold water into hot water on *Shabbos*.**

The Rabbis taught in a Baraisa: Beis Shammai maintains that one may pour hot water into cold water [based on the idea that *tisa’a gavar*, the lower element dominates, and the cold water below will cool off the hot water above]. One may not pour cold water into hot water, however [as the hot water below will cook the cold water from above]. Beis Hillel, however, posits that one may even pour cold water into hot water, if the pouring of the water is done into a cup.¹ One may pour hot water into cold water that is in a bathtub [because of the rule that *tisa’a gavar*, the lower waters dominate]. One may not, however, pour

that the water does not get heated. Second, the cup is called *kli sheini*, a secondary vessel, and one is permitted Biblically to cook in a secondary vessel.

cold water into hot water that is in a bathtub.² Rabbi Shimon ben Menasya maintains that unlike the opinion of Beis Hillel, one may not even pour cold water into hot water that is in a cup, because of the rule *tisa'a gavar*. Rabbi Shimon ben Menasya forbids.

Rav Nachman said: the halachah follows Rabbi Shimon ben Menasya.

Rav Yosef thought to rule: A basin is as a bath. Said Abaye to him, Rabbi Chiya taught: A basin is not as a bath. Now, on the original supposition that it is as a bath, while Rav Nachman ruled, The halachah is as Rabbi Shimon, can there be no washing in hot water on the Shabbos?³ -Do you think that Rabbi Shimon refers to the second clause? He refers to the first clause: 'While Beis Hillel maintain: Both hot into cold and cold into hot are permitted';⁴ but Rabbi Shimon ben Menasya forbids even cold into hot. Shall we say that Rabbi Shimon ben Menasya rules as Beis Shammai?⁵ -He says thus: Beis Shammai and Beis Hillel did not differ in this matter.⁶ (42a)

3. Rava would pour cold water into a vessel containing hot water on *Shabbos*.

Rav Huna the son of Rabbi Yehoshua saw that Rava had no reservations about a vessel (he poured cold water into a *kli sheini*, a secondary vessel contains hot water). This was deduced from a *braisa* taught by Rabbi Chiya, which states: One may pour either a flask of hot water into cold water, or one may pour a flask

of cold water into hot water. [It is evident from this *braisa* that one may pour cold water into hot water, and this supports Rava, who would pour cold water into a *kli sheini* containing hot water.]

Said Rav Huna to Rav Ashi: Perhaps it is different there, because the vessel intervenes?⁷ -It is stated that he pours it, was his answer.⁸ [Thus:] A person may pour a jug of water into a basin of water, both hot into cold and cold into hot. (42a)

4. Mishnah: There is a dispute as to which utensils one may add spices to on *Shabbos*.

The first opinion of the *Mishna* maintains that one is forbidden to add spices to a frying pan or a pot that were removed while boiling, but one may add spices to hot food that is in a bowl or in a tureen [because they are a *kli sheini* that does not cook]. Rabbi Yehudah, however, maintains that one may add spices to any boiling pot that has been removed from the fire, as long as the food does not contain vinegar or fish juice. (42a – 42b)

The scholars inquired: Does Rabbi Yehudah refer to the first clause, and [he rules] in the direction of leniency;⁹ or perhaps he refers to the second clause, [inclining] to stringency?¹⁰ — Come and hear: Rabbi Yehudah said: One may put [spices] into all stew pots and into all boiling pots that are seething, except something that contains vinegar or brine.¹¹ (42b)

² The bathtub cooks on a Biblical level and a person wants the water in the bathtub to be hot, so he is not allowed to pour cold water into hot water, as he will only add a small amount of cold water.

³ Even if heated before Shabbos, cold water must be added to temper its heat, which according to Rabbi Shimon ben Menasya is forbidden.

⁴ The reference being to a cup, not a bath, as stated.

⁵ Surely not, for it is axiomatic that the halachah is always as Beis Hillel.

⁶ Both agreeing that it is forbidden.

⁷ He assumed that the water is poured on to the inner side of the basin first, which somewhat cools it.

⁸ I.e., directly into the water.

⁹ I.e., the first Tanna, having stated that spices may not be put into a 'first vessel', Rabbi Yehudah permits it, save where it contains vinegar or brine.

¹⁰ The first Tanna permits spices to be put into a 'second vessel', no matter what its contents, whereas Rabbi Yehudah makes an exception.

¹¹ Thus he refers to a 'first vessel'.

5. There is a dispute whether salt will cook even in a secondary vessel.

Rav Yosef suggested that salt has the status of other spices, in that salt will cook in a *kli rishon*, a primary vessel, but not in a *kli sheini*. Abaye said to him: It can be proven from a *braisa* taught by Rabbi Chiya that salt is unlike spices and could even cook in a *kli sheini*. Rav Nachman, however, disagrees and maintains that salt will only cook on the fire, as salt needs the amount of cooking that it will take to cook the meat of an ox.

An alternative version of this dispute is that Rav Yosef suggested that salt has the status of other spices, in that salt will cook in a *kli rishon*, a primary vessel, but not in a *kli sheini*. Abaye said to him: It can be proven from a *braisa* taught by Rabbi Chiya that salt is unlike spices and would not even cook in a *kli rishon*. This *braisa* is proof to Rav Nachman who maintains that salt needs the amount of cooking as would be required for the meat of an ox. (42b)

6. Mishnah: One may not place a vessel under a candle to allow the oil to drip into the vessel on Shabbos.¹² But if it is placed there before sunset, it is permitted; yet one may not benefit from it, because it is not prepared.

¹² Placing the vessel under the candle to catch the oil is forbidden because the oil is *muktzeh*, an article removed from use on *Shabbos*. One may not move a vessel on *Shabbos* unless he is moving it for the purpose of a vessel that may be moved. Furthermore, one may not negate the use of a vessel on *Shabbos*, a prohibition known as *mavatel kli maheichano*. By placing the vessel under the candle and catching the oil that is *muktzeh*, one is immobilizing the vessel, which is forbidden to do on *Shabbos*.

¹³ To move a vessel for the sake of an object that may not be handled, as the egg in question.

¹⁴ Since it is not likely that the hen will lay an egg on an incline, the Chachamim did not permit one to place a vessel under the hen to catch the egg. The Chachamim did, however, allow one to place a vessel over an egg to prevent it from being crushed, as it is commonplace that a hen's eggs get crushed underfoot. In

Rav Chisda said: Though they [the Sages] ruled, A vessel may not be placed under a fowl to receive its eggs, yet a vessel may be overturned upon it [the egg] that it should not be broken. Said Rabbah, What is Rav Chisda's reason? — He holds that it is usual for a fowl to lay her eggs in a garbage heap, but not on an incline; now, they [the Sages] permitted¹³ in a common [case of] saving, but in an uncommon [case of] saving they did not permit.¹⁴

Abaye raised an objection: Now, did they [the Sages] not permit in an uncommon [case of] saving? Surely it was taught: If a person's barrel of *tevel*¹⁵ burst on the top of his roof, he may bring a vessel and place it beneath it.¹⁶—The reference is to new jars, which frequently burst.¹⁷

Abaye asked from a Mishnah: One may place a vessel under a candle to catch the sparks that fall. The Gemora answers that sparks are common to fall from a candle. [The Chachamim did not forbid placing a non-*muktzeh* vessel under the candle to catch the sparks that are *muktzeh*.] (42b)

such circumstances, the Chachamim allowed one to move a vessel that is not *muktzeh* for the sake of something that is *muktzeh*, like the egg.

¹⁵ *Tevel* is produce that *terumah* and *ma'aser* were not separated from. Since the produce is not usable, it is considered *muktzeh*.

¹⁶ Though *tevel* itself may not be handled, while such a case of saving is uncommon, as it is rare for a barrel to burst. The same assumption is made in the other attempted refutations, that the savings permitted are in an uncommon case.

¹⁷ Since the barrel of *tevel* is a new earthenware vessel, which commonly burst, one is permitted to move another vessel for its sake, as this is considered a likely loss, and the Chachamim did not forbid moving a non-*muktzeh* vessel for the sake of a *muktzeh* vessel.

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Iruy, pouring hot liquid, from a kli rishon, onto spices in a kli sheini

The *Mishna* stated that one may add spices to hot food in a bowl that is a *kli sheini*. Tosfos writes that one may not infer from the fact that the *Mishna* stated that one may not add spices to a *kli rishon* and did not state that one may not perform *iruy*, pouring, that *iruy* is like a *kli sheini* with regard to cooking. Rather, the opposite is true, as the latter part of the *Mishna* states that one may add spices to hot food in a bowl, but the *Mishna* did not allow one to pour hot water on the food that contains spices.

This inference would imply that *iruy* from a *kli rishon* into a *kli sheini* is prohibited.

The Rashbam, however, proved from the fact that *tisa'a gavar*, the lower elements dominate, that *iruy* is rendered the status of cooking in a *kli sheini*.

The R"i proves from a *Gemora* in Zevachim that *iruy* is classified as cooking in a *kli rishon*.

The *halachah* follows the R"i, and one is forbidden to pour hot water from a *kli rishon* into a *kli sheini* that contains spices.

DAILY MASHAL

Tavlin, Tevalin, Tevel

In our era we are used to read *tavlin* (spice) according to the Ashkenazic tradition and according to this reading, *tavlin* is singular and the plural form is *tavlinim*. However, according to the tradition of the Yemenites and Oriental communities, *tevalin* is the plural form of *tevel*, which appears in 'Arachin 2:6: "The Leviim..didn't say with a harp but with their mouths to give a taste (*tevel*) to the tune"

(*tevel* forms *tevalin* or *tevalim* just as *kesem* forms *kesamim*).

According to the simple meaning, there's no link between this word, found in Chazal's statements, and the Biblical word *tevel* appearing in the *parashah* concerning immorality (see Rashi, Vayikra 18:23) and it surely has nothing to do with *teiveil*, meaning "the earth".

However, Chazal connected these similar words in their *derashos* (see *Shitah Mekubetzes* on Nedarim 51a and *Sifrei* at the beginning of *parashas 'Eikev*). From Chazal's famous statement – "We have one spice (*tavlin echod*) and its name is *Shabbos*" – it appears that *tavlin* is singular and is read *tavlin*! However, some read the version "*tevel echod*".