

9 Kislev 5773
Nov. 23, 2012



Shabbos Daf 51

Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamah of

Tzvi Gershon Ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o"n

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for his neshamah and may his soul find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

1. There is a dispute whether a man can groom himself during the week.

Ameimar and Rav Ashi washed with *barda* (one-third aloes, one-third myrtle, and one-third violets) on *Shabbos*, and Mar Zutra did not wash with it. Mar Zutra maintained that although a man can scrape dirt from a wound on his flesh to relieve his discomfort, he cannot do so for the purpose of beautifying himself, as this violates the transgression of a man grooming himself like a woman. Ameimar and Rav Ashi, however, maintained that a man should clean himself to honor Hashem, because man was created in the image of Hashem, and there is an obligation for one to recite a blessing upon seeing beautiful people. (50b)

2. There is a dispute whether we are concerned that if by removing the pot on *Shabbos* the wool shearings will fall in.

Rabbi Eliezer states that one can tip the box on its side and take out the food, because if he removes the pot in the normal fashion, we are concerned that the shearings will fall in and then he will not be able to remove the shearings, which are *muktzeh*. The Chachamim are not concerned that the shearings will fall in, and therefore the Chachamim allow one to remove the pot and replace it. The Chachamim agree that if the shearings fall in that he cannot replace the pot. (50b)

3. One may insert a plant in the earth, remove it, and again insert it before *Shabbos*, in order to be

allowed to remove it and replace it in the earth on *Shabbos*.

The *slikusta* plant was a beautiful plant used by the wealthy. If one placed the plant in the earth, removed the plant, and placed it back in the earth before *Shabbos*, then there is no issue of taking it out of the earth and reinserting it on *Shabbos*. It is not an issue of *muktzeh* and there is no prohibition of digging, because he will not be moving any earth on *Shabbos*. If one did not remove and reinsert the plant before *Shabbos*, then it is forbidden to remove it and reinsert the plant on *Shabbos*. The same ruling applies to a knife that is kept as safekeeping between bricks. Taking the knife out from between the bricks loosens the mortar and this is prohibited on *Shabbos*. Therefore, one must stick the knife in between the bricks, remove it and reinsert it before *Shabbos*, and then he can take it out and reinsert it on *Shabbos*. If he does not follow this protocol, he cannot remove the knife on *Shabbos*. (50b – 51a)

4. One may not cover a pot on *Shabbos* if it was not covered before *Shabbos*.

If one did not insulate the pot before *Shabbos*, he cannot cover the pot on *Shabbos* even with materials that do not add heat to the food, because we are concerned that he will reheat the food on *Shabbos* before insulating it. If he insulated the food before *Shabbos* and it became uncovered, even before *Shabbos*, he may cover the food again on *Shabbos*. (51a)



5. One may insulate cold water on *Shabbos* by covering it to keep it away from the heat of the sun.

The *Mishna* states that one may cover a bottle of cold water with cushions on *Shabbos* in order that the sun does not warm it. Insulating warm food on *Shabbos* is prohibited but insulating something cold is permitted. The *Gemora* states that not only is it permitted to insulate cold water, which is normally not insulated to warm it up, but one may even insulate cold food, which is normally insulated to warm it up. (51a)

6. Rabbi Yosi and Rebbe cherished each other greatly.

Rebbe stated that one is prohibited from insulating cold food on *Shabbos*. Although the *Mishna* states explicitly that one is permitted to insulate cold food on *Shabbos*, the *Gemora* explains that Rebbe taught that it is forbidden to insulate cold food on *Shabbos*, and Rabbi Yishmael the son of Rabbi Yosi told Rebbe that his father, Rabbi Yosi, permitted insulating cold food on *Shabbos*. Upon hearing this, Rebbe retracted his ruling in deference to Rabbi Yosi. The *Gemora* states that if Rabbi Yosi had been alive, he would have subjugated himself before Rebbe, as Rebbe was the Nasi, the leader of the generation. This is evident from the fact that Rabbi Yishmael the son of Rabbi Yosi was equal to his father in scholarship and he sat before Rebbe. Nonetheless, when Rebbe heard Rabbi Yosi's ruling regarding the insulation of cold food on *Shabbos*, Rebbe deferred to the ruling of Rabbi Yosi. (51a)

7. Rav Ami felt that Rav Nachman was more distinguished than others and should therefore conduct himself with a different standard.

Rav Nachman instructed his servant to insulate cold food for him on *Shabbos*, and during the week Rav Nachman told his servant to bring him water heated by a gentile. Rav Ami heard these two rulings from Rav Nachman and protested. Although Rav Nachman was following the rulings of his teachers, Rav Ami felt that

since Rav Nachman was of great stature should not have insulated cold food on *Shabbos* and he should not drink water heated by a gentile. The reason for Rav Ami's protest is because he felt others would see a great man like Rav Nachman ruling leniently and they might go and rule even more leniently, which may lead to a transgression. (51a)

8. If one insulated and covered a pot with material that is forbidden to move on *Shabbos*, he cannot remove and replace the pot if the whole opening of the pot is covered with a cover that is *muktzeh*.

One can take the cover off a pot and remove the pot from its place if the cover can be moved on *Shabbos*. This rule applies even if the pot was insulated with materials that may not be moved on *Shabbos*. If both the insulation and the covering were done with materials that cannot be moved on *Shabbos*, or even if the insulation was done with materials that can be used on *Shabbos*, but the cover cannot be moved on *Shabbos*, then the law is as follows: If part of the opening of the pot is uncovered, he can tip the pot and the cover that is *muktzeh* will fall off by itself. If the opening of the pot is completely covered with the cover that is *muktzeh*, then it is forbidden to remove the pot, because he cannot remove the pot without moving the cover that is *muktzeh*. (51a – 51b)

9. One cannot deliberately melt snow or hail on *Shabbos* so that water should flow from it.

There are two reasons offered why one cannot melt snow or hail on *Shabbos*. One is because it looks like the person is fashioning something new, and this is similar to a *melachah*, an act of labor that is forbidden on *Shabbos*. Another reason offered is that one may confuse melting snow or hail with squeezing the juice out of a fruit, which is forbidden because it is *mefarek*, a derivative of the *melachah* of *dash*, threshing. (51b)

WE SHALL RETURN TO YOU, BAMEH TOMNIN

10. A camel can go out on *Shabbos* with a halter, a female dromedary can go out with a *chatom*, *luvdekim* can go out with a *prumbia*, and a horse can go out with a collar.

One is forbidden to allow his animal to work on *Shabbos*. Therefore, one cannot allow his animal to carry a burden from a private domain to a public domain on *Shabbos*. A halter is not considered a burden, and one's camel may go out with a halter on *Shabbos*. A white female dromedary may go out on *Shabbos* with a nose ring fashioned from iron, and this is not a burden but a restraint for the dromedary which is harder to control than other camels. All animals that (*generally*) wear a collar may go out with a collar and may be pulled by a collar. And one may sprinkle (*water of purification; the ash water of the parah adumah*) upon them (*even while they are on the neck of the animal*), and they may be immersed (*if they became tamei*) in their place.

Rabbah bar bar Chanah explained the *Mishna* to mean that a white female dromedary (*may go out*) with its iron nose ring.

Rav Huna explained that *luvdekim* are donkeys from Luv, and they may go out with an iron halter.

The *Gemora* relates that Levi sent money to Bei Chozai for a Luvian donkey to be bought for him. They, however, wrapped it (*his money*) up with some barley and sent it to him, to intimate to him that a donkey's steps depend on barley. [*Barley is the proper food for donkeys. They returned his money, not wishing to send a donkey on a six month journey from where Levi lived.*]

Rav Yehudah said in the name of Shmuel: They switched them (*the cases*) before Rebbe (*and asked as follows*): What about one animal going forth with (*the restraint*) of the other? As for a dromedary with a halter, there is no question, since it is not guarded with it, it is a burden (*and therefore prohibited*). The question is in respect of a camel with a nose ring. What is the *halachah*? Since a halter is sufficient, this

(*the nose ring*) is a burden (*for it is an excessive restraint*), or perhaps an additional guard is not called a burden? Rabbi Yishmael son of Rabbi Yosi said before Rebbe: Thus did my father rule: Four animals may go out with a halter: a horse, mule, camel and donkey. What does this exclude? Surely it excludes a camel with a nose ring?

Rebbe disagrees: No; it excludes a female dromedary with a halter.

It was taught in a *braisa*: A Luvian donkey and a camel may go out with a halter.

This, the *Gemora* notes, is dependent on *Tannaim* (*of the following braisa*): A beast may not go out with a rope collar. Chananyah said: It may go out with a rope collar and with anything whereby it is guarded.

The *Gemora* explains: To what is the reference? It cannot be referring to a large beast (*such as a bear*), for is a rope collar sufficient! But if a small beast is meant, is a rope collar insufficient? Evidently, they must surely differ in respect to a cat: the first *Tanna* maintains that since a mere cord is sufficient, it (*a rope collar*) is a burden (*and therefore prohibited*), while Chananyah holds that whatever is an additional guard is not called a burden.

Rav Huna bar Chiya said in the name of Shmuel: The *halachah* is as Chananyah.

The *Gemora* relates: Levi the son of Rav Huna bar Chiya and Rabbah bar Rav Huna were travelling on a road, when Levi's donkey went ahead of Rabbah bar Rav Huna's, whereupon Rabbah bar Rav Huna felt disturbed. Levi said: I will say something to him, so that his mind may be appeased. He said: A donkey of evil habits, such as this one, may it go out wearing a halter on *Shabbos*? Rabbah bar Rav Huna replied: Thus did your father say in the name of Shmuel: The *halachah* is as Chananyah (*who permits an extra guarding*). (51b – 52a)



INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Can a Man Dye his Hair for Cosmetic Purposes?

The *Gemora* states that Mar Zutra would not wash himself with *barda* (one-third aloes, one-third myrtle, and one-third violets) even during the week, as Mar Zutra maintained that a man is forbidden to groom himself like a woman as this is in violation of the prohibition that the Torah states a man cannot wear the clothing of a woman.

The Poskim writer that a man is forbidden to dye his white hairs black, even if this is a source of embarrassment for him, i.e. if his hair or beard is black on one side and white on the other. The reason this is forbidden is because it may be in violation of the prohibition that the Torah states a man shall not wear the clothing of a woman. A man may, however, dye his black hairs white.

The Minchas Yitzchak, based on Tosfos in our *Gemora*, rules that if a man is embarrassed of his hair color, he may dye his hair because shame is considered distress, and even Mar Zutra permits one to groom himself if he is in distress.

DAILY MASHAL

Grooming Oneself to Serve Hashem Better

The *Gemora* states that one should wash his face, hands and feet every day for his Creator.

Rashi explains that the meaning of the words for his Creator is either for the honor of his Creator, or because one who sees beautiful people should recite the blessing, blessed is He Who has such in His universe.

The Mahretz Chayes writes that the explanation of Rashi notwithstanding, one can interpret the words of the *Gemora* to mean like the Rambam, who writes that one should intend in

all his actions that they should be for the sake of heaven. One should eat that his body should be healthy, one should rest so that he is at ease, and one should ensure that he does not become ill. In this way, a person will constantly serve Hashem, as all his daily activities are for the purpose of serving Hashem.

This, then, would be the explanation of the *Gemora* here that one should wash his face, hands and feet for his Creator, in that he will prevent bacteria and disease from affecting him, and in this manner he will be able to serve Hashem in good health. This attitude of living a healthy lifestyle to serve Hashem is considered a mitzvah.