

4 Adar 5773
Feb. 14, 2013



Shabbos Daf 134

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

The *Mishna* had stated: If the cumin was not crushed on the *Shabbos* eve [he may chew it with his teeth and then apply it. If he did not beat the wine and oil together on the *Shabbos* eve, he should place each of the ingredients in the bowl by itself.]

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*: The things which may not be done for circumcision on the *Shabbos* may be done on Festivals: cumin may be crushed, and wine and oil may be beaten up together on its account.

Abaye asked Rav Yosef: Why does (the crushing of) cumin on Festivals differ? Presumably, it is because it is fit for cooking; then wine and oil as well are fit for a sick person on the *Shabbos*? For it was taught in a *braisa*: One may not beat up wine and oil for a sick person on the *Shabbos*. Rabbi Shimon ben Elozar said in the name of Rabbi Meir: One may indeed beat up wine and oil. Rabbi Shimon ben Elozar related: Rabbi Meir was once suffering intestinal pain and we wished to beat up wine and oil for him (to cure him), but he would not permit us. We said to him: Shall your words (that it is permitted for a sick person) be made null in your own lifetime! He replied: Though I rule thus, yet my colleagues rule otherwise (and you would think that I would act in accordance with my own opinion), in my lifetime, I have never presumed to disregard the words of my colleagues.

Abaye concludes: Now he was stringent in respect to himself, but for all others it is permitted?

Rav Yosef answers: There (regarding an ordinary sick person), it need not be beaten so well, whereas here (by a circumcised person), it needs to be beaten extremely well.

The *Gemora* asks: Then let us do likewise here as well, and not mix it so well?

The *Gemora* answers: That is what the *Mishna* taught: he should place each of the ingredients in the bowl by itself.

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*: One may not strain mustard seed through its own strainer (on the Festival), nor sweeten it with a burning coal (for this will result in the extinguishing of the coal).

Abaye asked Rav Yosef: Why does it (the first ruling) differ from that which we learned in a *Mishna*: An egg may be passed through a mustard strainer (to make the mustard appear nicer)? [Accordingly, it should be permitted to strain the mustard itself!]

Rav Yosef answered: There (by the egg) it does not look like sorting, whereas here, it looks like sorting.

The *braisa* had stated: nor sweeten it with a burning coal.

The *Gemora* asks: But surely it was taught in a different *braisa*: One may sweeten it with a burning coal?

The *Gemora* answers: There is no difficulty, as one refers to a metal coal, and the other refers to a wooden coal. [It is forbidden to extinguish a wooden coal, for that is the process to make charcoal.]

Abaye asked Rav Yosef: Why does it differ from (roasting) meat on coals (even though its juices drip and extinguish the coal)?

Rav Yosef answered: There it is impossible (*that the meat should be roasted before the Festival and be just as tasty as when it is roasted on the Festival*), whereas here it is possible (*that the mustard seeds could have been sweetened the previous day, without suffering any deterioration to its taste*).

Abaye asked Rav Yosef: What about making cheese? He answered: It is forbidden. Abaye persisted: Why is it different from kneading (*dough*)? Rav Yosef replied: There it is impossible (*that the dough should be kneaded before the Festival and be just as warm and fresh as when it is kneaded on the Festival*), whereas here it is possible (*that the cheese could have been made the previous day, without suffering any deterioration to its taste*).

The *Gemora* asks: But the people of Nehardea say that freshly made cheese is excellent?

The *Gemora* answers: They mean that even freshly made cheese is excellent (*but it is even better when it is made the previous day*).

The *Mishna* had stated: One (*after the circumcision*) may not make a shirtlike bandage for the member (*after the medication has been applied*) in the first place [*but he may wrap a rag about it*].

Abaye said: Mother¹ told me: The hem of an infant's shirtlike bandage should be uppermost (*so that the loose threads will not be facing the flesh*), lest a thread of it stick (*to the wound*), and he (*the infant*) may become genitally mutilated (*when the bandage is pulled away*). Abaye's mother, however, used to make a lining for half the bandage (*as a way to intervene between the hem and the wound*).

Abaye said: If there is no shirtlike bandage for an infant, a hemmed rag should be brought, and the hem should be tied around at the bottom (*of the member, so as not to touch the wound*) and doubled over at the top (*so that the threads sticking out will not stick to the wound*).

Abaye also said: Mother told me regarding an infant whose anus is not visible; he should be rubbed with oil and stood in the sun, and where it shows transparent (*which indicates that this is the correct spot*), it should be torn crosswise with a barley grain. A metal instrument should not be used, because that causes inflammation.

Abaye also said: Mother told me that if an infant cannot suckle, it is because his lips are cold. What is the remedy? A cup of burning coals should be brought and held near his mouth, so as to heat it; then he will suckle.

Abaye also said: Mother told me that if an infant does not breathe, he should be fanned with a fan, and he will breathe.

Abaye also said: Mother told me that if an infant cannot breathe easily, his mother's afterbirth should be brought and rubbed over him, and he will breathe easily.

Abaye also said: Mother told me that if an infant is too thin, his mother's afterbirth should be brought and rubbed over him from its narrow end to its wide end; if he is too fat, (*it should be rubbed*) from the wide to the narrow end.

Abaye also said: Mother told me that if (*the body of*) an infant is too red, so that the blood is not yet absorbed in him (*i.e., it did not absorb into his limbs, but it is still in between his skin and flesh; this makes circumcision dangerous*); we must wait until his blood is absorbed and then circumcise him. If he is yellow, so that he is deficient in blood, we must wait until he is full blooded and then circumcise him. For it was taught in a *braisa*: Rabbi Nassan said: I once visited the Sea towns, and a woman came before me who had circumcised her first son and he had died and her second son and he had died; the third she brought before me. Seeing that he too was red, I said to her, "Wait until his blood is absorbed." So she waited until his blood was absorbed and then circumcised him and he lived; and they called him Nassan the Babylonian after my name.

On another occasion I visited the Province of Cappadocia, and a woman came before me who had circumcised her first

¹ his surrogate mother

son and he had died and her second son and he had died; the third she brought before me. Seeing that he was yellow, I examined him and saw no covenant blood in him. I said to her, "Wait until he is full blooded." She waited and then circumcised him and he lived; and they called him Nassan the Babylonian after my name.

We may bathe the infant (*using hot water*) both before and after the circumcision (*for otherwise, it was regarded as dangerous to the infant's life*), and sprinkle (*hot water*) over him by hand but not with a vessel.

Rabbi Elozar ben Azaryah said: A circumcised child may be bathed on the third day after circumcision which falls on *Shabbos*. [*How do we know that the infant is in danger, and therefore the Shabbos may be desecrated on its account (just as it would be for any critically ill person) by boiling the water for such a child?*] It is because it is written: *and it came to pass on the third day, when they were in pain*.

As for one who is doubtful (*for perhaps he was born in the eighth month of pregnancy, and the Rabbis were of the opinion that such a child could not possibly live, and therefore the Shabbos might not be violated for his circumcision*), and an *androgynous* (*a hermaphrodite – one that has both male and female genitals*) - we may not desecrate the *Shabbos* on their account; but Rabbi Yehudah permits it in the case of an *androgynous*.

The *Gemora* asks: But you say in the first clause that we may bathe (*which implies – even in the normal manner, whereas the next clause states that the sprinkling must be done by hand – in somewhat of an unusual manner*)?

Rav Yehudah and Rabbah bar Avuha both said: The *Tanna* is teaching how (*the bathing is to be done*), as follows: We may bathe the infant (*using hot water*) both before and after the circumcision. How? We may sprinkle (*hot water*) over him by hand but not with a vessel.

Rava objected: But the *Mishna* states: We may bathe (*indicating that it may be done in a normal manner*)?

Rather, said Rava, He teaches as follows: We may bathe the infant (*using hot water*) both before and after the circumcision – on the first day, in a normal manner. And on the third day after circumcision which falls on *Shabbos*, we may sprinkle (*hot water*) over him by hand but not with a vessel. Rabbi Elozar ben Azaryah said: A circumcised child may be bathed on the third day after circumcision which falls on *Shabbos*. It is because it is written: *and it came to pass on the third day, when they were in pain*. [*It emerges according to Rava that all Tannaim agree that bathing in a usual manner is permitted on the first two days; the argument is on the third day.*]

A *braisa* was taught in accordance with Rava: We may bathe the infant before and after the circumcision on the first day in the normal manner, but on the third day which falls on the *Shabbos* we may sprinkle (*hot water*) over him by hand. Rabbi Elozar ben Azaryah said: A circumcised child may be bathed on the third day after circumcision which falls on *Shabbos*, and though there is no proof for this, there is an allusion to this, for it is written: *and it came to pass on the third day, when they were in pain*. And when they sprinkle, they sprinkle neither with a cup, nor with a plate, nor with a vessel, but only by hand.

The *Gemora* notes that this (*last ruling*) is following the opinion of the first *Tanna*.

The *Gemora* asks: Why does he say 'though there is no proof, there is an allusion to it' (*doesn't it seem from the verse that the people of Shechem were in physical danger on the third day*)?

The *Gemora* answers: It is because an adult's flesh does not heal quickly, whereas an infant's does.

The *Gemora* relates: A certain person came before Rava, and he issued a ruling for him in accordance with his view (*that the infant may be bathed on the day of circumcision*). Then Rava fell ill. He thought, "What business did I have (*to disagree*) with the interpretation of the older scholars (*Rav Yehudah and Rabbah bar Avuha, and perhaps the illness is a punishment for this*)? Thereupon, the Rabbis said to Rava:



But a *braisa* was taught in accordance with the master? Rava replied: But our *Mishna* supports them, for it states: Rabbi Elozar ben Azaryah said: A circumcised child may be bathed on the third day after circumcision which falls on *Shabbos*. Now, it is well if you assume that the first *Tanna* means that we may merely sprinkle, therefore Rabbi Elozar ben Azaryah said to him that we may bathe. But if you understand that the first *Tanna* means that we may bathe on the first day and sprinkle on the third day, then instead of Rabbi Elozar ben Azaryah stating: we may bathe (*on the third day*); we may also bathe (*on the third day*) is required!?

DAILY MASHAL

Naming Children after Torah Leaders

In our sugya, we find that R' Nosson offered advice to two families who had lost children as a result of performing the bris milah before the child was healthy enough to endure it. He instructed them to postpone the bris until the children were ready. They followed his advice, and in both cases the children lived, and the parents named them both Nosson HaBavli, after R' Nosson.

We find many instances in the Torah in which children are named after events in the lives of their parents. For example, Moshe Rabbeinu named his son Gershom, explaining, "For I have been a sojourner (*ger*) in a foreign land," (Shemos 2:22). Later generations began to name their children after their forefathers instead. The Midrash explains, "R' Shimon ben Gamliel said: the earlier generations made use of Ru'ach HaKodesh. Therefore they chose [original] names based on the events that occurred to them. We do not have use of Ru'ach HaKodesh, therefore we name our children after our fathers," (Bereishis Rabbah, 37:7; See also Meoros HaDaf HaYomi, Kesubos 100a).

Nosson HaBavli was just one example of a Torah leader after whom parents named their children. However, he was not the first. Our Sages tell us that a convert who was drawn to Torah observance by Hillel, named his son Hillel (Avos D'Rebbe Nosson, ch. 15). Thousands of families whose

domestic strife was resolved through Aharon's HaKohen's intervention, named their sons after him (ibid, ch. 12).

An auspicious name brings success to its bearer: In Zecher David (cited in Otzer HaBris I, 341) the author writes that an auspicious name brings success to its bearer. For this reason, many have the custom to name their children after their rabbis. R' Elimelech of Lizensk *zt"l* said that when a tzaddik's name is given to a child, his light is awakened in the higher worlds, creating an influence to help the child resemble him.

Some authorities hold that it is preferable to name one's child after his rabbi, than after his father (Zecher David, ibid). Others hold that a child should only be named after the previous generations of his own family (Mishneh Halachos VI, 256). Sometimes parents are forced to name their child after someone in their family, whose lifestyle was such that the parents can only hope that their child will excel his namesake. In such a case, it is best that the parents intend that the name refer to a tzaddik who carried the same name (ibid, 253).

Naming a child after a tzaddik who endured misfortune:

The Poskim debate whether it is proper to name a child after a tzaddik who endured uncommon misfortune (see Teshuvos Afarkasta D'Aniya, 101; Otzer HaBris, ibid). For this reason, many refrain from naming their children after such tzaddikim as Yishayahu HaNavi, Yirmiyahu HaNavi, and Gedalyahu ben Achikam, who all suffered untimely deaths at the hands of their enemies. Those who do name their children after them, change the name slightly, removing the final *vav*. Thus, the names Yishaya, Yirmiya, and Gedalya are more common (see Beis Shmuel, hilchos gittin, Shemos Anashim:10; Teshuvos Chasam Sofer, E.H. II, 25; Otzer HaBris p. 263, 347).

Segulah for having children: Some hold that if a person davens to have a child, and resolves to name him after a tzaddik, this merit will assist his prayers (Birkas HaBanim, p. 533).