

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

- 1. Wool shearings of a warehouse that were used for insulation may not be moved, but if the householder prepared to use them, they may be moved.**

The *Mishna* stated that one may insulate food before Shabbos with wool shearings, but one is not allowed to move them. Rava said: They learned this only where one had not insulated [food] in them but if one had insulated food in them [on that Shabbos], they may be handled. A certain student of one day's standing¹ refuted Rava: We may insulate [food] ... in wool shearings, but they may not be handled. What then is done? The lid [of the pot] is lifted, and they [the shearings] fall off of their own accord.² Rather if stated, it was thus stated: Rava said: They learned this only when one had not designated them for insulating, but if he had, they may be handled. It was stated likewise: When Ravin came, he said in the name of Rabbi Yaakov in the name of Rabbi Assi ben Shaul in Rebbe's name: They learned this only where one had not designated them for [constant] insulating; but if he had designated them for [constant] insulating, they may be handled. Ravina said: They [the Sages of the Mishnah] learned in reference to the [merchant's] shelves.³ It was taught likewise: Wool shearings of the shelves may not be handled; but if a private individual

prepared them for use, they may be handled. [Summary: The *Gemora* offers two versions of how to interpret the *Mishna*. One explanation is that one may not move wool shearings unless he designated them for insulation. A different explanation offered is that even if he does not designate the wool shearings for insulation, as long as he used the shearings of insulation, he may move them. When the shearings are those that a merchant keeps on his shelves, then even if they are used for insulation, they still remain *muktzeh*.] (49b – 50a)

- 2. There are three opinions with regard to branches that are *muktzeh* and one decided to use them for sitting.**

Rabbah bar Bar Chanah taught a Baraisa before Rav: If one had branches that were designated for firewood and he decided to use them for sitting, he is required to tie the bundles together before *Shabbos* to render them non-*muktzeh*. Rabbi Shimon ben Gamliel said: He does not need to tie them (he maintains that merely intending to sit on the branches is sufficient). The *Gemora* states that three *Amoraim* debated this issue. Rav says that one must tie the bundles; Shmuel says intention to sit on the branches is sufficient, and Rav Assi says that sitting on them before *Shabbos* is all

¹ I.e., who had come to the Beis Medrash for the first time that day.

² This proves that even when food was insulated in the shearings on that day, they may not be handled.

³ Wool shearings stored in the merchant's shelves are certainly not designated for storing, and even if thus employed they will eventually

be replaced in the shelves. Hence they may not be handled even if used for insulating. But Rava referred to ordinary shorn wool: when one employs them for such a purpose, it is as though he designated them for insulating, and therefore they may be handled. Thus Ravina justifies the first version of Rava's statement.

that is required, even if he did not tie them nor intends to sit on them. The Gemora asks: As for Rav, it is well; he rules as the first Tanna: and Shmuel too [is not refuted, for he] rules as Rabbi Shimon ben Gamliel. But according to whom does Rav Assi rule?—He rules as the following Tanna. For it was taught in a Baraisa: One may go out on *Shabbos* in a public domain with combed wool or flax that he placed on his wound, as long as he soaked the wool or flax in oil and tied them with a string before *Shabbos*. If he did not dip them [in oil] and tie them with a string, he may not go out with them; yet if he had gone out with them for one moment before nightfall,⁴ even if he had not dipped or tied them with a string, he may go out with them [on the *Shabbos*]. [Summary: One may only go out in a public domain on *Shabbos* with a garment, and wearing a bandage is considered carrying. If one dips the bandage in oil before *Shabbos* and wraps the bandage with string so it does not fall off, one may go out with the bandage on *Shabbos*. If he even went out with the bandage for a short period before *Shabbos*, he may go out with them on *Shabbos* even if they were not dipped in oil and tied with a string. By wearing the bandage before *Shabbos*, he also has alleviated the *muktzeh* prohibition concerning wool and linen that are normally used for weaving or spinning.] (50a)

3. One may move straw on a bed with his body.

Rav Ashi said: We also learned like this in a Mishna: One is not allowed to move straw on a bed with his hand, (because the straw is *muktzeh*, as it is normally used for fashioning bricks or for fuel). One is only allowed to move the straw on the bed in an indirect manner, such as moving the straw with his body. He is allowed to move the straw with his hand if the straw is used for animal food and is not *muktzeh*, or if there was a pillow or sheet on the straw before *Shabbos*. Learn from this (as Rav Assi ruled). (50a)

4. Rabbi Chanina ben Akiva told his students before *Shabbos* to mentally designate branches for sitting on *Shabbos*.

And which Tanna disagrees with Rabbi Shimon ben Gamliel? Rabbi Chanina ben Akiva. For when Rabbi Dimi came, he said in the name of Ze'iri in Rabbi Chanina's name: One time Rabbi Chanina ben Akiva went to a certain place and found date palm branches that were prepared as firewood, and he told his disciples to mentally designate the branches on Friday so that they would be able to sit on the branches on *Shabbos*. [Ze'iri said:] And I do not know whether it was a house of feasting or a house of mourning. Since he says, '[I do not know] whether it was a house of feasting or a house of mourning', [it implies] only there, because they are occupied;⁵ but elsewhere it must be tied together; but if not, it is not [permitted]. [This act of intention only was effective because the people were busy and did not have time to tie the branches, but normally one must tie the branches before *Shabbos* in order to be allowed to sit on the branches on *Shabbos*.] (50a)

5. One may use earth on *Shabbos* for all his needs.

Rav Yehudah said: One may bring a basketful of earth [into his house before the *Shabbos*] and use it for all his needs (for the purpose of covering filth or other things in the house). Mar Zutra expounded in the name of Mar Zutra Rabbah: Only if he allotted a certain corner to it. Said the students before Rav Pappa: With whom [does this agree]: Rabbi Shimon ben Gamliel? For if with the Rabbis, — an act is required!⁶ — Rav Pappa answered: You may even say, with the Rabbis. The Rabbis ruled that an act is required only where an act is possible, but not where it is impossible. [If the earth is spread over the floor of the house, it is

⁴ Before the onset of *Shabbos*.

⁵ For that reason mere intention was sufficient.

⁶ The equivalent of tying the branches.

considered part of the ground and is *muktzeh*. Even the Chachamim, who normally require one to perform an action to render an object non-*muktzeh*, agree in this case that one cannot perform an action to designate earth. It is sufficient to have intention that the earth will be used on *Shabbos*.] (50a)

6. One may rub utensils to shine them with all substances, except for silver utensils with tartar.

The Gemora comments: let us say that this matter is a Tannaic dispute: One is allowed to shine silver with all materials on *Shabbos*, but one may not shine silver with tartar, (as silver is delicate, and rubbing silver with tartar smoothes the silver, which is forbidden on *Shabbos*). This implies that using niter or sand would be permitted. The Gemora asks: But surely it was taught, Niter and sand are forbidden? Surely they differ in this: one Master holds that an act is required,⁷ while the other Master holds that no act is required? No. All agree that no act is required, yet there is no difficulty: one is according to Rabbi Yehudah, who maintains: What is unintentional is forbidden; the other is according to Rabbi Shimon, who rules: What is unintentional is permitted. [According to Rabbi Yehudah, one may not use niter or sand to shine silver, because Rabbi Yehudah prohibits one to perform a forbidden act of labor, even if he is not intentionally smoothing the silver. Rabbi Shimon, however, maintains that one may shine silver with niter and sand, because one is permitted to perform an unintentional act of labor on *Shabbos*.] The Gemora asks: How have you explained the view that it is permitted? As agreeing with Rabbi Shimon! Then consider the last clause: But one must not cleanse his hair with them.⁸ Rather, if [this represents] Rabbi

Shimon, surely he permits it? For we learned in a Mishna: A nazir (who is prohibited from removing hairs from his head) is allowed to rub his hair with niter and sand.⁹ Rather both are according to Rabbi Yehudah, yet two Tannaim differ as to Rabbi Yehudah's view: one Tanna holds that in Rabbi Yehudah's view they [niter and sand] smooth, while the other Tanna holds that in Rabbi Yehudah's view they do not smooth. How have you explained them? As agreeing with Rabbi Yehudah! Then consider the second clause: 'But the face, hands, and feet are permitted';¹⁰ but surely it removes the hair?-If you wish, I can answer that it refers to a child; alternatively, to a woman, another alternative, to a eunuch [by nature].¹¹ (50a – 50b)

7. One is permitted to wash his face with various cleansing agents on *Shabbos*.

Rav Yehudah said: One is allowed to clean his face on *Shabbos* with ground brick. Rav Yosef said: It is permitted to use sesame pulp. Rava said: It is permitted to use crushed pepper. Rav Sheishes said that one can clean himself with *barda*. What is *barda*? Rav Yosef said: It is a mixture containing a third aloes, a third myrtle, and a third violets. Rav Nechemiah bar Yosef said that as long as only half is aloes, one may use it to clean himself. More than half aloes will remove hair and is forbidden to use on *Shabbos*. (50b)

8. One may not mutilate olives with a rock on *Shabbos* in order to sweeten them.

⁷ To show its purpose, and since such is impossible, they are forbidden, but not because there is anything objectionable in them per se.

⁸ Because it pulls hair out.

⁹ According to Rabbi Shimon a *nazir* is allowed to rub his hair with niter and sand, and a *nazir* can separate the hairs of his head with his hand,

but not with a comb. When he combs his hair he will certainly remove hair, but he is allowed to rub it and separate it by hand because he is not intentionally removing hair.

¹⁰ This follows the prohibition of cleansing the hair with niter or sand.

¹¹ None of these three have hair on the face or body.

Rav Sheishes was asked: Is it permissible to bruise olives on the Shabbos?¹² He answered them: Who permitted it then on weekdays? He holds [that it is forbidden] on account of the destruction of food. Shall we say that he disagrees with Shmuel; for Shmuel said: One may do whatever he desires with bread?-I will tell you: A loaf [crumbled] is not repulsive, but these are. [Summary: A person may use bread for whatever he needs, as bread does not become disgusting. One may not mutilate olives even during the week because the juice that emanates from the olives is disgusting.] (50b)

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

Ameimar, Mar Zutra, and Rav Ashi were sitting, when *barda* was brought before them. Ameimar and Rav Ashi washed with *barda* on *Shabbos*, and Mar Zutra did not wash with it. They said to him: Do you not accept Rav Sheishes' ruling that *barda* is permitted? Rav Mordechai answered them: Exclude the Master [Mar Zutra], who does not hold it [permitted] even on weekdays. His view is as what was taught: One may scrape off the dirt scabs and wound scabs that are on his flesh because of the pain; [but] if in order to beautify himself, it is forbidden. And whose view do they adopt? — As what was taught: One must wash his face, hands, and feet daily in his Creator's honor, for it is said: Hashem made everything for his own purpose. [Summary: 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)

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

The Mishna had stated: Rabbi Elozar ben Azaryah said: the basket is tilted on one side and [the food] is removed, lest one lift [the lid of the pot], etc. Rabbi Abba said in Rabbi Chiya bar Ashi's name: all agree that if the cavity becomes disordered, we may not replace [the pot]. We learned: but the sages say: one may take and replace [it]. What are the Circumstances? If the cavity is not disordered, the Rabbis [surely] say well? Hence it must mean even if the cavity becomes disordered!-No. In truth, it means that the cavity was not disordered, but here they differ as to whether we fear. One master holds: we fear lest the cavity become disordered; while the other master holds: we do not fear. [Summary: 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)

11. 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.] Rav Huna said: If one placed the plant in the earth, removed the plant, and placed it back in the

¹² May olives be bruised on a stone, which improves their taste?

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*. Shmuel said: [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*. Mar Zutra-others state Rav Ashi-said: Yet it is well [to insert a knife] between the branches of a reed hedge.¹³ Rav Mordechai said to Rava, Rav Katina raised an objection: If one stores turnips or radishes under a vine, provided some of their leaves are uncovered, he need have no fear on account of kil'ayim, or Shemittah,¹⁴ or ma'asros,¹⁵ and they may be removed on the *Shabbos*.¹⁶ This is indeed a refutation. (50b – 51a)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Children Playing in a Sandbox on Shabbos

The *Gemora* states that one can use earth on *Shabbos* for all his needs as long as he designated a corner of the house for the earth. This renders the earthy prepared and he can then use the earth for his needs on *Shabbos*. The *Ritva* writes that if he spread the earth around the house, the earth is not considered prepared because the earthy is subordinate to the earth of the house that is stepped on.

¹³ We do not fear that in removing it he may scrape off the peel of the reeds, which is forbidden.

¹⁴ If these are from the sixth year and are placed in the earth in the seventh, they are not subject to the laws of Shemittah produce.

¹⁵ Having been tithed before they were placed in the earth they are not to be retithed on removal, as though this were a

If the earth is placed in middle of the house and people will not trample on that earth, it is considered as if he designated a corner for the earthy and the earth will not be *muktzeh*.

The Mishnah Berurah writes that even if his intention when he brought the earth into the house was to use the earth for his needs and then he spread the earth throughout the house, the earth is now subordinate to the earth of the house and is rendered *muktzeh*. If he would need to remove some of the spread earth on *Shabbos* for his use, he would not be allowed to use the earth. The Mishnah Berurah quotes Rabbi Akiva Eiger who writes that concerning a stone or wood floor, one may use the earth that is found on the floor for his needs. Rabbi Akiva Eiger himself is not convinced of this leniency, as even the earth is considered part of the earth of the house and is meant for walking on, rendering even this earth *muktzeh*.

The Shmiras Shabbos Kihilchoso writes that sand by the sea is *muktzeh*, and even sand in a construction site that children play in is *muktzeh*, because a child cannot designate something for use on *Shabbos*. Furthermore, the sand in the construction site does not belong to the children. Sand in a sandbox that children play in is not *muktzeh* and can be moved on *Shabbos*. One is not required to protest against children playing in a sandbox on *Shabbos* with regard to the prohibition of *muktzeh*. There is room to suggest that playing in a sandbox constitutes the prohibition of building that is forbidden on *Shabbos*.

new harvest.

¹⁶ On this account the condition is made that some of the leaves must be uncovered, for otherwise it would be necessary to remove the earth, which may not be done. But the other statements hold good even if they are entirely covered.

Hopscotch on Shabbos

Children often find amusement in simple, valueless objects such as apricot pits, popsicle (ice-) sticks and hopscotch rocks, articles that have no value to an adult. The question must be asked whether these objects might in fact be *muktzeh* on *Shabbos*. Valueless objects are usually *muktzeh*, since they are not prepared (*muchan*) for any use. Our *sugya* discusses how one may prepare them before *Shabbos* for use, thus allowing him to move them on *Shabbos*.

For example, palm branches are *muktzeh*. Yet, the *Gemora* states that if a person designates them for a use that is permitted on *Shabbos*, such as sitting upon them, the prohibition of *muktzeh* falls away. The Rishonim note that elsewhere (142b), the *Gemora* states that when a rock is used to cover a barrel, it nevertheless remains *muktzeh*. Furthermore, even the barrel becomes *muktzeh*, since it serves as a base for the rock. What is the difference between preparing a rock for use as a barrel-cover, which is ineffective, and preparing branches for use as seats?

The Rishonim offer two answers. The Rashba (Teshuvos V 225) explains that preparing *muktzeh* objects is only effective if one prepares them for permanent use. In the case of the palm branches, they were designated to be used continuously. Therefore, they became *muchan*, like any other utensil, and the prohibition of *muktzeh* fell away. In the case of the rock, it was to be used as a barrel-cover only for that one *Shabbos*. Therefore, the prohibition of *muktzeh* remained.

The Ran (23) writes that it is sufficient to prepare an object for one-time use. However, one must prepare it for a function that is commonly performed with this object. In the time of the *Gemora*, it was common to use palm branches for seats, but it was uncommon to use a rock for a barrel-cover.

The Shulchan Aruch (O.C. 308:22) cites both opinions, and the Mishna Berurah (s.k. 97) rules that when it is

necessary, one may rely on the Ran. Note that when a rock or a popsicle stick is designated as a toy to be used indefinitely, not just for a day, all opinions agree that the prohibition of *muktzeh* falls away.

A child's intent: We have seen that the mere thought and intent of a person to designate an object for use eliminates the prohibition of *muktzeh*. However, we must question whether the intent of a minor has sufficient halachic weight. Is it enough for a child to designate his rocks and sticks as toys, or need an adult designate them for him? Tosfos *Shabbos* (end of introduction to 308) rules that although a child's deeds are effective, his thoughts are halachically insignificant (See Pri Megadim, general introduction to hilchos Yomtov, section two, 1:6). Thus, he would need to perform an action to prepare his rocks, such as polishing or shaping them. His mere intention to use them is insufficient. Alternatively, a parent may prepare his child's rocks for use with a mere thought, designating it from now on as a toy (See Nachalas Yisrael 15:7).

Some suggest that a child need not perform an action that changes the shape or outward appearance of his rocks and sticks. The simple act of gathering them together is sufficient action to designate them as toys (see Halachah Aruchah p. 118).

The Beis Yosef's opinion: The Shulchan Aruch rules that an object designated for playing remains *muktzeh*! "It is forbidden to play with a ball on *Shabbos* and Yomtov" (O.C. ibid, 45). He understood that the prohibition of *muktzeh* can only be lifted by preparing an item for a significant function, not merely for playing (Mishna Berurah s.k. 157). Designating rocks and sticks for toys is therefore ineffective. Sefardim should follow this opinion, and instruct their children not to play with *muktzeh* objects, even if they had been designated for use as toys. Ashkenazim, who follow the rulings of the Remo, must inquire whether the children had done any action to prepare the object for play, or if an adult had designated it for play.