



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

**1. Mishnah: 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 covered the food before *Shabbos* and it became uncovered (even before *Shabbos*), he may cover the food again on *Shabbos*. One may fill a bottle (with cold water) and put it under a cushion or under a bolster.<sup>1</sup> (51a)

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

Rav Yehudah said in Shmuel's name: One may insulate cold (water, food, etc.). Said Rav Yosef: What does he inform us? We learned: One may fill a bottle (with cold water) and put it under a cushion or under a bolster. Abaye answered him: He tells us much, for if [we learned] from the Mishnah [alone], I might argue: That applies only to an object which it is not customary to insulate,<sup>2</sup> but not to an object which it is customary to insulate.<sup>3</sup> Therefore he informs us [that it is not so]. (51a)

**3. Rebbe and Rabbi Yosi**

Rav Huna said in the name of Rebbe that one is prohibited from insulating cold food on *Shabbos*. The Gemora asks: But

it was taught in a Baraisa: Rebbe permitted cold [water, etc.] to be insulated?—There is no difficulty: the one [ruling was given] before he heard it from Rabbi Yishmael son of Rabbi Yosi; the other after he heard it [from him]. For Rebbe was once sitting and he said that one is prohibited from insulating cold food on *Shabbos*. Rabbi Yishmael the son of Rabbi Yosi told Rebbe that father permitted insulating cold food on *Shabbos*. Upon hearing this, Rebbe said: The elder has already ruled (thus retracting his ruling in deference to Rabbi Yosi).

Rav Pappa said: See how much they care for each other! For if Rabbi Yosi had been alive, he would have sat submissively before Rebbe (although he was a greater scholar, Rebbe was the Nasi, the leader of the generation). This is evident from the fact that Rabbi Yishmael the son of Rabbi Yosi was his father's successor and he sat submissively before Rebbe. Nonetheless, Rebbe said that the elder has already ruled (and he deferred to the ruling of Rabbi Yosi). (51a)

**4. 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, Daru, 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. Rav Yosef asked: Why did he protest, after all, Rav Nachman was following the rulings of his teachers!? One [act]

<sup>1</sup> To prevent the sun from reaching and warming it.

<sup>2</sup> To heat it, as for instance cold water; therefore it may be insulated in order to keep it cold.

<sup>3</sup> For if permission is given to insulate it in order to keep it cold, the reverse too may be regarded as permitted.

being according to Rav, and the other according to Shmuel. According to Shmuel, for Rav Yehudah said in Shmuel's name: Cold [water, etc.] may be insulated. According to Rav, for Rav Shmuel son of Rav Yitzchak said in Rav's name: Whatever can be eaten in its natural state, raw, is not subject to [the prohibition against] the cooking of gentiles. The Gemora answers: Rav Ami felt that it is different since Rav Nachman was of great stature [and he 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)

5. The Gemora cites a Baraisa: Though it was said: One may not insulate [food] after nightfall even in a substance which does not add heat, yet<sup>4</sup> if one comes to add, he may add. How does he do it? Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel said: He may remove the sheets and replace them with blankets, or remove the blankets and replace them with sheets. And likewise did Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel said: Only the self-same pot was forbidden;<sup>5</sup> but if it [the food] was emptied from that pot into another, it is permitted: seeing that he cools it,<sup>6</sup> will he indeed heat it up!<sup>7</sup>

**6. The Baraisa continues regarding insulating, covering and muktzeh.**

If one insulated [food] in and covered [it] with a substance that may be handled on the *Shabbos*, or if he insulated [it] in something that may not be handled on the *Shabbos*, but covered [it] with something that may be handled on the *Shabbos*, he may remove [the covering] and replace it.<sup>8</sup> If one insulated [food] in and covered [it] with a substance that may

not be handled on the *Shabbos*, or if he insulated [it] in something that may be handled on the *Shabbos*, but covered it with something that may not be handled on the *Shabbos*, provided it was partly uncovered, he may take it [out] and replace [it];<sup>9</sup> but if not, it may not be removed and replaced.

Rabbi Yehudah said: Thoroughly beaten flax is the same as manure.<sup>10</sup> A kettle may be placed upon a kettle, and a pot upon a pot,<sup>11</sup> or<sup>12</sup> a pot upon a kettle or a kettle upon a pot; and the mouth [of the top vessel] may [also] be daubed over with dough:<sup>13</sup> not in order to make them hotter, but that [their heat] may be retained. And just as hot [food] may not be insulated, so may cold [food] not be insulated. Rebbe permitted cold [food] to be insulated. (51a – 51b)

- 7. One cannot deliberately crush snow or hail on *Shabbos* so that water should flow from it (and be collected). But he may place them into a cup or a bowl (containing liquid – to cool the liquid), and he need not be concerned.**

[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**

- 8. Mishnah: With what may an animal go out and with what may it not go out? A camel can go out on *Shabbos* with a halter, a female dromedary can go out with a *chatom*, *luvdekim***

<sup>4</sup> If the pot was already insulated.

<sup>5</sup> I.e., food may not be insulated after nightfall in the same pot in which it was cooked.

<sup>6</sup> By emptying it from one pot into another.

<sup>7</sup> Surely there is no fear of this, which is the reason for the usual prohibition; hence it is permitted.

<sup>8</sup> Since the cover can be removed, one can take hold of the pot.

<sup>9</sup> Since there is something by which he can grasp it.

<sup>10</sup> It adds heat, and therefore food may not be insulated in it even before the *Shabbos*.

<sup>11</sup> A kettle is of copper, and a pot is of earthenware.

<sup>12</sup> According to Rashi's corrected text.

<sup>13</sup> Kneaded before the *Shabbos*, so it shouldn't be muktzeh.

can go out with a *prumbia*, and a horse can go out with a collar. And all animals that 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.

[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 ones 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.]

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

And *luvdekim* can go out with a *prumbia*. Rav Huna explained that *luvdekim* are donkeys from Luv, and they may go out with an iron bit. (51b)

The *Gemora* relates that Levi sent money to Bei Chozo'el 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. (51b)

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. (51b)

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.

#### HALACHAH ON THE DAF

##### *Hatmanah*

The *Gemora* rules that one may be *matmin* (*insulate*) a cold food or drink on *Shabbos*. The Shulchan Aruch (Orach Chaim 257:6) clarifies that one may only do so when the insulation does not add heat (*eino mosif hevel*), and his whole purpose of doing so is to ensure that the item will not become too cold. If however it does add heat (*mosif hevel*), then it is forbidden to insulate it even prior to *Shabbos*.

In generations past, in order to keep the cooked food warm once it was taken off the fire, it was insulated. Although there isn't any *issur melachah* with *hatmanah* per se, the *Chachamim* nevertheless forbade it so as not to violate the *issur* of *bishul* in the event that before the insulation he would find that the item cooled off and then he would return it to the fire. Therefore one may not do *hatmanah* on *Shabbos* even when the insulation is not *mosif hevel* (ibid 257:1).

The *Chachamim* additionally forbade insulating an item in a place where it's *mosif hevel* even before *Shabbos*. The reason being since in the times of the *Gemora* the ideal place for *mosif hevel* was in the ash next to the fire, and he might come to stir the ash on *Shabbos* to heat up the insulated food, thereby violating a form of *mavir* (ibid).

Reb Moshe Feinstein (Igros Moshe Orach Chaim 4:74 - Hatmanah) explains that it is forbidden to insulate an item in a manner of *mosif hevel* even early Friday morning. [One cannot infer that Reb Moshe held that there isn't any problem of *hatmanah* if it was insulated before Friday, since the question he was addressing was regarding Friday morning. On the contrary, it is pretty clear from his wording that it would be forbidden to do so no matter when it was insulated.]

#### 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.