



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”h**

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

## HIGHLIGHTS

1. A sack is susceptible to *tum’ah*, even though it is not woven. A rope and measuring-string are not. The rule is that to be susceptible to *tum’ah*, something must be made of spun thread that is twisted, although not necessarily woven.
2. An *agil* is an ornamental brassiere. A *kumaz* is an ornament that covers a woman’s private area. When the Jews attacked Midyan after they caused the Jews to sin with the daughters of Moav, the soldiers did not sin with the Midyani women. However, they wanted to bring an atonement-offering for the sin of gazing at the women. It is just as prohibited to gaze at a woman’s little finger for pleasure as it is to gaze at her private area.
3. **Mishna:** A woman may go into the public domain on *Shabbos* with twisted hairs tying her hair in place, regardless of who the hair came from. She may wear a frontlet or head bangles when they are tied to her hat. She may wear an ornamental hat or wig in a courtyard, but not in the public domain. She may go out with cotton in her ears, or shoes, or as a tampon, and she may go out with a pepper or chunk of salt in her mouth, but she may not put them in on *Shabbos*. Rabbi Meir allows a woman to go out with a gold tooth, but the Chachamim disagree.
4. A young woman may not go out with the hair of an older woman used to tie her hair, nor may an old woman go out with a younger woman’s hair as a tie.
5. The author of our *Mishna* holds that the only things a woman is prohibited from wearing in the public domain that she may wear in a courtyard are an ornamental hat and wig. Rav rules like our *Mishna*. However, Rabbi Anani bar Sasson cites the *Tanna* Rabbi Yishmael bar Yosi as holding that all the items mentioned in the *Mishna* which a woman may not wear in the public domain are permitted in a courtyard. The early Sages prohibited a menstruant from wearing makeup or colored clothing, but Rabbi Akiva permitted it.
6. Rav Yehudah said in the name of Rav that anything prohibited due to *mar’is ayin* is prohibited even in private. This follows the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Shimon, but the *Tanna Kamma* of the *braisa* permitted acts of *mar’is ayin* in private.

## COMMENTARY

1. The *Gemora* cites a *braisa* discussing what types of cloth are susceptible to *tum’ah* from a *sheretz*.<sup>1</sup> The Torah states clearly that a sack is susceptible

<sup>1</sup> Certain types of creeping creatures are called *sheretzim*, and are *tamei* when they die.

to *tum'ah*, even though it is made of braided, rather than woven, thread.

The *braisa* then derives from a *gezeirah shavah* that any spun thread that is twisted at least to the level of being braided is susceptible both to the *tum'ah* of a *sheretz* and the full *tum'ah* of a corpse. This includes the breast strap and girth used to secure packs on horses and donkeys (*the breast strap went around the neck, while the girth went below the belly of the animal*). Ropes and measuring strings,<sup>2</sup> however, are not susceptible to *tum'ah*, since they are braided from unspun hairs.

The *Gemora* points out that this is a *gezeirah shavah mufneh*, meaning a case where one or both of the verses used to make the *gezeirah shavah* are superfluous, since where the verses are not superfluous, one may not derive laws from a *gezeirah shavah* unless no question can be asked on the logic of the laws being derived.

2. The Torah discusses the subject of *tum'ah* of a corpse while telling us the story of the war against Midyan. Hashem commanded us to destroy them after they engineered a plot to cause the Jews to sin with the daughters of Moav. When the soldiers came back from the war, they wanted to bring an atonement-offering in the form of a dedication of the jewelry they took from the spoils of war. Among the spoils, the Torah mentions *agil* and *kumaz*. The *Gemora* now explains that the *agil* was an ornamental brassiere, and a *kumaz* was a form of ornament that covered a woman's private area. Seeing that the soldiers brought the women's jewelry to the Mishkan, Moshe suspected that they had sinned with the Midyani women, but they informed him that they wanted atonement merely for gazing at

the women.

Rav Sheishes said: Why is it that the Torah listed together, in the loot from Midyan, jewelry worn on the genitals (*kumaz*) and jewelry worn on the visible parts of the body (*a ring*)? We derive from the juxtaposition of a ring with a *kumaz* that it is just as forbidden to gaze at a woman's little finger as it is to gaze at her private area.

3. **Mishna:** A woman may go into the public domain on *Shabbos* with twisted hairs tying her hair in place, whether the hair that she uses is her own, from a friend, or even from an animal. She may wear a frontlet or head bangles<sup>3</sup> when they are tied (to her hat<sup>4</sup> – Rashi). She may wear an ornamental hat<sup>5</sup> or wig in a courtyard. She may go out with cotton<sup>6</sup> in her ears to absorb earwax, or in her shoes to provide comfort, or she may go out with cotton as a tampon. She may go out with a pepper or chunk of salt in her mouth,<sup>7</sup> but she may not put them in on *Shabbos*.<sup>8</sup> Thus, if they fall out, she may not put them back in. A false tooth is called a *toseves*. Rabbi Meir allows a woman to go out with a gold *toseves*, and the Chachamim disagree. According to the first interpretation of the *Mishna* as presented in Rashi, this is all the *Mishna* meant to say. According to the second interpretation in Rashi,

<sup>3</sup> The *Gemara* earlier (57b) explained that a frontlet is an ornament made of some metal (gold, in this case) that is tied on a woman's forehead from ear to ear. Head bangles are a sort of wrap that drapes bangles on either side of her head down to the jaw.

<sup>4</sup> *Sevachah*, a type of hat made of netting.

<sup>5</sup> The *Gemara* earlier (*ibid.*) debated whether this term – *kevul* – refers to a slave's mark or an ornamental hat for women, made of wool. Here, Rashi tells us, all opinions agree that it refers to the ornamental hat.

<sup>6</sup> *Moch* refers really to any sort of fuzzy material, not just cotton.

<sup>7</sup> The pepper was used as a breath freshener, while the salt was used to heal a tooth illness.

<sup>8</sup> The *mishnah* uses the term *lichatchila* here, which literally means "at the first," and usually connotes the fact that although such a thing should not be done, if it is done, there are no halachic consequences. Occasionally, this word is used to connote that it is *preferable* not to do something, but that does not seem to be the intent here.

<sup>2</sup> These strings were made to specific lengths, and were used to measure the lengths of various plots of land.

however, this law is prefaced by stating that a woman may go out on *Shabbos* with a real tooth that is being used in place of one that fell out. Since the tooth does not look any different than any other, there is no concern that she will remove it out of embarrassment.

4. The *Mishna* had said that a woman may go out with twisted hairs used to tie her hair up, whether the hairs are hers, her friend's, or even an animal's. The *Gemora* explains that there is more concern that she might remove the hairs if they are her friend's, since they do not appear natural and she might be embarrassed. For the same reason, there is even more concern that might remove the hairs if they come from an animal. The *Mishna* thus had to speak out that even animal hairs are permitted. However, the *Gemora* cites a *braisa* stating that a young woman may not go out with the twisted hairs of an older woman, nor may an older woman wear the twisted hairs of a young woman.
5. Rav said that the only cases of something that a woman may wear in a courtyard, but not in the public domain, are the ornamental hat and wig of our *Mishna*.

Rav Anani bar Sasson quoted Rabbi Yishmael, however, as saying that in *all* the cases mentioned in the *Mishna* where a woman is forbidden to take something into the public domain, she may go into a courtyard with it.

The *Gemora* then points out that this is clearly not the position of our *Mishna*. Rav Anani, however, quoted Rabbi Yishmael bar Yosi, a Tanna who disagreed with our *Mishna*.

The *Gemora* then asks why Rav (*and the author of our Mishna*) allowed these few adornments in a courtyard, and answers that the Sages allowed

her a few adornments so that her husband will not become disgusted with her.

Similarly, the *Gemora* cites a *braisa* stating that the early Sages forbade a menstruant woman to apply eyeliner, rouge,<sup>9</sup> or to adorn herself with colored clothing. Rabbi Akiva, however, stated that this cannot be so, for a woman must be allowed some adornments so that her husband will not become disgusted with her. Thus, Rabbi Akiva provides a different interpretation of the verse that the early Sages used in their ruling – the verse means that she may not come close to her husband, even after the seven days are up, until she immerses in a *mikvah*.

6. Rav Yehudah said in the name of Rav that anything that is forbidden because of *mar'is ayin* – i.e. out of concern that an onlooker might mistakenly conclude that a forbidden activity is taking place – is forbidden even when done in private, where nobody can see.

The *Gemora* then brings a *braisa* showing that this is actually the subject of a debate. The *Tanna Kamma* rules that one whose clothing became wet on *Shabbos* from rain may spread them out to dry in a place where the public cannot see them. He may not spread them out where the public can see, as there is concern that someone might think the clothes were washed on *Shabbos*. Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Shimon, however, prohibit spreading the clothes out even where the public cannot see them.

## INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

### *Pepper in the Mouth*

The *Mishna* said that a woman may go out with a pepper

<sup>9</sup> A type of makeup applied to the face to make it redder – Rashi.



or lump of salt in her mouth, but she may not put the pepper or salt in her mouth on *Shabbos*, nor may she return them to her mouth on *Shabbos* if they fell out.

Tosafos cites Rabbeinu Poras as explaining that the reason for this prohibition is that the use of pepper and salt are forms of healing, which are prohibited on *Shabbos*.

Tosafos, however, rejects this opinion, based on a *Gemora* in Eruvin (102b) which implies that returning a poultice to its place when it falls off is only forbidden if the poultice is has a creamy consistency, where there is a concern that it will be spread. Thus, if the only prohibition of putting the pepper and salt in her mouth were due to its being a form of healing, it should be permitted to return the pepper or salt to her mouth if it fell, but the *Mishna* forbids this.

Tosafos therefore explains that the reason for this prohibition is due to *mar'is ayin* – it appears as if the woman put the pepper in her mouth specifically to find a way to carry it in the public domain. If so, says Tosafos, then the cases where a woman uses cotton in her ears, shoes, etc, should also be forbidden to apply on *Shabbos*.

According to Tosafos' reasoning, we may have the answer to another question, as well. Rav Yehudah cites Rav at the end of our Daf as discussing the *halachos* of *mar'is ayin*. But *mar'is ayin* does not seem to be the topic of our *Gemora* at all! If we accept Tosafos' reasoning, however, then Rav Yehudah is a fitting introduction to the very next topic discussed in the *Gemora* – that of the cotton placed in a woman's ear.

According to Rabbeinu Poras, the connection to this *Gemora* might lie in the *type* of statement made, and by whom. Rav had just said that wherever a woman may not go into the public domain wearing something, she may not even go into a courtyard wearing it (with the exception of the ornamental hat and wig mentioned in the *Mishna*). Thus, the *Gemora* now presents a statement by Rav Yehudah, citing Rav, where another ruling is

claimed to be absolute. Just as Rav said that those things a woman may not take into the public domain are also forbidden in a courtyard, he also says that those things which are forbidden because of what an onlooker might see are forbidden even when done in private.

## ***Niddah* Wearing Makeup or Colored Clothing**

The *Gemora* cites a debate between the “early Sages” and Rabbi Akiva about whether a menstruant may wear makeup or colored clothing. The debate centers around a verse, which describes a woman “whose flow emerges while she is a *niddah*.” Because the Torah uses the term *niddah*, the early sages understood that she must remain completely separated from her husband.

Rashi explains that while the term *niddah* is generally used to refer to a menstruant, the term actually means separation or quarantine. Thus, the early Sages understood that a menstruant should be “quarantined” from her husband, in the sense that anything that draws them close should be forbidden. Rabbi Akiva understands that this cannot be the meaning of the verse, however. He therefore explains that the verse should not be read as “one whose flow emerges while she is separated,” but rather as “one whose flow emerges *is* separated” until she immerses herself, even though the flow has stopped and seven days have already gone by.