

8 Iyar 5780
May 2, 2020



Shabbos Daf 57

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

Mav the studing of the Daf Notes be a zechus for their neshamot and mav their souls find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

What can a woman go out with on *Shabbos* and what may she not go out with on *Shabbos*? [*The Sages decreed that a woman should not go out with certain ornaments on Shabbos, because she may come to remove it to show a friend, and she will then carry it four amos in a public domain.*]

A woman may not go out with woolen strands, linen strands, or straps around her head (*which were woven into the braids of a woman’s hair*); nor may she perform an immersion (*in a mikvah*) while wearing them unless she loosens them (*for otherwise, it would constitute a chatzitzah – an interposition between her body and the water*). She may not go out with frontlets or with head bangles, if they are not sewn (*to her hat; for then, she will not remove it, as she would not uncover her hair in public*). She may not go out with a woolen cap into the public domain (*but she may wear it in a courtyard, whereas all the others are forbidden even in a courtyard, lest she forget herself and go out into the public domain*), or with a golden city (*an ornament which was engraved with a picture of Jerusalem*), or with a *katla* (*type of necklace, similar to a choker*), or with nose rings, or with a ring which has no signet, or with a needle which is not pierced. Yet if she goes out with any of these, she is not liable to a *chatas* (*for it is merely a Rabbinic prohibition*).

The *Gemora* asks: Who mentioned anything about ritual immersion?

Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak said in the name of Rabbah bar Avuha: The *Tanna* (*of the Mishna*) is stating “what is the reason” (*for the halachah*), as follows: What is the reason that a woman may not go out with woolen or linen strands? It is because the Sages ruled that, on a weekday, she may not perform an immersion (*in a mikvah*) while wearing them unless she loosens them, and since on a weekday she may not

perform an immersion while wearing them, she may not go out with them on *Shabbos*, lest she happen to need an obligatory immersion, and she will untie them, and so come to carry them four *amos* in a public domain.

Rav Kahana inquired of Rav: What of open-link threads? [*These, due to their open construction, cannot be tied very tightly; therefore the question is whether they need to be loosened before immersing in a mikvah for they are regarded as a chatzitzah, and by corollary, must not be worn on Shabbos, or perhaps, due to their looseness the water is able to penetrate them and reach the hair, they are not regarded as a chatzitzah, and therefore, they may be worn on Shabbos?*]

He said to him: You speak of something woven? Whatever is woven was not included in the prohibition (*and therefore, they may be worn on Shabbos*).

The *Gemora* notes: It was stated likewise: Rav Huna son of Rav Yehoshua said: Whatever is woven was not included in the prohibition.

And others said: Rav Huna son of Rav Yehoshua said: I saw that my sisters are not particular about them (*to remove them before immersing in a mikvah; this demonstrates that they know that the water enters through them, and consequently, it is unnecessary to remove them before going to the mikvah, and they may be worn on Shabbos*).

The *Gemora* asks: What is the difference between the latter version and the former?

The *Gemora* answers: There is a difference where they (*the*



threads) are soiled. According to the version that whatever is woven was not included in the prohibition, these too are woven. But according to the version which bases it on his sisters not being particular; since they are soiled, one does indeed insist on removing them before immersing (and therefore, they would constitute a chatzitzah, and consequently, they could not go out while wearing them on Shabbos).

We learned a *Mishna* elsewhere: And the following constitute interpositions in the case of human beings (and immersion while wearing these things would be invalid): Woolen strands, linen strands, and straps around the maidens' heads. Rabbi Yehudah said: Strands of wool or of hair do not interpose, because the water enters through them.

Rav Huna observed: And we learned all of these with reference to maidens' heads.

Rav Yosef asked: What does this exclude? Shall we say it excludes strands of the neck (that they are not regarded as an interposition), and of what material (are they made from)? Shall we say that it excludes wool? The following question can be raised: if soft material (wool, that is tied) on hard (hair, which is a hard surface) forms an interposition, is there any question of a soft material upon soft (such as skin – that it constitutes an interposition, for, when tied, it will sink more readily into the skin)!? And if it excludes linen strands, we can object similarly: if hard material (linen, that is tied) on hard (hair, which is a hard surface) forms an interposition, is there any question of a hard material upon soft (such as skin – that it constitutes an interposition, for, when tied, it will sink more readily into the skin)!?

Rather, said Rav Yosef, Rav Huna's reason is because a woman does not strangle herself (and when tied around a woman's neck, they are tied loosely).

Abaye challenged him from the following *braisa*: Maidens may go out with the strands through their ears (they are inserted there after the ear is pierced for ear rings; this is to prevent the hole from closing up), but not with drawstrings around their necks. Now if you say that a woman will not

strangle herself, why can't she go out with drawstrings around their necks?

Ravina said: The reference here is to a *katla* which a woman does strangle herself with (she ties it very tightly around her neck), as she is pleased to have a fleshy appearance (for in those days, a double chin, and in general, a plump appearance was a good sign).

Rabbi Yehudah said (in the *Mishna* cited above): Strands of wool or of hair do not interpose, because the water enters through them.

Rav Yosef said in the name of Rav Yehudah in the name of Shmuel: The *halachah* is as Rabbi Yehudah in respect of strands of hair (that they do not constitute an interposition).

Abaye said to him: 'The *halachah* is ...' implies that they (the *Tanna Kamma* and R' Yehudah) argue regarding this as well (but they do not)!? And should you say that had he (R' Yehudah) not known the *Tanna Kamma* to be referring to strands of hair as well, he would not have referred to it either; but perhaps he argued with them in a "just as" (from analogy) format, as follows: just as you agree with me in the matter of strands of hair (that they do not constitute an interposition), so too should you agree with me in respect of woolen strands?

It was stated (like Abaye that they both agree that strands of hair do not constitute an interposition): Rav Nachman said in the name of Shmuel: The Sages agree with Rabbi Yehudah in respect to strands of hair (that they do not constitute an interposition). It was taught likewise in a *braisa*: Strands of wool interpose; strands of hair do not interpose. Rabbi Yehudah maintained: Strands of wool or of hair do not interpose.

Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak said: A *Mishna* proves this as well, for it teaches: A woman may go out with strands of hair (which are tied around her own hair), whether of her own hair or of her companion's. Now, who is the *Tanna* who holds like this? Shall we say that it is Rabbi Yehudah? Even strands of wool are permitted! Therefore, it must surely be the Rabbis,

which proves that they do not disagree in respect of strands of hair. This indeed proves it.

The *Mishna* had stated: She may not go out with a *totefes* (*frontlets; as the Gemora will explain*).

The *Gemora* asks: What is *totefes*?

Rav Yosef said: A charm (*worn*) to ward off the evil eye.

Abaye said to him: Let it be regarded as an amulet that is effective, and therefore permitted (*to go out with, as the Mishna below states*)?

Rather, said Rav Yehudah in the name of Abaye: It is a frontlet (*an ornament of beads worn on the forehead*).

It was taught likewise in a *braisa*: A woman may go out with a gilded hat (*for if she removes it, her hair will be uncovered; therefore, she is unlikely to remove it*), or with a frontlet or head bangles that are fastened to it.

The *Gemora* asks: What is a frontlet and what is a head bangle?

Rabbi Avahu said: A frontlet (*is an ornament that*) encompasses her head from ear to ear; a head bangle reaches (*down*) to her cheeks.

Rav Huna said: Poor women make them of various colored materials; wealthy women make them of silver and gold.

The *Mishna* had stated: She may not go out with a *kavul* (*woolen cap worn as an ornament, as the Gemora will explain*).

Rabbi Yannai said: I do not know what is this *kavul*: whether we learned of a slave's *kavla* (*an emblem which was placed on a slave's clothing in order to identify him as a slave*), but a woolen cap is permitted; or perhaps we learned of a woolen cap, and how much more so a slave's *kavla*?

Rabbi Avahu said: Reason supports the view that we learned

of a woolen cap. And it was taught likewise in a *braisa*: A woman may go out into a courtyard with a *kavul* and an *istema* (*which will be explained shortly*). Rabbi Shimon ben Elozar said: She may go out with a *kavul* into a public domain too. Rabbi Shimon ben Elozar stated a general rule: Whatever is worn beneath the hat, one may go out with it; whatever is worn above the hat, one may not go out with it. [*If it is under the hat, it is obviously an ornamental woolen cap, and not the slave's kavla – something that is placed on his clothing.*]

The *Gemora* asks: What is *istema*?

Rabbi Avahu said: It is *bizyonei*.

The *Gemora* asks: What is *bizyonei*?

Abaye said in the name of Rav: It is that (*a type of scarf*) which cover the stray hairs (*which protrude from her braids*).

DALY MASHAL

A Seal That Can't Be Forged

"Why is Hashem's seal the truth?" asked Rabbi Bunim of Pshischa zt"l. "Very simple," he replied, "this seal can never be forged and if it is forged, it is not the truth at all."

A Complete Error

They didn't say "Anyone who says that Reuven sinned errs" but "can only be mistaken". The matter has nothing to do with the truth at all (Pesach 'Einayim).