

10 Iyar 5780
May 4, 2020



Shabbos Daf 59

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

Still Usable

The *Gemora* offers the following reasons why a bell which has lost its clapper is still considered a utensil:

1. One can still use it to make noise by banging it on pottery (Rava and Rabbi Yosi the son of Rabbi Chanina).
2. One can still use it to serve a drink to a child (Rabbi Yochanan).

The *Gemora* challenges this statement of Rabbi Yochanan, which implies that a utensil need not serve its original function to remain a utensil from another statement of his.

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa* about a seat of a *zav*, who had an impure emission. The verse about this seat refers to “any utensil which he [the *zav*] will sit on...,” teaching that it only becomes impure as a seat when it is meant to be sat on. However, if he sat on a measuring vessel, it is not considered a seat, since he will not sit on it in the future, as people need it for measuring.

Rabbi Elozar and Rabbi Yochanan dispute the extent of this qualification. Rabbi Elozar says that it only applies to the impurity of a *zav*, but not of a corpse, while Rabbi Yochanan says it applies to both.

This indicates that Rabbi Yochanan would say that if a utensil does not function for its original purpose, it is no longer impure, as it will be used for something different now, contradicting his explanation of the broken bell’s impurity.

The *Gemora* therefore switches Rabbi Yochanan and Rabbi Yosi the son of Rabbi Chanina’s explanations of the bell.

The *Gemora* explains that we switch that statement and not the one in his dispute with Rabbi Elozar, since we have a proof that Rabbi Yochanan says that a utensil must serve its original purpose to remain impure.

The *Mishna* says that an animal’s metal shoe can become impure, and the following explanations are given to explain how it functions as usable by a person:

1. One can drink water from it (Rav).
2. One can anoint oil from it (Rabbi Chanina).
3. When one runs from battle, he can put it on to shield his feet from thorns and twigs (Rabbi Yochanan).

Since Rabbi Yochanan explains a use that matches its current function, this indicates that Rabbi Yochanan requires the original function to be intact.

The *Gemora* explains that Rav’s reason only applies to a shoe which is clean enough to drink from is a utensil, while Rabbi Yochanan’s only applies to one which is light enough to run away on. (58b – 59a)

A City of Gold

The *Mishna* said that a woman may not go out wearing a city of gold.

Rabbah bar bar Chanah explains that this refers to a gold replica of Yerushalayim, worn as jewelry, like the one Rabbi Akiva made for his wife.

The *braisa* cites a dispute of *Tannaim* about this jewelry. Rabbi Meir says that a woman may not go out wearing it, and if she does unintentionally, she must offer a *chatas* if she did so unintentionally. The Sages agree that she may not wear it, but say that she is not liable for a *chatas*, as it is only Rabbinically prohibited. Rabbi Eliezer says that a woman may wear it outside.

The *Gemora* explains that Rabbi Meir doesn't consider it an adornment, but rather a form of carrying, and therefore wearing it is a violation of the Torah prohibition of *Shabbos*. The Sages say it is considered an adornment, but it Rabbinically prohibited, out of concern that she will take it off to show others, and then wind up carrying it outside. Rabbi Eliezer says that it is generally worn by fancy women, who don't usually take off their jewelry to show it to others. (59a – 59b)

Head Band

The *Gemora* cites a dispute about a head band. Rav says that a woman may not wear it outside, while Shmuel says she may.

The *Gemora* says that both agree that she may not wear one that is totally metal, as that is substantial enough that she may show it others. They dispute whether she may wear a decorated strap. Rav says that it is mainly for the decoration, making it like jewelry, while Shmuel says it is mainly for the strap, making it like regular clothing.

Rav Ashi says that they agree that a decorated strap is permitted, but they dispute whether she may wear a metal one. Rav says she may not, as she may show it to someone, while Shmuel says that it is generally worn by fancy women, who do not show their jewelry to others.

Rav Shmuel bar bar Chanah told Rav Yosef that he explicitly taught him that Rav allowed a woman to wear a head band (*supporting Rav Ashi's version of the dispute, in which Rav does allow a decorated strap*).

They told Rav Acha that a very important tall limping scholar has arrived in Nehardea, and he has publicly ruled that a woman may wear a headband. He knew that the description was of Levi, who was large and limped. He therefore deduced that this meant that Rabbi Afas, who had been the head teacher in *Eretz Yisroel*, had died, and Rabbi Chanina had taken his place. As a result, Levi, who had been learning with Rabbi Chanina outside the lesson, had no one to learn with, and therefore moved to Nehardea.

The *Gemora* asks why he didn't think that Rabbi Chanina himself had died, leaving Levi alone.

The *Gemora* answers that if that happened, Levi would have entered Rabbi Afas's lesson, as he was his senior, and he only stayed outside out of respect to Rabbi Chanina. Furthermore, Rabbi Chanina could not have died before becoming the head teacher, as Rebbe had commanded on his deathbed that Rabbi Chanina would teach the lesson, and that had to be fulfilled, as Hashem fulfills the will of the righteous.

The *Gemora* says that after Levi permitted headbands in Nehardea, 24 women with headbands went out on *Shabbos*. After Rabbah bar Avuha permitted them in Mechuza, 18 women with headbands on one street went out on *Shabbos*. (59b)

Fancy Belts

Rav Yehudah quoted Rav Shmuel permitting *kamara* – a fancy belt.



Some say this refers to a decorated strap, and Rav Safra explains that it is permitted just like a garment adorned with gold.

Some say this refers to a metal one, and Rav Safra explains that it is permitted just like a royal belt of metal.

Ravina asked Rav Ashi whether one may wear such a belt on top of his regular one.

He told him this was equivalent to wearing two belts, which would be considered carrying, as one is unnecessary. (59b)

Other Prohibited Garments

Rav Ashi says that one may go out with a large piece of material only if it has small straps to fasten it well, since otherwise we are concerned that it will fall off, and he will carry it home.

The *Mishna* said that one may not wear a *katla*.

The *Gemora* explains that this refers to an adornment which gathers fringes (*a decorated garment which a woman fastens around her neck*).

The *Mishna* said that one may not wear *nezamim*, and the *Gemora* explains that this refers to nose rings. (59b)

Rings, With or Without Seals

The *Mishna* said that one may not wear a ring without a seal.

The *Gemora* infers that if it had a seal, it would not just be prohibited (*Rabbinically*), but would be a Torah violation of carrying, making her liable for a *chatas*, as it is not considered an adornment.

The *Gemora* challenges this from a *Mishna* which says that women's jewelry is a utensil which can become impure, listing the following jewelry: *katla*, earrings, rings (*with or without a seal*), and nose rings.

Rabbi Zeira resolves this by saying that our *Mishna* follows Rabbi Nechemiah, who says that the main part of a ring is its seal, while the other *Mishna* follows the Sages.

The *Gemora* cites the *braisa* about this dispute. The *braisa* says that a metal ring with a wooden seal is a utensil, while a wooden one with a metal seal is not, as we determine the nature of the item by the ring itself. Rabbi Nechemiah says the main element of:

1. a ring is its seal
2. a yoke is its pegs
3. a display pole used by a storekeeper is the nails used to hang merchandise
4. a ladder is its rungs
5. a balance scale is its chains, from which the balances hang

The Sages say that any item is determined by the part that it stands on (*i.e., the body of the ring, yoke, display pole, ladder, and the wood on which the chains of balance hang*).

Rava resolves it by saying that the other *Mishna* lists a ring with a seal as an example of a man's adornment, and a ring without a seal as an example of a woman's. Our *Mishna*, referring to a woman, therefore says that only one without a seal is considered jewelry and not carrying.

Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak resolves it by distinguishing between impurity, which applies to any utensil that serves a purpose, and *Shabbos*, where the ring must be considered an adornment to not be considered carrying. While a ring serves a purpose with or without a seal, it is only considered an adornment if it has no seal. (59b – 60a)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

A Gartel

The *Gemora* says that Ravina asked Rav Ashi if one may wear a *kamara* – fancy belt on top of his regular one, and he responded by saying, “you’re asking about wearing one belt on top of the other!”

Rashi cites two explanations of his answer. The first explanation is that he was saying that it is therefore prohibited, as one is unnecessary, and therefore carrying. The second explanation is that he was saying that it is permitted, as it is simply another belt, and therefore considered a garment. Rashi says that he thinks the first explanation is correct.

Tosfos (59b trai) challenges the first explanation from the *Gemora* later (120b), which lists the clothing one can wear out of a house which is fire, and includes two types of belts.

Tosfos answers that in that case, there is a garment in between each belt, making each one necessary for its garment.

The Beis Yosef (301) notes that the Rambam and Rif do not cite the *Gemora* about the *kamara*, and therefore infers that they followed the second explanation, and therefore permit two belts.

The Shulchan Aruch (301:36) rules that one may wear two belts, while the Rama cites Tosfos, permitting it only when each is a belt for a separate garment.

Rav Moshe Feinstein (Igros Moshe OH 2:76) applies this prohibition to one who wishes to wear a *gartel* to shul on *Shabbos*, as this would be tantamount to two belts.

Furthermore, he says that a *gartel* is not even a proper garment, as people only wear it for davening, and not for its appearance or function.

The Minchas Yitzchak (5:41) disagrees, and allows one to wear a *gartel* to shul on *Shabbos*. He argues that the reason people wear it for davening is because it inherently is a respectful garment, and it therefore has significance outside of davening. Furthermore, the fact that it is worn at all, even if just for davening, makes it a garment, and not a form of carrying. Finally, he notes that some people wear it for more than just davening, which also makes it a proper garment.

DAILY MASHAL

Total War

The Kotzker Rebbe zt”l said: A person who goes to war must be devoted to it with all his heart and soul and not think about his family at all – “he writes a bill of divorce for his wife” (see Rambam, Hilchos Melachim 7:15, who states that he who goes to war “should not think about his wife or children but erase their memory from his heart and be free of everything for war”). In the same way, said the Rebbe, should be the behavior of one who goes to war against his evil inclination – he mustn’t think about anything else.

In the Merit of Tzitzis

Nasan Detzutzisa is mentioned in the Gemara and the Rishonim explain that he was a penitent (see Rashi). Imrei Shamai explains (here) that it could be that he is the one mentioned in Menachos 44a, who repented because he was heedful of the mitzvah of tzitzis and Midrash Hagadol states that he was called Nasan. If so, this is Nasan Detzutzisa.