



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"n

Tzvi Gershon ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o"n

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

HIGHLIGHTS

1. The *Mishna* had said that one may not go into the public domain with *sirion*, *kasda*, or *magefayim*. *Sirion* is chain mail, and *kasda* is a helm, a leather hat covered by steel. *Magefayim* are steel boots used in war.
2. **Mishnah.** A woman may not go out with a pierced needle or signet ring. She may not go out with a *coliar* or a *koveles*,¹ or with a flask of balsam oil. Rabbi Meir said that if a woman goes out with any of these, she must bring a *korban chatas*. The Chachamim said she does not bring a *chatas* for carrying a *koveles* or a flask of balsam.
3. The *Mishna* said a woman may not go out with a signet ring. Ulla holds that a man may not go out with a regular ring, and that men and women are two completely different species. Rabbi Meir holds that *tefillin* should be worn by women, since he holds that *tefillin* are worn on *Shabbos* and at night. Rabbi Yirmiyah holds that only a woman who regularly uses a signet ring must bring a *korban chatas* if she go into the public domain wearing one on *Shabbos*. Rava says all women must bring a *korban*.
4. A *coliar* is a type of pendant. A *koveles* is a scarf soaked in balsam oil. Rabbi Meir says that a woman

who wears a *koveles* in the public domain on *Shabbos* must bring a *korban chatas*. The Chachamim said she does not need to bring a *korban*, but that it is still forbidden to wear it. Rabbi Eliezer said that it is permitted to wear it. He also permitted a flask of balsam. Rabbi Meir (*and presumably Rabbi Eliezer as well*) forbid a woman from carrying a key in the public domain on *Shabbos*. Rabbi Eliezer did not permit a woman to go out with a *koveles* or flask of balsam unless some of the balsam remains in the container. If the flask is empty, however, she must bring a *korban* if she carries it. According to Rav Adda bar Ahavah, Rabbi Eliezer also required a *korban* for carrying a container which had less than a *grogeres* of food in it. Rav Ashi disagrees.

5. Rav Yehudah said in the name of Shmuel that balsam oil is the most desirous of oils. Abaye said that the only pleasures that were forbidden in memory of the Destruction were those that bring both pleasure and joy. Rabbi Yosi said in the name of Rabbi Chanina that some Jews in the first Beis Hamikdosh era were guilty of urinating near their beds, which is forbidden on the grounds of being disgusting. Rabbi Avahu held that the sin described in the verse was that they would trade wives.
6. Three things bring poverty: one who urinates near his bed, one who is not careful to wash his hands properly, and one whose wife curses him to his face.

1 These terms are defined in the the *Gemora* below.

7. One of the sins that caused the Destruction of the first Beis Hamikdosh was adultery. The *Gemora* derives that many of the punishments the Jews suffered at that time were directly related to this sin.

COMMENTARY

1. The *Gemora* on the previous Daf tried to show from the fact that one may carry a *kemea* in the public domain on *Shabbos* that it may be brought into a bathroom. If one may carry in the public domain, there must not be a concern that one will remove it. But if one must remove the *kemea* in order to go to the bathroom, there ought to be a worry that he might end up carrying it, just as there is such a concern regarding *tefillin*. The *Gemora* answered that one may actually carry a *kemea* outright in the public domain, since it is for healing. The *Gemora* rejects this answer, however, for Rav Oshiya taught in a *braisa* that one may not carry it in a public domain. The *Gemora* therefore explains that the *Mishna* that permitted *kemeas* to be brought into the public domain on *Shabbos* referred specifically to *kemeas* covered in leather. Since the leather covers the holy words, the *kemea* may be brought into a bathroom, and there is thus no concern that it will be taken off and carried. However, if the *kemea* is not covered, the *Gemora* seems to hold that it may not be worn in the public domain on *Shabbos*, or brought into a bathroom. The *Gemora* then asks why *tefillin*, whose parchments are covered in leather, may not be brought into the bathroom. It answers by citing Abaye, who writes that the letters of Hashem's name that are displayed in the leather of the box and

straps of the *tefillin shel rosh* are Siniatic laws (*which give them status as legitimate letters as opposed to mere allusions*). Thus, the name of Hashem is written in the leather as well as the parchment.

2. The *Mishna* had said that one may not go into the public domain with *sirion*, *kasda*, or *magefayim*. *Sirion* refers to chain mail. Rav explains that *kasda* is a helm, a leather hat covered by steel, and *magefayim* are steel boots used in war.
3. **Mishnah.** A woman may not go out with a pierced needle or signet ring. She may not go out with a *coliar* or a *koveles*,² or with a flask of balsam oil. Rabbi Meir said that if a woman goes out with any of these, she must bring a *korban chatas*. The Chachamim said she does not bring a *chatas* for carrying a *koveles* or a flask of balsam. (62a)
4. The *Mishna* said a woman may not go out with a signet ring. The implication is that they may go out wearing a regular ring. Ulla says that the reverse applies to a man. [Men may wear signet rings in the public domain on *Shabbos*, but not regular rings. Both of these laws are derived from the norms for men and women, since that which is unusual for someone to wear is not considered an adornment.] Thus we see that Ulla holds that whatever is fit for a man is not fit for a woman, and whatever is fit for a woman is not fit for a man. Rav Yosef objected: Shepherds may go out [on the *Shabbos*] with sackcloths; and not only of shepherds did they [the Sages] say [thus], but of all men, but that it is the practice of shepherds to go out with sacks.³ Rather, says Rav Yosef, Ulla considers women “a nation all to themselves” - i.e. the two genders are so different

² These terms are defined in the *Gemora*. A *coliar* is a type of pendant necklack (see Rashi to 57a, s.v. *Ir shel zahav*), and a *koveles* is a type of scarf soaked in balsam oil used as a deodorant.

³ The *Gemora* proves, however, that if a certain group of people normally wears a certain type of adornment, it is considered an adornment for everyone. Thus, the *Gemora* asks why a woman may not wear a signet ring, or a man a regular ring, since this is a normal form of adornment for the opposite gender.

that the above rule about adornments for various groups does not apply. Abaye then cites a *braisa* which states that both men and women may put on *tefillin* to bring them into a house on *Shabbos*, if they are found by the wayside.⁴ Now if you say that women are a separate people, surely it is a positive command limited in time, and from all such women are exempt? The *Gemora* answers that Rabbi Meir (*who is assumed to be the author of the braisa*) holds that *tefillin* are worn at all times, even *Shabbos* or at night, thus it is a positive mitzvah not limited by time, and therefore women are also required to wear *tefillin*.⁵ (62a)

The *Gemora* then asks why, in any case, the woman who wears a signet ring should have to bring a *korban chatas*. The normal method of carrying an object is not to wear it, so her wearing this ring constitutes carrying in an unusual manner, which is only forbidden Rabbinically.⁶

Rabbi Yirmiyah answers that we are dealing with a woman who is an overseer.⁷ Rabbah said [to him]: You have answered the case of a woman; but what can be said of a man?⁸ Rava (alternately: Rabbah bar Chanah) said that since sometimes, a man gives a signet-ring to his wife to take it to a chest, and she places it on her hand until she comes to the chest.

And sometimes a woman gives a non-signet ring to her husband to take it to an artisan to be repaired, and he places it on his hand until he comes to the artisan. [Men and women wear their spouse's rings when transporting them somewhere, this is considered a normal method of carrying rings.⁹ Thus, according to Rava, every woman is required to bring a *korban* if she wears a signet ring (or a man wears a regular ring), since he considered this a normal way to carry rings.] (62a)

5. The Mishnah had stated: She may not go out with a coliar or a spice bundle. Rav said that a *coliar* is a type of pendant, and both he and Rav Assi said a *koveles* is a scarf soaked in balsam oil used as a deodorant. The *Gemora* cites a *braisa* stating that Rabbi Meir required a woman who goes out with a *koveles* to bring a *korban*, while the Chachamim forbade going out but did not require a *korban*, and Rabbi Eliezer permitted the *koveles* entirely, as well as a permitting a flask of balsam. In what point do they argue? Rabbi Meir does not consider the *koveles* to be an adornment, but rather looks at it as a load, for which one must bring a *korban*. The Chachamim, however, considered a *koveles* to be an adornment. They only forbid it on the grounds that the woman might take it off to show someone. Rabbi Eliezer is not concerned that the woman might

⁴ Thus, since *tefillin* are an adornment for men, it seems that women may wear them on *Shabbos*.

⁵ Women are usually considered exempt from the mitzvah of *tefillin* since they are not required to fulfill most mitzvos that only apply during certain times. Since Rebbe Meir says that *tefillin* are worn at night and on *Shabbos*, he does not consider it a time-bound mitzvah.

⁶ That is, since it is not considered normal for women to wear signet-rings, a woman who wears one is only considered to be "carrying" it, rather than wearing it as an adornment. But "carrying" is not usually done by attaching an object as if it were clothing. Thus, although she is "carrying" the ring, she is doing so in a manner that is not considered usual.

⁷ And uses a signet ring often. Although the fact that she personally uses the ring often does not change the rule that a signet ring is not considered an adornment for women, it does mean that it is not considered unusual for her to carry it by wearing it.

⁸ Ulla states that a man is culpable for wearing a non-signet ring; but that too is a backhanded manner?

⁹ I.e. since people who cannot be considered to be "wearing" the ring as an adornment do, nevertheless, sometimes wear the rings they are "carrying," this is considered a normal way to carry them.

remove it, since it is there to disguise a foul smell and is thus embarrassing to be seen with. [Presumably for the same reason, Rabbi Eliezer permits a woman to wear a flask of balsam oil.] But it was taught: Rabbi Eliezer declares [her] non culpable on account of a koveles and a flask of balsam oil? — There is no difficulty: the one [ruling] is in reference to Rabbi Meir; the other, in reference to the Rabbis. [Thus:] when referring to Rabbi Meir, who maintained that she is liable to a chatas, he [R' Eliezer] said to him that she is not culpable. When treating of the Rabbis who maintained that there is no culpability, yet it is forbidden, he ruled that it is permitted at the outset.

The *Gemora* then cites the *braisa* of Rabbi Meir: A woman may not go out with a key in her hand, and if she does, she incurs a chatas; this is Rabbi Meir's view. Rabbi Eliezer holds her non-culpable in the case of a koveles and a flask of balsam oil. Who mentioned a koveles? — It is as if there was missing words, and it was thus taught: And she may likewise not go out with a koveles or a flask of balsam oil; and if she does, she incurs a chatas: this is Rabbi Meir's view. Rabbi Eliezer holds her non-culpable in the case of a koveles and a flask of balsam. When is that said? When they contain perfume; but if they do not contain perfume, she is culpable. (62a – 62b)

From this, Rav Ada bar Ahavah infers that Rabbi Eliezer would likewise require a *korban* if one carried a container with less than a *grogeres* of food in it, the minimal amount of which one would be required to bring a *korban* due to the food. Since here, when it [the flask] does not contain spice or oil, it is analogous to less than the statutory quantity [of food carried out] in a utensil, and yet it is taught that she is culpable. Rav Ashi points out, however, that although the container does not have enough food

to require a *korban*, there is nevertheless some food in it, and so the container might be considered secondary in the face of the more important food. Thus, one would not bring a *korban* due to the container, and there is not enough food to require a *korban* on its account. Here, however, where there is no oil at all, but only the scent that absorbed into the flask, there is no reason that the flask should be considered secondary to its contents, as it has none. Thus, in our case, one would have to bring a *korban*, but not in the case of the container of food. (62b)

6. Rav Yehudah cited Shmuel as describing the “first of oils” (Amos, 6:6) as balsam oil. If so, Rav Yosef asked, Rabbi Yehudah ben Bava forbade balsam oil too, but they [the Sages] did not agree with him. Now if you say [that the prophet's objection] is on account of its being a luxury, why did they not agree with him?¹⁰ Said Abaye to him, Then on your view, when it is written, that drink in bowls of [mizreke] wine, [which] Rabbi Ammi and Rabbi Assi — one interpreted it [as meaning] *kenishkanim*,¹¹ while the other said: It means that they threw [mezarkim] their goblets to each other — is that too forbidden? Surely Rabbah son of Rav Huna visited the house of the Exilarch who drank from a *kenishkanim*, yet he said nothing to him! Rather (said Abaye) that only those activities that brought both pleasure and joy were forbidden. Pleasure alone was not forbidden. The verse (ibid. pasuk 4) also says they would disgrace their beds. Rabbi Yosi said in the name of Rabbi Chanina that this means they would urinate near their beds while naked. Rabbi Avahu derided this: If so, is that why it is written: Therefore shall they now go captive with the first that go captive: because they urinate before their beds naked they shall go captive with the first that go captive! Rather said Rabbi Avahu: This refers to people who eat and

¹⁰ Why was this pleasure, described in the verse as one of the pleasures the Jews took while ignoring the warnings of the

prophets, not forbidden afterwards to remember the Destruction?

¹¹ A cup with spouts, enabling several persons to drink from it.

drink together, join their couches, exchange their wives, and make their couches foul with semen that is not theirs. (62b)

7. Rabbi Avahu said and some said that a *braisa* states that three things bring man to poverty. Urinating in front of one's bed naked, treating the washing of the hands with disrespect, and being cursed by one's wife in his presence. One who urinates near his bed while naked, Rava said: That is only said if he is facing the bed, but not when he is facing outward. And when he is facing the bed, it is only if he urinates onto the ground, but if he urinates into a chamber pot, it will not bring poverty. One who is not careful to wash properly, Rava says that it is not said unless he does not wash his hands at all, but if he washes but does not wash them well (he uses even a small amount of water), he will not be stricken with poverty. But it is not correct, as Rav Chisda said: I washed my hands with full handfuls of water and I was given full handfuls of prosperity. One whose wife curses him to his face. Rava says this refers to one who does not buy his wife jewelry, but this is only when he can afford it (and she therefore curses him). (62b)

8. Rabbah son of Rabbi Ilai lectured: What is meant by: Moreover Hashem said: Because the daughters of Zion are haughty? That means that they walked with haughty bearing. And walk with outstretched necks — they walked heel by toe. And wanton eyes - they filled their eyes with makeup and beckoned. Walking and mincing: they walked, a tall woman by the side of a short one. And spew venom with their feet: Rabbi Yitzchak said in the name of Rabbi Ammi: This teaches that they placed myrrh and balsam in their shoes and walked through the market-places of

Jerusalem, and on coming near to the young men of Israel, they kicked their feet and spurted it on them, thus instilling them with passionate desire like with serpent's poison.¹² (62b)

9. And what is their punishment? — As Rabbah bar Ulla lectured: And it shall come to pass, that instead of fragrance there shall be decay; the place where they perfumed themselves shall be decaying sores. And instead of a belt - a rope; the place where they were girded with a belt shall become full of bruises. And instead of well-set hair — baldness; the place where they adorned themselves shall be filled with bald patches. And instead of a sash - a girding of sackcloth; the openings that lead to [sensual] joy shall be for a girding of sackcloth. Branding instead of beauty: Said Rava: Thus men say: Ulcers instead of beauty. (62b)

10. Therefore the Lord will smite with a scab the crown of the head of the daughters of Zion. Rabbi Yosi son of Rabbi Chanina said: This teaches that tzaraas broke out in them. Here it is written *ve'sipach*; while elsewhere it is written, [This is the law for all manner of plagues of tzaraas ...] and for a rising and for a scab [sapachas]. And Hashem will cause their openings to pour. Rav and Shmuel — one maintained: This means that they were poured out like a pitcher; while the other said: Their openings became like a forest. (62b)

11. Rav Yehudah said in the name of Rav that the adulterers of that time would discuss their “achievements” (*cohabitations*) with each other. They would say: On what did you dine today: on well-kneaded bread (*a woman who was not a virgin*) or on bread that was not well kneaded (*a virgin*); on

¹² One of the sins that caused the Destruction of the first Beis Hamikdash was adultery: married women would walk with heads held high, taking their time so that they would be noticed, and wearing makeup and winking at unmarried men. They would

walk next to shorter women so that they appeared more regal, and perfume their shoes so that the perfume would come out when they stamped their feet near the men.

white wine (*one with a fair complexion*) or on dark wine; on a broad couch or on a narrow couch; with a good companion (*the woman was attractive*) or with a poor companion? Rav Chisda observed: And all these are in reference to immorality. (62b – 63a)

12. Rachavah said in the name of Rabbi Yehudah: The fuel logs of Jerusalem were of the cinnamon tree, and when lit, their fragrance would waft through the whole of *Eretz Yisrael*. But when Jerusalem was destroyed, they were hidden, and only as much as a barley grain being left, which is to be found in Queen Tzimtzeimai's storehouses. (63a)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Letters on the Tefillin

The *Gemora* explained that one may not take *tefillin* into the bathroom even though they are covered with leather, because the leather itself contains a name of Hashem.

According to the text that we have in front of us, this refers to the letter *shin* that is embossed on the box, as well as the *daled* and *yud* that are twisted in the straps. This is also the version Rashi cites.

Tosafos, however, claims that only the *shin* is actually a Siniatic law, and the other two letters are not holy.

Earlier (28b), the *Gemora* had asked what *halachah* was being taught when a *braisa* stated “Heavenly service is only acceptable with the skin of a kosher animal.” The *Gemora* answered that it refers to the *tefillin*, but disqualifies much of the laws of *tefillin* from this statement, since they were already known by Siniatic law. Among these are the leather, “since the *shin* is Siniatic law” (*and thus the box is holy*), that they must be stitched with sinews, and that the straps must be black. However, that the straps must be of a kosher animal because they are holy is not a Siniatic law, even though the letters *daled* and *yud* are made in the

straps. Thus, Tosafos derives that these letters are not known by Siniatic law.

It is not clear how Rashi would respond to this, though he clearly seems to address this issue, since he adds the discussion of the *daled* and the *yud* to the *Gemora* on 28b even though the *Gemora* itself does not mention it. Perhaps he felt that it was only known by Siniatic law that the part of the strap containing the letters must be of a kosher animal, but that the rest of the strap must be from a kosher animal was only derived from the *braisa* stated there.

Koveles

The *Mishna* said a woman may not go out on *Shabbos* with a *koveles*, but that Rabbi Meir and the Chachamim disagreed as to whether a woman must bring a *korban chatas* if she transgresses and wears it in the public domain. The *Gemora* then cites a *braisa* in which Rabbi Eliezer permits a woman to go out wearing a *koveles*. In explaining what a *koveles* is, Rav and Rav Assi call it *chomarta dipilon*.

Rashi comments that this is a “tie in which a potion called *pilon – balsama* in the vernacular – is tied.” The term “tie” seems to refer to some sort of cloth that is secured on the body, hence our translation of scarf. Since the term *pilon* apparently refers to balsam *oil* rather than the wood itself, it appears that a *koveles* is a scarf soaked in balsam oil.

However, the *Gemora* later cites a *braisa* which points out that Rabbi Eliezer does not allow a woman to go out with a *koveles* unless there are some physical remains of the “potion,” as opposed to merely a scent. The implication is that the balsam oil is mixed with some sort of spice or incense, so that a physical remnant is always present in the scarf.