

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

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*.¹ The Torah states clearly that a sack is susceptible 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,² 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*

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

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



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 bangles³ when they are tied (to her hat⁴ – Rashi). She may wear an ornamental hat⁵ or wig in a courtyard. She may go out with cotton⁶ 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,⁷ but she may not put them in on *Shabbos*.⁸ 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, 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

³ 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.

⁴ *Sevachah*, a type of hat made of netting.

⁵ 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.

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

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

⁸ 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.



forbade a menstruant woman to apply eyeliner, rouge,⁹ 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.

ELUCIDATION

Our Rabbis taught: Woven stuff of whatever size is tamei, and an ornament of whatever size is tamei. [An object partly] woven and [partly] an ornament of whatever size is tamei. A sack goes beyond a garment, in that it is tamei as woven material. Rava said: Woven stuff of whatever size is tamei: this is [deduced] from, 'or a garment'. An ornament of whatever size is tamei: [this is learnt] from the tzitz. [An object partly] woven and [partly] an ornament of whatever size is tamei: this is [deduced] from, every serviceable utensil. Said one of the Rabbis to Rava: But that is written in reference to Midian? We learn the meaning of utensil [here] from [the employment of] 'utensil' there, answered he. 'A sack goes beyond a garment, in that it is tamei as woven material.' Is then a garment not woven material? —This is its meaning: A sack goes beyond a garment, for though it is not of woven material, yet it is tamei. For what is it fit? — Said Rabbi Yochanan: A poor man braids three threads [of goats' hair] and

suspends it from his daughter's neck. (63b – 64a)

Our Rabbis taught: [And upon whatever any of them . . . does fall, it shall be tamei; whether it be any vessel of wood ... or] sack: I know it only of a sack; how do we know to include a horse cover and the saddle band? Therefore it is said, 'or sack'. I might think that I can include ropes and cords; therefore 'sack' is stated: just as a sack is spun and woven, so must everything be spun and woven. Now, concerning the dead it is stated, and all that is made of skin, and all work of goats' hair ... you shall purify yourselves: this is to include a horse cover and the saddle band. I might think that I can include ropes and cords. (But it [the reverse] is logical: [the Divine Law] teaches tumah by a dead sheretz, and it teaches tumah by the dead: just as when it teaches tumah by a sheretz, it declares tamei only that which is spun and woven; so when it teaches tumah by the dead, it declares tamei only that which is spun and woven. How so! If it is lenient in respect to tumah through a sheretz, which is lighter, shall we be lenient in respect to tumah by the dead, which is graver? Therefore 'a garment and skin' is stated twice, to provide a gezeirah shavah. Thus: a garment and skin are mentioned in connection with sheratzim, and also in connection with the dead: just as the 'a garment and skin' which are mentioned in connection with sheratzim, it [Scripture] declares tamei only that which is spun and woven, so the 'a garment and skin' which are stated in connection with the dead, it declares tamei only that which is spun and woven; and just as 'a garment and skin' which are stated in connection with the dead, anything made of goats' hair is tamei, so 'a garment and skin' which are stated in connection with sheratzim, anything made of goats' hair is tamei. Now, I know it only of that which comes from goats: how do I know to include what is produced from the tail of a horse or a cow? Therefore it is stated, 'or sack'. (But you have utilized it in respect of a horse cover and saddle bands? — That was only before the gezeirah shavah was adduced; but now that we have the gezeirah shavah, it [sc. the 'or'] is superfluous.) And I know this only in the case of a sheretz: how do we know it in respect to tumah by the dead? But it is logical: [Scripture] declares tumah through the dead, and also declares tumah through sheratzim: just as when it declares tumah through the dead, it treats that which is produced from the tail of a horse or cow as that which is made of goats' hair, so when it declares tumah through the dead, it treats that which is produced from the tail of a horse or a cow as that which is made of goats' hair. How so! If it [Scripture] includes [this] in tumah

⁹ A type of makeup applied to the face to make it redder – Rashi.

until evening, which is extensive, shall we include [it] in seven days' tumah, which is limited? Therefore 'a garment and skin' are stated twice, to provide a gezeirah shavah. 'A garment and skin' are stated in connection with sheratzim, and 'a garment and skin' are stated also in connection with the dead; just as a garment and skin, which are stated in connection with sheratzim, that which comes from the tail of a horse or cow is treated as that which is made of goats' hair, so 'a garment and skin' which are stated in connection with the dead, that which is produced from the tail of a horse or cow is treated as that which is made of goats' hair. And this must be redundant. For, if it is not redundant, one can refute [the deduction]: as for a sheretz, that is because it causes tumah by the size of a lentil. In truth, it is redundant. For consider: a sheretz is likened to semen, for it is written, a man whose seed goes from him, in proximity to which it is written, or whoever touches any creeping thing; while in respect to semen it is written, and every garment and every skin, on which there shall be semen; then what is the purpose of 'a garment and skin' written by the Divine Law in connection with sheratzim? Infer from this that its purpose is to leave it redundant. Yet it is still redundant [only] on one side: this is well on the view that where it is redundant on one side we can learn [identity of law] and cannot refute [the deduction]; but on the view that we can learn, but also refute, what can be said? — That [stated] in connection with the dead is also redundant. For consider: the dead is likened to semen, for it is written, 'and who touches anything that is tamei by the dead, or a man whose seed goes from him'; while in respect to semen it is written, 'and every garment and every skin, on which there shall be semen. What then is the purpose of 'a garment and skin' written by the Divine Law in connection with the dead? Infer from this that its purpose is to leave it redundant. (64a)

And we have brought an offering for Hashem, what every man has found of jewels of gold, ankle chains, and bracelets, signet-rings, ear-rings, and armlets. Rabbi Elozar said: Agil is a cast of female breasts; kumaz is a cast of the womb. Rav Yosef observed: Thus it is that we translate it "machoch," [meaning] the place that leads to levity [gichuch]. Said Rabbah to him: It is implied in the very verse itself: Kumaz = here [ka-an] is the place [Makom] of lewdness [zimma]. (64a)

And Moshe was angry with the officers of the army. Rav Nachman said in Rabbah bar Avuha's name: Moshe said to Israel: 'Maybe you have returned to your first lapse [sin]?' 'There lacks not one man of us,' they replied. 'If so,' he queried, 'Why an

atonement?' 'Though we escaped from sin,' said they, 'yet we did not escape from meditating upon sin.' Immediately, 'and we have brought an offering for Hashem.'" The School of Rabbi Yishmael taught: Why were the Israelites of that generation in need of atonement? Because they gratified their eyes with lewdness. Rav Sheishes said: Why does the Torah enumerate the outward ornaments with the inner? To teach you: Whoever looks upon a woman's little finger is as though he gazed upon the place of her nakedness. (64a – 64b)

MISHNAH: A woman may go out with ribbons made of hair, whether they are of her own [hair] or of her companions, or of an animal, and with frontlets and with head bangles that are fastened to her; she may go out] with a woolen cap and with a wig into a courtyard; with wadding in her ear, with wadding in her sandals, and with the cloth prepared for her menstruation; with a peppercorn, with a globule of salt and anything that is placed in her mouth, providing that she does not put it in her mouth in the first place on the Shabbos, and if it falls out, she may not put it back. As for an artificial tooth, [or] a gold tooth, — Rebbe permits but the sages forbid it. (64b)

GEMARA: And it is necessary [to state all the cases]. For if we were told about her own [hair], that might be because it is not ugly; but as for her companions', which is unbecoming, I might say [that it is] not [permitted]. While if we were informed about her companions', that might be because she is of her own kind; but an animal's, that is not of her own kind, I might say [that it is] not [permitted]. Thus they are necessary. (64b)

It was taught: Providing that a young woman does not go out with an old woman's [hair], or an old woman with a young woman's. As for an old woman [not going out] with a young woman's hair, that is well, because it is an improvement for her; but [that] a young woman [may not go out] with an old woman's [hair]. Why [state it], seeing that it is unsuitable for her? — Because he teaches of an old woman's [going out] with a young woman's [hair], he also teaches of a young woman's [going out] with an old woman's hair. (64b)

With a hair-net and a wig into a courtyard. Rav said: Whatever the Sages forbade to go out with into the street, one may not go out with into a courtyard, except a hair-net and a wig. Rabbi Anani bar Sasson said on the authority of Rabbi Yishmael son of Rabbi Yosi: It is all like a hair-net. We learnt: With a hair-net and a wig into a courtyard. As for Rav, it is well; but according to Rabbi



Anani bar Sasson it is a difficulty? — On whose authority does Rabbi Anani bar Sasson say this? On that of Rabbi Yishmael son of Rabbi Yosi! Rabbi Yishmael son of Rabbi Yosi is a Tanna, and can disagree. Now, according to Rav, why do these differ? — Said Ulla, [They are permitted] lest she become repulsive to her husband. As it was taught: And the menstruating woman in her state of niddah: the early Sages ruled: That means that she must not rouge nor paint nor adorn herself in dyed garments; until Rabbi Akiva came and taught: If so, you make her repulsive to her husband, with the result that he will divorce her! But what [then] is taught by, ‘and the menstruating woman in her state of niddah’? She shall remain in her impurity until she enters into water. (64b)

Rav Yehudah said in Rav's name: Wherever the Sages forbade for appearances' sake, it is forbidden even in one's innermost chambers. We learnt: Nor with a bell, even if it is plugged. And it was elsewhere taught: One may plug the bell around its [the animal's] neck and walk with it in the courtyard? — It is [a controversy of] Tannaim. For it was taught: He may spread them out in the sun, but not in the sight of people; Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Shimon forbid it. (64b – 65a)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Pepper in the Mouth

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