



Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Maseches Shabbos, Daf טז – Daf לז

Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas R' Avrohom Abba ben R' Dov HaKohen, A"H
vl'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

-----Daf טז-----57-----

PEREK BAMEH ISHA – PEREK SHISHI

MISHNA

- With what may a woman go out with on Shabbos and with what may she not go out with on Shabbos?
 - A woman may not go out on Shabbos with woolen strands, linen strands, or straps in her hair. She may also not go to the mikvah with those in her hair until they are loosened. She may not go out with a “totefes” or “sarvitin” if they are not sewn into her hat. She may also may not go out with a “kavul” in the reshus harabim (all the other items listed in the Mishna are assur for a woman to wear even in her chatzer). She may not go out with a “city of gold”, a “katla”, a nose ring, a ring without a seal, or a pin without an eye.
- In all these cases, if she does go out with them on Shabbos, it is only assur D'Rabanan and there is no chatas liability (D'Oraisa these are “tach'shitin” and therefore mutar to wear even in the reshus harabim. The **Rabanan** were afraid that she may remove these items to show them to another woman and in that way end up carrying into or within the reshus harabim).

GEMARA

- **Q:** Why did the Mishna bring in the din of mikvah? **A: R' Nachman bar Yitzchak in the name of Rabbah bar Avuha** said, mikvah is the reason why a woman can't wear these strands on Shabbos. Since she must loosen them if she needs to go to the mikvah, if she needs to go the mikvah on Shabbos she may come to loosen them and carry them 4 amos in reshus harabim.
- **Q: R' Kahana** asked **Rav**, may a woman go out on Shabbos with a chain of round, hollow, woven material in her hair? **A: Rav** said, anything woven may be worn (because it doesn't have to be loosened before going to the mikvah).
 - **R' Huna the son of R' Yehoshua** said like **Rav**. **Others** say, that he said he saw his sisters were not particular to remove these strands when bathing and therefore they are not a chatzitza. (The difference between these approaches is if the strands are dirty. One the one hand, they are woven, on the other hand, a woman would be particular to remove them).
- A Mishna says, strands of wool, strands of linen, and straps that are worn in the hair of girls are a “chatzitza” and need to be loosened before “tevila”. **R' Yehuda** says, strands of wool and strands of hair do not need to be loosened because they cannot be tied tight enough to prevent water from getting around the girl's hair.
 - **R' Huna** said, the **T”K** and **R' Yehuda** are referring to strands worn by girls in their hair.
 - **Q: R' Yosef** asked, what is **R' Huna** coming to exclude? It can't be to exclude a woolen strand worn around the neck, because if a soft, woolen strand is a chatzitza when wrapped around a hard object like hair, certainly it will be a chatzitza when wrapped around a soft object like skin!? It can't be to exclude a linen strand worn around the neck, because if a hard, linen strand is a chatzitza when wrapped around a hard object like hair, certainly it will be a chatzitza when wrapped around a soft object like skin!? **A: R' Yosef** says, he does come to exclude straps worn around the neck, and the reason they are not a chatzitza is because they will never be tied around the neck tight enough to be a chatzitza.
 - **Q: Abaye** asked, a Braisa says that a woman may not go out on Shabbos with strings around her neck. If they are not worn tight (like **R' Yosef** said) then why can't it be worn?! **A: Ravina** said, the Braisa is talking about a “katla” (a bib worn by women to stay clean) which was worn very tightly to make her look like she was chubby.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **R' Yosef in the name of R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** paskens like **R' Yehuda** (in the Mishna that was quoted) who says that strands of hair are not a chatzitza when tied into a girl's hair.
 - **Abaye** asked, from **Shmuel** it seems that there are those who argue on **R' Yehuda**, but the **T"K** doesn't argue in that Mishna?! In fact, we see others and a Braisa who agree that the **T"K** does not argue with **R' Yehuda** regarding the halacha for strands of hair!?

LO B'TOTEFES

- **R' Yosef** said, this is a pouch worn to protect the woman from "ayin harah".
 - **Q: Abaye** asked, that should be mutar, just like a proven "kemaya" may be worn?! **A:** Rather, **R' Yehuda in the name of Abaye** said, the "totefes" is a gold decorative piece worn on the forehead.
 - A Braisa says that a "totefes" may be worn when attached to the woman's hat. This is a proof to **Abaye's** interpretation of "totefes".

V'LO B'KAVUL

- **R' Yannai** said that he was unsure whether this refers to a female slave's badge (that shows that she is a slave), and that is what may not be worn, but woman may wear a woolen hat ("kavul" can mean a badge or a hat), or whether the Mishna means to prohibit the wearing of the woolen hat (and certainly the wearing of the badge will be prohibited as well).
 - **R' Avahu** said, it makes sense to say that the Mishna refers to a woolen hat. We see a Braisa that says that a "kavul" and an "istima" may be worn in a chatzer. **R' Shimon ben Elazar** says a "kavul" may even be worn into reshus harabim, because anything underneath a hat may be worn outside (a woman would never remove it and thereby expose her hair). We see from here that a "kavul" is something worn on the head, not a badge.
 - **Q:** What is an "istima"? **A:** **R' Avahu** said, it is "bizyonay", which **Abaye in the name of Rav** explains to be a small hat that covers all the hair that sticks out of the woman's regular hat.
 - A Braisa says, three things were said about an "istima": 1) it is not subject to the halachos of sha'atnez (it is made of felt and not from spun threads); 2) it does not become tamei from negaim (because it is not considered a "begeg" for the same reasons as with regard to sha'atnez); 3) it cannot be worn out into the reshus harabim on Shabbos. They added in the name of **R' Shimon**, that wearing an "istima" does not violate the ban on wearing bridal crowns (as a sign of mourning after the Churban).

-----Daf 71-----58-----

- **Shmuel** said, when the Mishna prohibits a woman from wearing a "kavla", it refers to the badge worn by a female servant.
 - **Q: Shmuel** says elsewhere that a servant may go out on Shabbos with a badge around his neck, but not on his clothing!? **A:** When the master made the badge, it is mutar to wear it outside, because the servant is afraid to remove it. When the slave made the badge, he cannot wear it outside, because the master doesn't care as much if he removes it and he may therefore come to carry it.
 - **Q:** If the case where **Shmuel** allows it to be worn outside is where the master made the badge, why is it only mutar around his neck, but not when it is on his clothing? **A:** We are afraid that the badge will fall off, and out of fear of the master, the slave will carry his coat and fold it over the place of the missing badge so that it should not be seen. Carrying in that way from one reshus to another, or 4 amos in reshus harabim, would be an issur D'Oraisa.
 - Like **Shmuel** said to **R' Chinina bar Shila**, "The **Rabanan** of the house of the Reish Galusa may not go out with their badge (issued by the Reish Galusa) on their coats (because if it falls off, they may decide to carry the coats to avoid angering the Reish Galusa). You, however, may go out with the badge, because the Reish Galusa would not be angered if you walked around without the badge."
- **Shmuel** said, a slave may go out with a badge around his neck, but not on his clothing. A Braisa says the same thing.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** Another Braisa says, a servant may not go out with a badge around his neck or on his clothing, and neither type of badge is mekabel tumah. Should we say that the first Braisa discusses where the master made it and the second where the slave himself made it (so he may end up removing it and carrying it)?
A: It could be they both discuss where the master made the badge. The first Braisa is discussing a badge made of clay (so if it falls, he will not carry it home), and the second Braisa deals with a badge made of metal (if it falls, he will carry it home).
 - A proof is that the second Braisa says it is not mekabel tumah. Why would we think it is? It must be because we are discussing metal badges.
- The Braisa said, a slave may not go out with a bell around his neck, but can go out with a bell attached to his clothing. The reason the Braisa permits the bell when attached to the clothing is, because we are discussing where it was attached by a professional so there is no reason to be goizer that it will fall off and be carried.
- The Braisa said an animal may not go out with a badge around its neck or on its clothing, or with a bell around its neck or on its clothing, and neither badge or bell is mekabel tumah.
 - **Q:** A second Braisa says that the bell of an animal IS mekabel tumah!? **A:** The first Braisa is discussing a bell with the clapper, so it is mekabel tumah. The second Braisa discusses a bell without the clapper, so it is not. We find this concept where **R' Shmuel bar Nachmeini in the name of R' Yonasan** says, that a metal keili that is made to make noise is mekabel tumah.
 - **Q:** The earlier part of the Braisa said that a slave may not go out with a bell around his neck, but may go out with bells on his clothing, and both of them are mekabel tumah. If, like we just said, the Braisa is discussing a bell without a clapper, why are these bells mekabel tumah? **A:** A bell that is made for sound is only mekabel tumah if it has a clapper. The bells on an adult person are made for decoration and are therefore mekabel tumah even without a clapper.
- The Braisa said, a bell that lost its clapper can still be mekabel tumah. **Abaye** explains, since one doesn't need to be an expert to fix it, it retains its din as a keili.
 - **Q: Rava** asked, a Mishna says that a bell and its clapper are considered attached for tumah purposes. This means that the clapper is an integral piece of the bell. Therefore, if the clapper is removed it should lose its din as a keili!? This Mishna can't mean that they are considered attached even if they are not physically attached, because a Braisa we learned earlier says that the pieces of a pair of scissors and a carpenter's tool are considered attached for tumah only when they are physically connected!? **A: Rava** says, since the bell can make noise by hitting it against something even when the clapper is not attached, it retains its din as a keili.

-----Daf 59-----

- **R' Yochanan** says, the reason that a bell without a clapper is mekabel tumah is because it can be used to give water to a child (so it is a keili).
 - **Q: R' Yochanan** says that if something cannot be used for its primary, original function, it loses its tumah status. If so, why is this bell tamei if it can no longer be used as a bell?! **A:** Switch the shitas and say that **R' Yochanan** is the one who said that the bell retains its status because it can make noise when hit against another object (and it therefore can be used for its original, primary function).
 - **Q:** Why don't we switch the shitas of the second statement of **R' Yochanan** and say that he is the one who says that if a keili retains any usable function it remains tamei, even if it is not its original, primary function?! **A:** We can't say that because we find elsewhere that **R' Yochanan** requires an original, primary use of a keili for it to retain its tumah. **R' Yochanan** says that an animal's shoe is mekabel tumah because it can be worn by a person when running away during a war. We see that **R' Yochanan** paskens like this only because it is being used in its original and primary function – as a shoe.

V'LO B'IHR SHEL ZAHAV

- **Rabbah bar bar Chana in the name of R' Yochanan** explains that this is a golden accessory engraved with or carved in the shape of the city of Yerushalayim (like **R' Akiva** had made for his wife).
 - A Braisa says, **R' Meir** says, a woman who wears this accessory outside on Shabbos is chayuv a chatas, because this piece has a din of a "burden". The **Chachomim** say, it is assur for a woman to wear it

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

outside on Shabbos, but there is no chatas liability, because this piece has a din of a “tachshit” and cannot be worn outside D’Rabanan because the woman may take it off to show someone and carry it. **R’ Eliezer** says, a woman may (l’chatchila) walk out wearing this on Shabbos because only wealthy women have this and wealthy women would not remove it to show anybody.

- **Rav** says a woman may not walk out wearing a tiara. **Shmuel** says that she may.
 - The Gemara says, they would both agree that a tiara made of gold cannot be worn outside because she may take it off and carry it. The machlokes is regarding a tiara of material that is studded with gold and jewels: **Rav** says that gold and jewels are the main component and it is therefore assur, because she may come to remove it and carry it. **Shmuel** says that the material is the main component and there is no reason to believe that she will remove it to show anyone.
 - **R’ Ashi** says they would both agree that a tiara of material is mutar to wear outside. The machlokes is regarding a tiara of gold. **Rav** says she may not wear it outside because she may come to carry it. **Shmuel** says only wealthy women have this item and wealthy women would not remove them and thereby come to carry them outside.
 - **R’ Shmuel bar bar Chana** said to **R’ Yosef**, “You told us that **Rav** allows a tiara” (which is a proof to **R’ Ashi’s** way of understanding the machlokes).
 - It was told to **Rav** that **Levi** came to Bavel and allowed the wearing of a tiara outside on Shabbos. **Rav** said, if **Levi** came to Bavel, it means that **R’ Afes** passed away and **R’ Chanina** became Rosh Yeshiva, because **Levi** would sit with **R’ Chanina** and learn and it must be that **R’ Chanina** was no longer available for that. **Rav** said it couldn’t mean that **R’ Chanina** passed away, because if that happened, **Levi** would have stayed in the yeshiva under **R’ Afes**. Also, on his deathbed **Rebbi** said that **R’ Chanina** will be the Rosh Yeshiva, so it’s not possible that **R’ Chanina** died before he became Rosh Yeshiva.
 - When **Levi** allowed the wearing of tiaras in Nahardah, 24 tiaras were taken out and worn on Shabbos. When **Rabbah bar Avuha** allowed wearing tiaras in Mechuza, 18 tiaras were taken out and worn in one mavoi.
- **R’ Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said, a belt studded with jewels and gold may be worn outside on Shabbos (no one will remove their belt to show other people and have their pants fall down).
 - **Some say** this refers to a studded, material belt and **R’ Safra** explains that it is mutar just like a gold studded cloak. **Others say** it refers to a belt of hammered gold, and **R’ Safra** explains that it is mutar just like the golden belt of a king.
 - **Ravina** asked **R’ Ashi**, may one wear this fancy belt on top of a regular belt? **R’ Ashi** said it is prohibited
 - **R’ Ashi** said, a person may wear a piece of clothing that is meant to be very tight around his body if it has strings which can be tied tightly and won’t let it fall off.

V’LO B’KATLA

- This is a fancy bib that was tied tightly around the neck and prevented the wearer from getting dirty from the food she was eating.

NIZAMIM

- This refers to nose rings (earrings would be mutar to wear on Shabbos, because it is difficult to remove and show off).

V’LO BITABA’AS SHE’EIN ALEHA CHOSEM

- A ring without a seal is only assur D’Rabanan. This suggests that a ring with a seal is assur even D’Oraisa, because it is not considered to be a “tachshit”.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that a ring, with or without a seal, is considered to be a tachshit for a woman?! **A1: R’ Zeira** said, our Mishna follows **R’ Nechemya**, who says that the status of a signet ring follows the seal portion of the ring (and therefore, a ring with a seal is considered a “burden” and not a tachshit), and the Braisa follows the **Chachomim** who argue on **R’ Nechemya** and say that even a ring with a seal is a tachshit (they say that all rings follow the status of the bottom part of the ring and therefore, even a ring with a seal is considered a tachshit). **A2: Rava** said, our Mishna is talking about a woman. A ring with a seal is not considered to be a tachshit for a woman. The part of the Braisa that says that a ring with a

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

seal is mekabel tumah is referring to a man, not a woman. A ring with a seal is considered to be a tachshit for a man. **A3: R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, you are asking from a Braisa about tumah to a Mishna about Shabbos. This is not a good comparison. For tumah purposes, with or without a seal, it has a din of a keili and is therefore mekabel tumah. For Shabbos, it depends on whether it is a tachshit, not just a keili.

-----Daf 60-----

V'LO B'MACHAT SHE'EINA NEKUVA

- **R' Yosef** said, a woman uses this pin to collect her stray hairs and stick them under her hat
 - **Q: Abaye** asked, why is this different than a garter, which is allowed to be worn because a woman will never remove it in public, so too this pin will not be removed for fear of showing her hair!? **A: Rava** said, this pin has gold and is used to part her hair during the week. On Shabbos it is used as a tachshit, which may end up being carried and therefore can't be worn.

MISHNA

- A man may not go out with a "sandel hamesumer" (a sandal with nails through its wooden sole to hold its leather straps), or with only one sandal if he doesn't have a wound on his foot (either because people will think he is carrying the other one, or because people may make fun of him and that may lead him to take it off and carry it).
- A man may not go out wearing tefillin, or a kemaya that is not from an expert, or a coat of armor, or with the hat that goes under a helmet, or with shin guards.
- If he goes out with any of these, he is not chayuv a chatas.

GEMARA

- **Q:** Why can't one wear a "sandel hamesumer"? **A: Shmuel** says, in a time of decree against the Yidden, a number of Yidden hid in a cave and said, whoever wants may come into hiding with us, but no one is to leave (because they were afraid that would compromise their hiding place). A person wore his sandal backward, and although he walked in, his footprints looked as if someone had walked out. When the people saw that, they panicked and began pushing. They were wearing "sandel hamesumers", and because of the nails that stuck out, they ended up killing each other in numbers greater than the enemy killed. Because of this story, the **Rabanan** were goizer that we may not wear these sandals on Shabbos. **R' Ilay ben Elazar** said, the people were hiding in a cave and heard people walking on top of the cave. They thought it was the enemy coming in to get them. Panic ensued and they ended up killing each other in greater numbers than the enemy killed. **Rami bar Yechezkel** said, the people were hiding in a shul and they heard noise from behind the shul. They thought it was the enemy coming to get them. Panic ensued and they ended up killing each other in greater numbers than the enemy killed.
 - **Q:** Why are these sandals not prohibited during the week as well? **A:** The story happened on a Shabbos.
 - **Q:** A Mishna says wearing these sandals is assur on Yom Tov as well!? **A:** On Yom Tov people gather together just like on Shabbos, so they felt the need to prohibit it then as well.
 - **Q:** People gather on fast days as well, so wearing these sandals should be prohibited on those days as well?! **A:** Yom Tov is like Shabbos in that they are both assur to do work, and that's why they were goizer on Yom Tov as well. Work is permitted on fast days.
 - Even according to **R' Chananya ben Akiva** who says a gezeira must follow the exact circumstance of the reason for the gezeirah (he says one may not transport parah adumah ashes over the Jordan River in a boat because of a story that happened), Shabbos and Yom Tov are so similar that it is considered to be the exact circumstances of the reason for the gezeirah.
- **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said, these sandals are only a problem if the nails are there to strengthen the sandal. If they are there for design purposes, it is mutar.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** How many nails can it have and it be considered for design purposes? **A: R' Yochanan** says 5 nails in each sandal, **R' Chanina** says 7 nails in each sandal. **R' Yochanan** explained, according to each shita, you divide the allowable amount to each side of the sandal, and the one left over is used to close the straps.
 - **Q:** A Braisa discusses an uneven sandal and says that some permit 7 nails and some permit 13 nails. Who does **R' Yochanan** follow? **A:** He follows **R' Nehorai** who allows 5 nails.
 - **Eifah** paskened that the talmidim of **R' Yochanan** should follow him, and the talmidim of **R' Chanina** should follow him.
 - **R' Ashi** paskened that up to 7 nails is mutar. Anything more is assur.
- **R' Ami** said, if one sewed a shoe into the inside of the sandal, it is permitted. **R' Ashi** explained, because it then becomes a “shoe”, not a “sandal”.
- **R' Abba bar Avina** said, if the nails are “U” shaped (like staples), it is mutar.
- **R' Sheishes** said, if one covers the entire sole with nails to prevent the wooden sole from rotting, it is permitted.
 - A Braisa says like **R' Sheishes** and then adds, if a sole is covered with nails and most fall out, and if 4 or 5 nails are left, it is mutar.
 - **Q:** The Braisa first seems to say that as long as most fell out, even if many are left it is ok. Then the Braisa says that if 4 or 5 are left it is ok?! **A: R' Sheishes** explains, that if it is noticeable that there was once a full sole of nails, then even if there remain more than 5 it is not a problem. If it is not noticeable that there were many more nails, then anything more than 5 is a problem.
 - **Q:** The Braisa says “4 or 5” are allowed. If 4 are allowed, for sure 5 are allowed?! **A: R' Chisda** explains, a small sandal may have up to 4, a large sandal may have up to 5.
 - **Q:** The Braisa said that **Rebbi** allows 7 nails. However, another Braisa says that **Rebbi** allows 13?! **A:** He allows 13 to even up an uneven sandal. With this, we can now say that **R' Yochanan** would allow more than 5 for an uneven sole as well, and therefore can even hold like the other shitas in the Braisa quoted above.
- **R' Masna** said, the halacha does not follow **R' Elazar** that one may not even move a “sandel hamesumer” to cover a keili. One would have thought we should follow him although he is a “yachid”, because it makes sense that we should be gozer that if one moves it he may come to wear it. **R' Masna** tells us that we do not follow him.
- **R' Chiya** said, if he wasn't afraid of being called one who easily permits everything, he would allow many more nails in the sandal before prohibiting it.
 - In Pumbedisa they said he would have allowed 24 nails in each sandal. In Sura they said he would have allowed 22 nails in each.

-----Daf 61-----

V'LO B'YACHID BIZMAN SHE'EIN BIRAGLO MAKI

- The Mishna seems to suggest that if he does have a wound on his foot he may go out with one sandal.
 - **Q:** On which foot can he wear that one sandal? **A: R' Huna** says on the foot that has the wound. He holds that a sandal is worn to prevent pain created from stepping on objects. If he wears the sandal on the foot with the wound, people will realize that he has to be more careful with that foot and will not think that he is carrying the other sandal, and will not make fun of him. **Chiya bar Rav** says he may wear the one sandal on the foot without the wound. He holds that a sandal is worn for comfort. If he wears only one sandal and doesn't wear it on the foot with the wound, it shows that he wants the comfort of sandals but can't put one on the second foot because of the wound. Therefore, no one will think he is carrying the second sandal and no one will make fun of him.
 - **R' Yochanan** also holds like **R' Huna**, because when **R' Yochanan** asked **R' Shemen bar Abba** for his shoes, and **R' Shemen** passed him only his right shoe, **R' Yochanan** said, “You are making me like someone with a wound” (the Gemara feels this means that **R' Yochanan** would not put on his left shoe

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

once he put on his right shoe, and therefore, it would be as if he had a wound on his right foot and that is why he would only be wearing his right shoe).

- The Gemara says, this is no proof. It may be that **R' Yochanan** was saying that by wearing only his right shoe it would be as if he had a wound on his LEFT foot, like **R' Chiya bar Rav!**
- **R' Yochanan** follows his shita from elsewhere, where he says that just like tefillin is put on the left hand, so too shoes should first be put on the left foot.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that first one puts on his right shoe and then his left?!
 - **R' Yosef** says, because we have **R' Yochanan** and the Braisa, whatever one does is good.
 - **Abaye** said, maybe **R' Yochanan** never heard this Braisa, and would have changed his shita if he had heard it? Or, maybe he would still have argued? Why is whatever one does good?
 - **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** says, one who fears Heaven can fulfill both. He was referring to **Mar the son of Ravina**, who would put on the right shoe first, but tie the left one first.
 - **R' Ashi** said that **R' Kahana** was not particular about which shoe he put on first.
- A Braisa says, one should put on his right shoe first, but when removing shoes, he should remove the left shoe first. When washing, he should wash the right first. When anointing, he should anoint the right first. When one wants to anoint his entire body, he should anoint his head first, because the head is the most important part of the body.

V'LO B'TEFILLIN

- **R' Safra** explained, this is not only if one holds that there is no mitzvah of tefillin on Shabbos, rather, even if one holds that there is a mitzvah of tefillin on Shabbos, still he may not wear them outside, because he may need to remove them (when going to the bathroom) and may carry them 4 amos in reshus harabim.
- **Others say** the explanation of **R' Safra** was on the end of the Mishna which says there is no chatas liability. On that **R' Safra** said, there is no chiyuv chatas even if one holds that there is no mitzvah of tefillin on Shabbos, because it is worn as clothing and is therefore not considered a “burden”.

V'LO B'KAMAYA BIZMAN SHE'EINO MIN HAMUMCHEH

- **R' Pappa** explains, “mumcheh” here means that the writer is a proven expert, and we don't need to prove that the “kamaya” is effective as well. The Mishna suggests this as well, because it says “she'eino MIN hamumcheh” – if it does not come FROM an expert it can't be worn. We are only concerned about the writer.
- A Braisa says, a proven kamaya is one that has healed 3 times (even the same person). It can be a written form kamaya or a kamaya of herb roots. It may be worn on Shabbos by a seriously ill person, or a sick person who is not seriously ill. It may be worn to cure an illness or to prevent an illness. One may tie and untie it even in reshus harabim as long as it is not tied as a charm to a bracelet or ring (because then it looks like it is not being done for refuah, but for a regular tachshit, and in truth this is not a tachshit).
 - **Q:** Another Braisa says that a kamaya must heal 3 *different* people to be considered proven?! **A:** The second Braisa discusses proving the writer as an expert. To do that, he must write 3 kamayas which heal 3 different sicknesses. The first Braisa deals with proving the kamaya itself as effective. That can be done with even one person.
 - **R' Pappa** says:
 - If one writes 3 kamayas, each for a different person, and each kamaya heals 3 times, both the person and the kamayas have been proven as effective.
 - If one writes 3 kamayas, each for a different person, and each kamaya heals that one person, the person is proven an expert, but the kamayas are not.
 - If one write one kamaya that heals 3 people, the kamaya is proven but the person is not.
 - **Q: R' Pappa** asked, what if one writes 3 kamayas that heal 1 person from 3 different sicknesses, is the person an expert, or is it the sick person's mazel that allows him to heal through kamayas?
A: TEIKU.
- **Q:** Do kamayas have “kedusha”? We have learned that one may not save them from a fire on Shabbos (in a case where he would have to be “oiver” on a D'Rabanan, which one is allowed to do for a Sefer Torah or the like), so

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

they don't have kedusha for that din. We have also learned that anything with a Name of Hashem needs "genizah" (burial), so kamayas would need that as well. The question is with regard to bringing them into a bathroom – may they be brought in or not? **A:** The Mishna said, one may not wear a kamaya if it is not proven, which suggests that a proven kamaya may be worn in the reshus harabim. If it must be removed when going to the bathroom, there should be a concern that he will carry it! It must be that it can be worn into a bathroom.

- One cannot say that our Mishna is referring to a kamaya of herb roots, because the Braisa says the same halacha applies to a written kamaya and a kamaya of roots.
- One cannot say that our Mishna is referring only to a seriously sick person, because the Braisa says the same halacha applies to a seriously and not seriously sick person.
- One cannot say that since a kamaya heals it may even be carried in the hand on Shabbos, because a Braisa says that one may not carry it in the hand.
- However, our Mishna may be discussing where the kamaya is covered with a piece of leather and that is why it may be brought into a bathroom.
 - Although the "parshiyos" of tefillin are covered with the leather "batim", they may not be brought into a bathroom because the "shin" on the batim are themselves a Halacha L'Moshe Mi'Sinai and therefore have kedusha.

V'LO B'SHIRYON, V'LO B'KASDA, V'LO B'MAGAPAYIM

- Shiryon is a coat of armor.
- **Rav** explained that a Kasda is a leather helmet worn under the metal helmet.
- **Rav** explained that Magapayim is the metal protection worn by soldiers to protect their feet and lower legs.

-----Daf 20---62-----

MISHNA

- A woman may not go out wearing a sewing needle, or a signet ring, or a "kulyar", or a "koveles", or a flask of balsam oil. If she does go out with any of these, **R' Meir** says she is chayuv a chatas. The **Chachomim** say there is no chatas liability if she walks out wearing the "koveles" or the flask of balsam oil.

GEMARA

- This Mishna and the previous one said, a woman is chayuv D'Oraisa for wearing a signet ring and D'Rabanan for wearing a regular ring. **Ulla** said, the opposite is true for a man (he is chayuv D'Oraisa for wearing a regular ring and D'Rabanan for wearing a signet ring). We see that **Ulla** holds that something befitting a woman is not befitting a man and visa-versa.
 - **Q: R' Yosef** asked, a Braisa says that all people may go out wearing sackcloth on Shabbos because it is the norm for shepherds to wear sackcloth. We see that if something is the norm for some people it is considered the norm for all?! **A: R' Yosef** explains that **Ulla** holds that women are considered to be a totally separate group than men, and the norm for one does not carry to the other.
 - **Q: Abaye** asked, a Braisa says that if one finds tefillin in the street on Shabbos, he may bring them inside by wearing one pair at a time. This may be done by a man or a woman. Tefillin are a "mitzvas asei she'hazman grama", which means that women are patur. If so, it is not a "malbush" for them, and their wearing the tefillin should be considered carrying. The fact that tefillin are a "malbush" for men will not make a difference according to what **R' Yosef** just said!? **A: R' Meir** must hold that tefillin is a "mitzvas asei she'lo hazman grama", because he holds that the mitzvah of tefillin applies by night and on Shabbos. Therefore, women are chayuv in it as well and may wear the tefillin without it being considered carrying on Shabbos.
- **Q:** Even if a signet ring is considered a "burden", wearing it on one's finger would be carrying in an unusual way, which should make him patur D'Oraisa. So, why does the Mishna say he is chayuv a chatas?! **A: R' Yirmiya** said, we are dealing with a woman who oversees other people and normally wears a signet ring. Although it is still considered a burden since most women don't have signet rings, wearing the ring is still considered a normal method of carrying because this woman typically wears a signet ring.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q: Rava** asked, that doesn't explain why a man is chayuv a chatas for wearing a regular ring (his wearing is carrying in an unusual manner)?! **A: Rava** explains that at times a woman wears her husband's signet ring when she is putting it away for him, and at times a man wears his wife's ring when he is taking it to be fixed. Therefore, it is considered a normal method of carrying it and that is why they are chayuv D'Oraisa for doing so.

V'LO B'KULYAR V'LO B'KOVELES

- **Rav** says a "kulyar" is a clasp used to close a woman's shirt, and a "koveles" is a pouch which holds the balsam spice.
- A Braisa says, if a woman goes out wearing a "koveles": **R' Meir** says she is chayuv a chatas (it is a burden). The **Chachomim** say it is assur D'Rabanan (it is a tachshit which she might take off to show). **R' Eliezer** says it is mutar l'chatchila (this is worn by women who don't smell good, and such women will not show this off to their friends because it is an embarrassment to have to wear this).
 - **Q:** Another Braisa says that **R' Eliezer** says a woman who wears this is patur (which generally means assur D'Rabanan)?! **A: R' Eliezer** holds its mutar l'chatchila. However, when he is only arguing with **R' Meir** who says "chayuv" (a chatas), he says "patur" (even though he really holds "mutar"). When he is arguing with the **Chachomim** who say "assur", he comes along and says "mutar". (We find a Braisa where only **R' Meir** and **R' Eliezer** are mentioned).
 - A Braisa says that **R' Eliezer** says a koveles and a flask of balsam may be worn on Shabbos when there is actual "besamim" inside. If it is worn empty (although it still carries the fragrance of the spice that used to be inside), she is chayuv a chatas. **R' Ada bar Ahava** said, from here we see that one who carries a keili with less than the amount of food needed to be considered carrying on Shabbos, is chayuv for carrying the empty keili. The Gemara feels that when only smell remains it is like having less the amount needed to be considered carrying and one is chayuv for doing so. **R' Ashi** said, it could be that one is only chayuv when it is totally empty, like here when only the smell remains, but if something remains, even if it is less than the amount needed to be considered carrying, one would not be chayuv for the carrying of the keili.
- A pasuk says "v'reishis shemanim yimshachu". **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said, this refers to balsam. This means that balsam is used for pleasure.
 - **Q: R' Yosef** asks, **R' Yehuda ben Bava** was goizer that balsam should not be used after the Churban, but the **Chachomim** disagreed. If the pasuk refers to balsam, which means that it is for pleasure, why would the **Chachomim** disagree? **A: Abaye** says, the **Chachomim** only prohibit things that are for pleasure and joy. Balsam is not for joy.
- A pasuk which explains why people were sent out to galus first is said to be referring to people who urinate by their beds. **R' Avahu** explains it as a reference to people who eat together, sleep together, are mezaneh with each other's wives and dirty their couches with other people's "shichvas zerah".
- **R' Avahu** says, 3 things bring to poverty: 1) urinating by one's bed (**Rava** explained, this is only when urinating onto the ground and towards the bed); 2) not being careful with the mitzvah of "netilas yadayim" (**Rava** said this is only if someone totally disregards the mitzvah, but the Gemara then says that **R' Chisda** would say that because he used a full amount of water he was rewarded with a full amount of "bracha"); 3) if one's wife curses him in front of him (**Rava** explained, this is when she does so for him not buying "tachshitin" for her, when he can afford it).
- **Rava the son of R' Illai** explains the psukim which talk about the bad behavior of some women and the punishment that they received. He says the (married) women would walk very straight and tall so that men should look at them. They would walk very slowly to allow time to look at them. They would wear a lot of eye makeup and make gestures to the men. Tall women would walk next to short women so that they would attract more attention. **R' Yitzchak** of the yeshiva of **R' Ami** said, they would also put perfume on their feet and kick the ground when passing the young men, thereby spraying perfume onto them and arousing their desire. **Rabbah bar Ulla** and others darshen pesukim to teach that their punishments were physical decay, wounds, baldness, reduced to wearing sackcloth, sores, "tzara'as", abnormal blood flow, and excessive hair growth in their private areas.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** says, the bad people of Yerushalayim would discuss their “znus” with each other and talk in terms of what “meal” they’ve eaten
- **Rachva in the name of R' Yehuda** said, people used to use special cinnamon wood for fuel in Yerushalayim. When this wood was burned, a pleasant smell would spread out over the entire Eretz Yisrael. After Yerushalayim was destroyed, only a barley sized piece of this wood remained, and this piece was taken into the treasury of Queen Tzimtzimai.

-----Daf 10---63-----

MISHNA

- A man may not go out with a sword, a bow, a shield, an “alah”, or a spear. If he does go out with one of these he is chayuv a chatas. **R' Eliezer** says these are tachshitin and he would therefore not be chayuv a chatas. The **Chachomim** say these items are disgraceful, for the pasuk says that after Moshiach comes there will be no more weapons because there will be no wars.
- A “biris” cannot become tamei and a woman may go out with it on Shabbos. “Kivalim” can become tamei and a woman may not wear them outside on Shabbos.

GEMARA

- “Alah” is a club with a thick head used to hit.

R' ELIEZER OMER TACHSHITIN HEIN LO

- A Braisa says, they asked **R' Eliezer**, if weapons are tachshitin, why will they cease to exist when Moshiach comes? **R' Eliezer** answered, because there will be no wars, and weapons will therefore be unnecessary. They will be like a candle during the daytime – totally useless.
 - This argues on **Shmuel** who says that the only thing that will change when Moshiach comes is that we will no longer be under foreign rule in galus (goyim will still have wars and weapons will still be needed).
 - Another version of the Braisa says that they asked **R' Eliezer**, if weapons are tachshitin, why will they cease to exist when Moshiach comes? **R' Eliezer** answered, they will not cease to exist.
 - This follows **Shmuel's** statement quoted above.
- **Abaye** explained, **R' Eliezer** called weapons “tachshitin” because a pasuk says a sword is “hodcha v'hadarecha” (your splendor and glory).
 - **Q: R' Kahana** asked, that pasuk is referring to Torah?! **A: Mar the son of R' Huna** said, the simple meaning of the words still refer to an actual sword, and the simple meaning can't be disregarded. **R' Kahana** said, he finished “shas” at 18 and didn't know that the simple meaning of a pasuk can't be disregarded. We see from here that one should first learn for a basic understanding and then delve deeper into the meanings.
- **R' Yirmiya in the name of R' Elazar** said, (based on a “drush” of a pasuk), two talmidei chachomim who sharpen each other in halacha are granted success from Hashem and are lifted to greatness. This is only for Torah learned “lishma”, and if it doesn't lead to arrogance. Torah learned in humility and lishma leads to meriting Torah which was given with the “right hand”.
 - **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, he merits what is said about the “right hand” of Torah (“Orech yomim bimina, bismola osher v'chavod”). This means that those who learn Torah in the proper way (“bimina”) get long life and wealth and honor. Those who learn for the wrong reasons are given wealth and honor, but not long life.
- **R' Yirmiya in the name of Reish Lakish** said (based on a “drush” of a pasuk), two talmidei chachomim who are nice to each other in halacha, Hashem listens to them. Even more, if they even think of doing a mitzvah, but don't do it, Hashem considers it as if they did the mitzvah.
- **R' Chinina bar Idi** said, one who does a mitzvah lishma will never be told bad tidings. **R' Assi** said, even if Hashem decreed bad on this person, it gets taken back.
- **R' Abba in the name of Reish Lakish** said (based on a “drush” of a pasuk), two talmidei chachomim who listen to each other in halacha, Hashem listens to them. If they don't, it causes the Shechina to leave from Klal Yisrael.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **R' Abba in the name of Reish Lakish** said (based on a “drush” of a pasuk), two talmidei chachomim who gather each other to learn halacha, Hashem loves them. **Rava** said, this is true if they know the basics of what they are learning, and that they don't have a Rebbi to teach it to them (if they do, they should go learn by him).
- **R' Abba in the name of Reish Lakish** said, lending money is greater than giving tzedaka, and investing with a poor person is even greater (he is not at all embarrassed and is not pressured to pay back).
- **R' Abba in the name of Reish Lakish** said, if a talmid chachom takes revenge like a snake, still hang around him. Even if an ahm haaretz is a “chossid”, stay away from him.
- **R' Abba in the name of Reish Lakish** said, one who raises a bad dog in his house holds back kindness from entering his house (poor people will be afraid to come). **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, he also throws away Yiras Shamayim.
 - A woman went to bake in a house and a barking dog scared her to the point that the baby in her stomach “uprooted”. The owner said “Don't be afraid, I've removed his teeth and his claws”. The woman said, it is too late. The baby has already been lost.
- **R' Huna** explained a pasuk that in the beginning says to be happy and cheerful and at the end says to remember that Hashem will bring you to judgement. **R' Huna** said, the beginning of the pasuk is what the yetzer hara says. The end of the pasuk is said by the yetzer tov. **Reish Lakish** says the beginning refers to learning Torah and the end refers to ma'asim tovim.

BIRIS TEHORAH

- **R' Yehuda** says “biris” is a bracelet.
 - **Q: R' Yosef** asked, the Mishna says that a “biris” cannot become tamei. However, a bracelet can become tamei, so that can't be what a “biris” is!? **A: R' Yehuda** meant that “Biris” is like a bracelet in that it is a band worn around the leg to hold up a woman's stockings. She may wear it on Shabbos. She will not remove it outside because her leg would then be exposed.
- **Ravin** said, “biris” is a band on one leg, “kevalim” are bands on two legs. **R' Huna** said, both are bands on two legs, but when one attaches the two legs with a chain it is called “kevalim”.
 - **Q: “Kevalim”** can become tamei, but “biris” cannot. The only difference is the chains, so how do the chains make it a keili that can become tamei? It can't be because a keili made to make noise is tamei and these chains, which make noise, are therefore tamei as well, because these chains are not made to make noise?! **A:** The chains are considered a keili because they accomplish a purpose in that they shorten the strides of the women who wear them (this prevents some women from losing their “besulos”).
- **R' Dimi in the name of R' Yochanan** said, we learn from the “tzitz” (which was very small) that a woven “beged” of any size can become tamei. **Abaye** asked, the “tzitz” was made of metal (gold), so how can we learn out woven materials from there? **R' Dimi** said “I was mistaken”. What **R' Yochanan** said was that we learn from the “tzitz” that a tachshit of any size can become tamei. We learn that a woven “beged” of any size can become tamei from the extra words in the pasuk – “Oy Beged” written in regard to sheretz tumah.
 - A Braisa says, a woven material of any size can become tamei (we learn it from “Oy Beged”). A tachshit of any size can become tamei (we learn it from the tzitz). If something of any size is made of part woven material and part tachshit it can become tamei (we learn that from “Kol Kli Ma'aseh”). Sackcloth is more stringent than material in that it can become tamei as a woven material (the Gemara will explain this).
 - The **Rabanan** asked **Rava** (who gave the parenthetical sources), “Kol Kli Ma'aseh” is said in regard to tumas meis. How do we know that a mixed cloth made of woven and tachshit can become tamei from a sheretz as well? **Rava** answered, we learn that from a gezeirah shava (“kli”, “kli”).