

This month's Daf Digest is dedicated
לכבוד the Wedding of Yosef and Shoshana Sokolin
And לעלוי נשמת Israel Isser Ben Tzion ben Yaakov whose yahrtzeit is on 19 Iyar

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) The tum'ah of a bell (cont.)

Rava explains that the reason a bell is susceptible to tum'ah even when the clapper was removed is because it could still be used as a bell by banging it against an earthenware pot.

R' Yosi the son of R' Chanina also explained like Rava, whereas R' Yochanan said the reason the bell is still susceptible to tum'ah is because it could be used as a cup for a child.

R' Yochanan's explanation seemingly contradicts a principle he stated elsewhere which is that a broken utensil only remains susceptible to tum'ah if it retains a semblance of its original function.

The Gemara resolves the contradiction by declaring that the opinions in the first quote, i.e. R' Yochanan and R' Yosi the son of R' Chanina, should be reversed to remain consistent with a third teaching of R' Yochanan where he repeats the requirement that the utensil retain a semblance of its original function to remain susceptible to tum'ah.

2) Defining עיר של זהב

Rabbah bar bar Chanah in the name of R' Yochanan identifies the עיר של זהב as an ornament engraved with an image of Yerushalayim on it.

A Baraisa records three opinions regarding whether it is permissible for a woman to go out on Shabbos wearing an עיר של זהב. The Gemara explains the rationale for each opinion.

3) כלילא

Wearing a כלילא (tiara) outside on Shabbos is a dispute between Rav, who prohibits it, and Shmuel who permits it.

According to one explanation, if the כלילא is made of gold or silver there is no dispute that it is prohibited and the dispute concerns a כלילא made from fabric covered with gold and precious gems. R' Ashi had a more lenient version of the dispute where everyone agrees that a כלילא made from fabric is permitted according to all opinions, and the dispute concerns one made from gold or silver. Support for R' Ashi's version is presented.

4) Different garments

R' Yehudah in the name of R' Shmuel ruled that an ornate belt may be worn outside on Shabbos. Some say that R' Shmuel referred to a belt of fabric covered with gold and precious gems, and some say that he referred to a belt made from hammered gold.

Ravina asked R' Ashi if it is permissible to wear an ornate belt on top of a regular belt. R' Ashi prohibited it.

R' Ashi ruled that a רסוקא (corset) that has ties may be worn outside on Shabbos. If it does not have ties this is prohibited.

5) Identifying items mentioned in the Mishnah

A קטלא is identified as a bib worn to catch crumbs

The Mishnah's prohibition against going out with rings is limited to nose rings.

6) Finger rings

Our Mishnah implies that if a woman was to go out with a signet ring she would be in violation of a Biblical transgression since it is not considered jewelry, and yet another Mishnah states that even a signet ring is classified as jewelry.

R' Zeira explains that our Mishnah follows the opinion of R' Nechemya and the other Mishnah follows the opinion of the Rabanan. ■

Gemara GEM

A picture of Mechuza

דרש לוי בנהרדעא: כלילא שרי, נפיק עשרין וארבע כלילי מכולה נהרדעא. דרש רבה בר אבוח במחוזא: כלילא שרי, ונפקו תמני סרי כלילי מחדא מבואה.

Sefer Yosef Da'as provides a picture of the people of Mechuza, which helps us understand their response to this ruling of Rabba bar Avuha.

The people of Mechuza were, for the most part, wealthy businessmen, and not blue-collar workers. They were sensitive and delicate by nature. According to Rava (Shabbos 109a), they were finicky and even somewhat spoiled. They were quite attentive to their appearance and the clothing they wore (ibid. 112a), and they also maintained their homes in good repair, while their wives were often idle from work (see ibid. 95a and 32b). This combination of factors (wealth and abundant idle time) now make it understandable that the women had time to become involved with improving their appearance and being interested in showing off their jewelry one to another. In fact, the women of Mechuza were known to be wine drinkers and connoisseurs (see Kesuvos 65a).

It is of interest to note that Rava, the rabbi of Mechuza, alerted his constituents to honor their wives with jewelry, in order that the family merit blessings from the heavens (Bava Metzia 59a). Many sefarim write that the wife is the conduit by which blessing are directed to one's household. On the other hand, it is Rava again who tells us (see Shabbos 62b) that if a woman is deprived of jewelry by her husband who is capable of providing for her but chooses not to do so, and she scolds him about it in public, this brings a person to a state of poverty. ■

REVIEW and Remember

1. Is anything that a zav sits upon tamei?
2. Why is the metal shoe of an animal susceptible to tumah?
3. How did Rav know that R' Efes passed away?
4. Why is a belt made of hammered gold considered an ornament for all Jews?

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
Mr. and Mrs. Shmuel Yaakov Meystel
In loving memory of their mother
מרת סימא בת ר' פסח, ע"ה
Mrs. Selma Behren

HALACHAH Highlight

Wearing a gartel out onto a public domain on Shabbos where no Eruv exists

אמר ליה רבינא לרב אשי: קמרא עילוי המיינא מאי? אמר ליה תרי המייני קאמרת?

Ravina said to Rav Ashi: If a person wishes to wear an ornate belt over an ordinary belt out onto public domain on Shabbos, what is the law? Rav Ashi responded: Are you asking about two belts?

Rav Ashi worded his response to Ravina in the form of a question, which can be understood in two ways, either to prohibit or permit. In fact, Rashi¹ quotes two different interpretations of the response of Rav Ashi. The first interpretation² understands Rav Ashi's response as prohibiting the wearing of two belts one on top of the other. Rav Ashi responded thus: Are you asking about wearing two belts atop one another, surely the outer belt is being carried as an unnecessary burden and is prohibited? The second interpretation³ reads the question to permit wearing the two belts. According to this view, Rav Ashi answered: Are you asking about what is synonymous to wearing two belts, surely that is permitted? Rashi prefers the first prohibiting interpretation.

Rav Yosef Karo deliberates the codification of this passage in his Beis Yosef⁴. He references Rashi's strict view and remarks that other Rishonim⁵ concur with the prohibitive interpretation of Rashi. He then continues to note that interestingly neither Rif nor the Rambam codify this law at all. He infers from this that they must interpret Rav Ashi's question in the permitted sense (namely: Are you asking about what is synonymous with wearing two belts, surely that is permitted?), and that there was no need to codify the permissibility. The Beis Yosef concludes that considering that both Rif and the Rambam rules permissively, the Halacha is in accordance with their permissive view. He consequently rules unambiguously in the Shulchan Aruch⁶ to permit the wearing of one belt upon another.

However, the Rema disagrees. He asserts⁷ that since many Rishonim clearly prohibit the wearing of two belts upon one another, how can they be entirely dismissed due to the absence of a ruling one way or another by Rif and the Rambam? Accordingly, Rema rules in his glosses⁸ to the Shulchan Aruch that it is forbidden to wear one belt upon another, unless a garment separates the two belts⁹.

One of the interesting applications of our passage is in regards to wearing a gartel out into a public domain where there is no Eruv. The

gartel is a belt worn by Chasidim primarily for prayer (but for the performance of other Mitzvos as well). May a person wear a gartel over his jacket in addition to the standard belt? Rav Binyamin Zilber¹⁰ was one of the first contemporary authorities to issue a ruling on this matter. He rules to prohibit the wearing of a gartel into a public domain on Shabbos. He contends that a gartel is neither a garment, nor does it serve a utilitarian function for a garment (שימוש להבגד). He arrives at this evaluation because a gartel is not worn all day, but rather only during prayer. As such, he opines that even the Shulchan Aruch would rule strictly, being that his leniency in regards to two belts upon one another was for two garments, but not for an item that does not qualify as a garment. Rav Zilber revisited this topic on numerous other occasions¹¹, and while there was some adjustment to his stringent ruling, essentially he maintained his strict position.

In a lengthy responsum, Rav Yitzchak Weiss¹² responds to Rav Zilber's strict stance on this topic, and rules that it would be permitted to wear the gartel over ones jacket out onto a public domain on Shabbos. Amongst the many points that Rav Weiss presents is the perspective that the gartel is to be classified as an ornament (תכשיט) even if is worn primarily for prayer. Rav Weiss concludes his analysis by stating that if one wishes to be strict, he should undo the buttons of his jacket. As well, Rav Moshe Feinstein¹³ and Rav Avraham David Horowitz, the Strasbourger Rav¹⁴ conclude that one may wear a gartel over ones jacket on Shabbos even where there is no Eruv. ■

1. רש"י כאן (ד"ה תרי המייני)
2. בשם תלמידי רבינו יצחק [בר יהודה – ב"ח]
3. בשם תלמידי רבינו הלוי
4. בית יוסף (סי' שא, עמ' רמח במהד' מכוון ירושלים)
5. שכן נראה דעת התוס' שם (ס"ה תרי) והרא"ש (פ"ו סי' ה) ושכן כתב התשב"ץ קטן (סי' מז) ע"ש. [ויש להוסיף לציין למאירי כאן (עמ' 20) שרוב גאונים אוסרים. ע"ש]
6. שו"ע (סי' שא סל"ו)
7. דרכי משה שם (אות יב) וע"י בב"ח שם שהבין איפכא בהשמטת הענין ע"י הרי"ף והרמב"ם שהוא סימן שאוסרים, דאי איתא דשרי הו"ל לפרושי. ע"ש
8. שם בהגה
9. וזה ע"פ משמעות התוס' הנ"ל (ד"ה תרי), ושכן כתב המרדכי (שבת פ"ו סי' שמו) וכן הוא באור שרוע (ח"ב סי' פד ס"ק ו)
10. שו"ת אז נדברו ח"א (סי' סט)
11. ע"י שו"ת אז נדברו ח"ב (סי' מו אות א) וח"ג (סי' לה) וח"ה (סי' כג ובהערה שנדפסה בסוף הספר לאחר המפתחות, עמ' כח). ע"ש. ויש לציין גם לדעתו של רבי משה שטרן בשו"ת באר משה ח"ב (סי' סד אות ח וסי' סה אות יא וסי' סו אות יג) שמצדד להחמיר. ע"ש
12. שו"ת מנחת יצחק ח"ה (סי' מא)
13. שו"ת אגרות משה (ח"ב מחא"י ס"ס עו וח"ג החא"י ס"י מו סוד"ה וללובשה)
14. שו"ת קנין תורה ח"ב (סי' נ' אות ג) ■

STORIES Off the Daf

Important women and the "City of Yerushalayim"

לא תצא אשה בעיר של זהב ואם יצתה חייבת חטאת דברי רבי מאיר

Some want to say that the reason for the ruling of Rabbi Meir is that, according to his understanding, the "City of Yerushalayim" charm was not designed to be decorative, but rather a legitimate remembrance of the destruction of Yerushalayim. Originally, in fact, it was not even made from gold. It was fashioned

from clay or some simple metal. In fact, the reason the Chachamim disagree and rule that a woman who wears such an item is exempt, is only because in this case "it is of gold". However, even the Chachamim agree that she would be liable for a חטאת if it was made of ceramic or tin. Rabbi Meir, on the other hand, holds that even if this particular piece is made of gold, she is still חייבת, because this item primarily serves to be a remembrance of Yerushalayim, and not as an ornament.

Rashba and Meiri note that although we do not allow an important woman – אשה עיר של זהב – to wear an חטאת – חטאת – Shmuel we do allow her to wear a כלילא (a

tiara). What is the difference? The Netzi"v answers that "an important woman" mentioned in reference to the medallion for Yerushalayim means a woman who is not necessarily wealthy, but she is distinctive in her fear of Heaven. In fact, she feels deeply about the destruction, and she wears an emblem to keep it in mind. Such a woman might share her feelings and inadvertently take off the "City of Yerushalayim" to show it to others. However, the "important woman" of the tiara discussion is a wealthy and prominent woman. She does not take off jewelry to show it to others. She may wear the crown in the public domain on שבת. ■

