

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) Goats' hair

The Gemara explains that the ruling of the previously cited Baraisa which indicates that goats' hair cloth is more susceptible to tum'ah than cloth made of other materials means that goat hair threads that are merely braided together are susceptible to tum'ah.

A lengthy Baraisa is cited that provides the scriptural source for the laws of tum'ah that are relevant for items made of goats' hair thread, horse tails and cow tails.

2) The battle with Midian

The terms עגיל and כומז are defined as ornaments worn to resemble a woman's private parts.

R' Nachman in the name of Rabbah bar Avuha presents the conversation between Moshe Rabbeinu and the commanders regarding the offering of gold that was brought to atone for the soldiers.

R' Sheishes taught that the reason the Torah listed outer jewelry (e.g. a finger ring) and inner jewelry (כומז) together was to teach that gazing at even the finger of a woman is likened to one who gazes at a woman's nakedness.

3) MISHNAH: A list of items that a woman may "wear" outside on Shabbos is enumerated.

4) Hair strands

The Gemara explains why the Mishnah needed to teach that a woman may go out on Shabbos with hair strands that come from three different sources, i.e. her own, her friend and from an animal.

A Baraisa qualifies the lenient ruling and forbids a young woman to go out with strands of hair from an elderly woman and for an elderly woman to go out with strands of hair from a young woman.

5) Defining "going out"

Rav teaches that the prohibition against "going out" with the outlawed items is, generally, not limited to reshus harabim, rather it includes going out to the courtyard as well. R' Anani bar Sasson in the name of R' Yishmael bar Yosi differs and limits the prohibition to reshus harabim.

The reason Rav agrees that a woman may go out to the courtyard wearing a woolen cap and a wig is to assure that a woman should not be repulsive to her husband.

The Gemara digresses to present another ruling of Rav, namely; any time Chazal prohibited an activity because it gives the appearance of wrongdoing, the act is prohibited even in the privacy of one's home.

This rule, the Gemara concedes, is a matter of dispute between Tanaim. ■

REVIEW and Remember

1. What can be done with braided goats' hair that makes it susceptible to tumah?
2. What is גזרה שוה מופנה?
3. According to Tanna d'vei R' Yishmael, what was the sin of the Jewish soldiers?
4. What is the principle that allows women to apply make-up while a niddah?

Distinctive INSIGHT

Using a Spray on Shabbos to Treat Bad Breath

בפילפל... שיתן לתוך פיה

Harav Yitzchok Zilberstein, in his sefer חשוקי חמד addresses the question whether a person may spray breath freshener into his mouth on Shabbos to remove bad breath.

Our Gemara says that it is permitted for a woman to have a piece of pepper or salt in her mouth on Shabbos to reduce the effect of bad breath, as long as she puts it in before Shabbos. Putting these items in her mouth on Shabbos itself is prohibited. Tosafos (ד"ה ובלבד) cites ר"י פורת who explains that this appears as if she is doing so for medicinal purposes, and that would be a violation of the rabbinic rule against "grinding herbs."

Rabbi Akiva Eiger points out that improving one's bad breath is not considered a medical remedy in halacha. (Tosefta, brought in the Rif, Perek Shmone Shratzim; also Shulchan Aruch O.C. 328:36). Why, then, is placing the pepper or salt in the mouth prohibited if placed in the mouth on Shabbos? Why is it only permitted if placed before Shabbos begins?

Eglei Tal (טורחן – מו,א) attempts to resolve this issue by saying that there is a difference between temporarily sweetening bad breath and curing the problem. If a person simply places a sweet smelling substance in the mouth to dissolve for a few minutes, this simply treats the symptom, but it is not a medicinal solution to the malady. In this case, it would be allowed even on Shabbos. ר"י פורת in Tosafos is dealing with placing a tablet in the mouth to cure the ailment from its root cause. This is a medicinal approach which is prohibited on Shabbos.

However, the Eglei Tal concedes that the question of Rabbi Akiva Eiger is in place, because, in fact the pepper discussed in the Mishnah does not cure the problem from the source. Even if we assume that the same substance which is used to sweeten bad breath can be used on a prolonged basis to cure the ailment, the question would still be justified, because the rule is (Shabbos 109b) that if a substance can be eaten or consumed for its nutritional value, it may be consumed on Shabbos, even if the intent is for its medicinal effect. The explanation of this is that it is not evident to an observer that someone eating it is doing so for medical reasons, and therefore the rabbinic objection of it appearing as if he might grind herbs does not apply. Why, then, can't this woman place this pepper in her mouth on Shabbos itself?

The Eglei Tal subsequently (סק"ח) answers Rabbi Akiva Eiger's question by saying that the ר"י פורת understands that the issur refers only to the grain of salt, which is a remedy, and not to the pepper, which is in fact permitted.

Harav Yitzchok Zilberstein therefore concludes that spraying breath freshener into the mouth to temporarily sweeten one's breath is permitted because it only treats the symptoms. This is not a medicinal remedy, and is not included in the prohibition of using medicines on Shabbos. ■

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated by Mr. and Mrs. Eliezer Freid
As a zechus for a Refua Shelaima for כל חולי ישראל

HALACHAH Highlight

Walking out into a public domain with cotton in one's ears

יוצאה אשה ... במוך שבאזנה.

A woman may go out on Shabbos into the public domain while she has a wad in her ear.

At head, the Gemara¹ discusses the parameters of this Halacha. Initially, the Gemara presents the view of Rami bar Yechezkel that the permission to go out with the wad in the ear is only if the wad is tied to her ear. The concern is that maybe the wad will fall out and she may be tempted to carry it with her. However, the two different views presented by Rashi² in explanation of the ensuing discussion about an incident involving R' Yochanan act to qualify the Halachic outcome of the passage. Following Rashi's first explanation, a wad that is tightly inserted in the ear would be equal to being tied, and a person would be allowed to go out thus into a public domain. Rashi then quotes another opinion³ according to which one is required to securely tie (קשר מהודק) the wad to the ear, and not merely to tie it. Rashi⁴ states that he prefers the first explanation. On the other hand, numerous Poskim⁵ rule in accordance with the second interpretation by which one would be required to have the wad firmly tied to the ear in order to walk out thus onto a public domain. The Shulchan Aruch⁶ appears to rule in accordance with the opinion that the wad must be firmly tied⁷ to her ear (ומהודק באזנה) in order to permit the woman to go out into the public domain.

The later authorities differ in the practical application of the Shulchan Aruch's ruling. Rav Shimon Greenfeld⁸ observes that once a wad has been pressed well into the ear, it is not possible to tie the wad to that inner area of the ear. As such, he rules that if the wad has been firmly compressed into the ear such that there is no concern that it fall out, one need not tie it, and it would be permitted to go out onto a public domain, even where no Eruv exists⁹. However, other authorities¹⁰ do require that the wad be tied. One authority¹¹ finds basis in the Yerushalmi¹² to permit a person who needs to have wads in his ears for medical purposes or in order to prevent contracting a cold during the frigid winter months to simply press the wad firmly into the ear without tying it.

Some Poskim propose distinctions between our present-day cotton and the wads of earlier times. One authority¹³ suggests that it should be permitted to place contemporary cotton firmly in the ear and to go out

thus without requiring it to be tied. He reasons that the wads of Talmudic times were thick and coarse, and so were very difficult to place securely in the ear. This is in distinction to our cotton which is very fine and pliable, and can easily be molded very firmly in the ear such that it could not fall out. As such, possibly our cotton does not need to be tied; moreover, it would be very difficult to tie our cotton to the ear. Another proposal presented by some Poskim¹⁴ is that our cotton should be compared to a wad utilized for menses that becomes repulsive upon falling out, and thus removes the concern that it possibly be carried¹⁵. Therefore, being that people discard the cotton if it falls out of the ear, we need not be apprehensive that it be carried.

One contemporary authority¹⁶ observes that these points to find permissibility are predicated on the cotton being needed to absorb fluid in the ear¹⁷ or to prevent contracting a cold. However, to place cotton in the ear simply to block out noise would not be permitted.

Finally, it would be permitted to put the cotton in the ears on Shabbos¹⁸. However, preparing the cotton involves issues beyond the scope of this article; but, to simply press a ball of cotton as is into the ear would be permitted on Shabbos¹⁹. ■

- 1 דף סה ע"א 2 רש"י דף סה ע"א (ד"ה הא דמיהדק) 3 בשם תלמידי רבינו הלוי
- 4 שם (סו"ה והא תני רמ). וכן נראה דעת המאירי (בפירוש המשנה, נמי 235) והריטב"א (סה ע"א ד"ה ר' יוחנן נפיק). ע"ש. 5 רבינו חננאל (סד ע"ב, ובמהד' מכוון לב שמח בעמ' פ), וכן בר"י (דף כט ע"א בדפי הרי"ף) ע"פ הגהת הבי"ח שם (אות א), וברא"ש (פ"ו ס"י ד) [ועי' שם קרבן נתנאל (אות י) לענין הרי"ף]. וכן כתב בעל המאורות (סה ע"א, עמ' קד) שבעינין קשר מהודק. ע"ש. וכן דעת הטור (ס"י שג, ריש עמ' רסז במהד' מכוון ירושלים) ועוד. ובשיטת הרמב"ם יש לציין שבפירוש המשניות כאן כתב שיהא קשור היטב באוזן. שמשמע כשיטת הרי"ף והרי"ף. אמנם בחיבורו (פ"יט מהל' שבת הי"א) כתב והוא שיהיה קשור, ולא הזכיר קשר מהודק. ועיין. וראה בזה בשער הציון (ס"י שג ס"ק לו). 6 ס"י שג סט"ו. ועי' בבאור הגר"א שם. ומש"כ עליו בשו"ת יד יצחק ח"ג (ס"י שמב ד"ה ועכ"פ). ודו"ק. 7 עי' שו"ת יד יצחק ח"ג (ס"י שמב ריש ד"ה ועכ"פ) שביאר לשון השו"ע שרי"ל שיהי' הקשר מהודק. 8 שו"ת מהרש"ג ח"ב (ס"י קכו אות ב' ד"ה ועכ"פ אפשר). ובסי' הלכתא רבתא לשבת (אות מ' סעיף ב' הערה ב', עמ' קעד) הביא ש"כ גם בסי' תולדות שמואל (מצוה לב). ע"ש. 9 ועי' בשו"ת קנין תורה ח"א (ס"י סג שאלה ד). וכן ראה בשו"ת אבני ישרה ח"א (ס"י עד). ואכמ"ל. 10 עי' בשו"ת יד יצחק ח"ג (ס"י שמב) ובקצות השלחן (ס"י קטו בבדי השלחן סוף אות מו, דף מד סו"ע"ב) [ונשם הוסיף טעם שאכן שייך חשש של דלמא אתי לאתויי מכיון שלפעמים מסירין הצמר גפן כשרוצים לשמוע היטב. ע"ש]. ובסי' הלכתא רבתא לשבת (אות מ' סעיף ב' הערה ב', סוף עמ' קעד) הביא ש"כ גם בשו"ת חמדת שאול ח"ב (ס"י יד). 11 רבי ישראל אברהם אלטר לאנדא בשו"ת בית ישראל ח"א (ס"ס יא ועוד בסי' נג). 12 ירושלמי (שבת פ"ו ה"ה) 13 שו"ת חסד יהושע ח"ג (ס"ו) הוב"ד בסי' הלכתא רבתא לשבת (אות מ' סעיף ב' הערה ב', סוף עמ' קעד). ועי' בסי' פסקי תשובות (ס"י שג אות א) שהביא סברא זו בשם שו"ת קנין תורה ח"א (ס"י סג). ובחפזי לא מצאתי כן שם (ס"י סג שאלה ד). ע"ש. 14 שו"ת חסד יהושע הנ"ל. וכן כתב בש"כ (פ"י"ח הערה פה, עמ' ריא) 15 שו"ע (ס"י שג סט"ו) 16 ס"י הלכתא רבתא לשבת (אות מ' סעיף ב' סוף הערה ג', עמ' קעד). 17 עי' משנ"ב (ס"י שג ס"ק מא) ע"פ רש"י כאן. 18 עי' בשו"ת מהרש"ג שם בסוף התשובה. וכן הציונים בסי' הלכתא רבתא לשבת (אות מ' סעיף ב' סוף הערה ד', סוף עמ' קעד). וכן בש"כ (פ"י"ח ס"כ) 19 עי' ש"כ (פ"י"ח הערה פד, עמ' ריא) בשם הגרש"א. ■

Gemara GEM

Coming Close to Considering Committing a Crime

אם מידי עבירה יצאנו מידי הרהור לא יצאנו

When Moshe asked the people whether they had sinned during their conquest of Midian, they assured him that although they had not fallen into "the hands of sin" (מידי עבירה), they nevertheless had been plagued by entering into "the hands of sinful thoughts" (מידי הרהור). This statement of the Gemara presents us with several puzzling questions. How could these people claim they had not sinned, when they admit that they were guilty of lustful thoughts? Is gazing upon immoral sights and indulging in fantasy

mind games not itself a sin? Furthermore, this battle was manned by a group of one thousand soldiers from each tribe. These men were chosen as the greatest tzaddikim and the most worthy men of the nation. How could it be that they faltered in this regard? Finally, the people did not say that they had not sinned, but rather that they had not fallen into the clutches of sin (מידי עבירה). What is the significance of this nuance?

Harav Nosson Lobart cites the Gemara in Nedarim (6b) which tells us that there are expressions that are clearly statements which indicate an oath, but there are also words that a person uses to indicate somewhat of a connection or an association to an oath (יש יד). Similarly, Rambam writes (Hilchos Isurei Bi'ah Ch. 21) that aside from the actual sin of forbidden relations, there are actions which

may lead to sin. There are lustful thoughts (יד הרהור), and there are things a person does which can lead to lustful thoughts (יד הרהור).

Here, the soldiers came to Moshe to offer a tribute as a form of atonement. Moshe asked them whether they had sinned. The soldiers assured Moshe that they had not sinned, nor had they actively been guilty of sinful thoughts. However, they had collected the jewelry from the women of Midian. This is generally a situation which can lead to having sinful thoughts - לידי הרהור. This is what they told Moshe, "We are not guilty of even coming close to sin, but we were involved in coming close to improper thoughts." Consequently, they brought this offering, because for people on that elevated plateau of spirituality, even this is something which they felt required atonement. ■

