

Laws of Shabbat Chapter 19 (Auto Translated)

English

Auto Translated

Shiur Overview

Summary of Chapter 19 — Laws of Shabbat (Laws of Carrying)

Introduction to the Chapter

Hotza'ah (carrying) takes up more chapters than all the other 39 melachot combined, both in the Rambam and in Tractate Shabbat. This is because hotza'ah is the most "spiritual" melachah — you don't feel like you're doing anything, you've merely moved something, but you've accomplished something. Chapter 19 is the last chapter of the laws of hotza'ah, and it deals with carrying related to clothing/garments — how garments are subordinate to the person (similar to the law that a bed is subordinate to a living person). But there are things that aren't true garments (like a pocketbook), and there are things that are garments but we're concerned that one will remove them and carry them.

Law 1: Weapons of War on Shabbat

The Rambam's words: "One may not go out with any weapons of war on Shabbat. If they were items that are not worn as clothing, such as armor, helmet, and leg guards — one is exempt but it is forbidden. But one who goes out with weapons that are not worn as clothing, such as a spear, sword, bow, shield, and buckler — he is liable."

Explanation: One may not go out on Shabbat with weapons of war. There are three categories: (1) Items that are worn on the body like clothing (armor, helmet, leg guards) — exempt but rabbinically forbidden; (2) Weapons that are held in the hands or tied on (spear, sword, bow, shield, buckler) — liable by Torah law because it's not the way of clothing at all; (3) Regular military uniforms — we don't discuss these, because a uniform is normal clothing.

Insights and Explanations:

1) "One may not go out" is rabbinic: "One may not go out" means exempt but forbidden — a rabbinic prohibition. The reason could be lest he carry it (he'll remove it and show it to another, and come to carry it in the public domain), or appearance (it looks like he's going to war, and on Shabbat one only goes to war in an emergency).

2) Distinction between armor/helmet/leg guards (exempt) and spear/sword/bow (liable): Armor, helmet, leg guards are worn on the body like clothing — therefore it's "in the category of clothing" and not the way of carrying. But because it's not normal clothing (no person normally goes around wearing an iron shirt — it's heavy and cumbersome), it's only exempt but forbidden. Spear, sword, bow, shield, buckler — one holds them in the hands or ties them on, it's not the way of clothing at all, therefore it's a proper burden and one is liable by Torah law.

3) Question of Lechem Mishneh — the Rambam rules like the Sages although he holds like Shmuel: In the

Mishnah there's a dispute between Rabbi Eliezer and the Sages. Rabbi Eliezer says that weapons (a sword) are an ornament for a man, and brings a verse "Gird your sword upon your thigh, O mighty one, your glory and majesty." The Sages say no — "They shall beat their swords into plowshares" shows that a sword is a last resort, not an ornament. The Gemara says that Rabbi Eliezer holds like Shmuel — "The only difference between this world and the Messianic era is subjugation to foreign kingdoms" — so even in the Messianic era we'll still need swords.

The Lechem Mishneh asks: The Rambam explicitly holds like Shmuel (the world continues as usual, only Jews will win), so how does he rule like the Sages that a sword is not an ornament? Seemingly according to Shmuel's approach one should say that a sword is indeed an ornament.

4) Discussion whether "ornament" is subjective or objective: Even if a sword is beautiful, it's not enough to be called an "ornament regarding carrying." An ornament means something a person would wear just on a "random Tuesday" — he wants to dress nicely, he's going to a wedding. Not something taken out once a year at a military parade. One side holds that everything is subjective — we need to check each region and culture (in Eretz Yisrael for example, people walk around with guns all the time). The other side holds that it's objective — "their opinion is nullified" — and the Rambam views a sword as not an ornament.

5) Distinction between a woman's ornament and a man's ornament: As the Gemara says "**A woman, weapons are upon her**" — a woman's ornament is to display beauty. A man's ornament is to display might — "**Like a mighty man in his strength**". A sword shows that he's a warrior. The question: In the future, what will be the true beauty? Is this only a "necessary beauty" as long as there are wars?

6) Aggadic insight: Rav Kahana/Rav Safra explained that the verse "Gird your sword upon your thigh, O mighty one, your glory and majesty" speaks metaphorically about words of Torah. The true might of a man is to know all six orders of Mishnah — "**Sixty mighty men around her**" — he knows sixty tractates. The Rambam's approach makes sense: he views a sword as not an ornament — it's a "reminder" (disgrace), not beauty.

7) Practical application in Eretz Yisrael: There's a question about bringing guns into the beit midrash — it says one shouldn't enter with a gun into the study hall. If there's no eruv, we encounter the question of carrying.

The Studded Sandal

The Rambam's words: "One may not go out with a studded sandal that was studded to strengthen it" — one may not go out with a shoe that has nails added to strengthen it. Even on Yom Tov, where there's no

prohibition of carrying, **they decreed that one should not go out with it.**

Explanation: The Gemara relates that Jews were in a bunker, and when they heard the loud banging of such shoes, they thought a whole military group was coming, and there was great danger — they fell upon one another.

Insights:

1) This is actually not a law of Shabbat, but a law of danger. The Rambam could have placed it in the Laws of Murder and Protection of Life, but he brings it here because it was included in the category of clothing that was forbidden.

2) Historical insight: The studded sandal was the garb of Roman soldiers — such sandals can still be seen in museums. Therefore it's gentile clothing. During the week it's not dangerous to go in gentile clothing, but in honor of Shabbat they forbade it. The proof that it's gentile: when they heard the banging, they immediately thought the gentiles were coming.

3) Question: Why didn't they also forbid it during the week because it's gentile? **Answer:** During the week one doesn't need to go so Jewish, but on Shabbat (as Jews go on Shabbat with longer coats and the like).

Belt with Gold and Silver

The Rambam's words: "And it's permitted to go out with a belt that has fixed pieces of silver and gold on it like a chain that craftsmen make, provided it's not loose" — lest it fall in the public domain and he come to carry it four cubits in the public domain.

Explanation: Generally one may not walk around with pieces of gold and silver, but when it's sewn permanently onto a belt, it's considered an ornament.

Insights:

1) What is the permission? The permission isn't just because it's "sewn on." Not everything sewn to a garment becomes permitted. The main permission is: an ornament is not a way of carrying. It's not a belt that he's carrying around his gold — he's wearing it because he wants to show off with an ornament.

2) Example: The Czar's underwear was sewn with brilliants and diamonds — this is not an ornament, one may not go on Shabbat. This is a way of carrying/storing valuables, not an ornament.

3) "Fixed pieces": The word "fixed" is important — it must be fixed in the belt, not randomly placed on today.

4) "Loose" — lest it fall: If it's loose and can fall off, there's a concern that it will fall in the public domain, and because it's a valuable item he'll pick it up and carry it four cubits.

Law 3: Ring with/without a Seal — Man and Woman

The Rambam's words: "A ring without a seal is a woman's ornament... A ring with a seal is a man's ornament... Therefore, a woman who goes out with a ring that has a seal, or a man who goes out with a ring without a seal — they are liable."

Explanation: A ring without a seal is a woman's ornament — a woman may go out with it, but for a man it's not an ornament. A ring with a seal is a man's ornament — a man may go out with it, but for a woman it's not an ornament.

Whoever goes out with a ring that doesn't fit their gender is liable.

Insights and Explanations:

1) Proof that we don't look at the specific person: The person who wore the ring actually thought it was an ornament for him, but the law looks at the objective standard — whether it's an ornament for his gender.

2) Question from the Gemara — not the way of carrying: The Gemara asks: If it's not an ornament for him/her, should he be liable? Perhaps it's not the way of carrying — he/she carried it out not in the normal manner?

3) Explanation of "not the way of carrying": "Not the way of carrying" doesn't just mean that he had it on his finger instead of in his hand. The point is that **it's not a man's way to carry on his finger except a ring suitable for him** — a man doesn't normally put on his finger a ring that doesn't belong to his type.

4) The Gemara's answer — it is a way of carrying even if not a way of ornament: Sometimes it happens that a man gives his ring (with a seal) to his wife to put away at home, and she puts it on her finger until she gets home. Or a woman gives her ring (without a seal) to her husband to bring to the craftsman to fix, and he puts it on his finger until he arrives. Therefore it's **the way they carry them** — it's a normal way of carrying, although not a normal way of ornament. **Therefore they are liable.**

5) Important distinction — way of ornament vs. way of carrying: There can be something that is **indeed a way of carrying but not a way of ornament.** The man carries the woman's ring on his finger — it's a normal way to carry (functional), but it's not an ornament for him. Therefore he's liable — because it's a way of carrying without an ornament exemption. If one holds it in the hand (not worn), one is certainly liable like any carrying.

6) Does the law change when reality changes: Today men do go with rings (even without a seal). Seemingly it should be permitted, because it's become an ornament for men. In **Shulchan Aruch** it's brought **"there are those who permit"** on this basis. It's not a divine decree — it's based on reality, and when reality changes, the law changes. This is different from weapons of war, where **everyone knows what a weapon of war is** and it's not a change in reality.

7) Why is there a seal on a ring? One puts a stamp on a ring so it won't be stolen, or so one will know whose stamp it is. Also — the stamp itself is a beautiful thing, with the person's name initials, beautifully engraved. The seal itself was part of the beauty, and it's then also used for signing.

8) Is a ring with a seal a vessel whose primary use is forbidden? A ring with a seal is made for sealing — should it be called a vessel whose primary use is forbidden? No — the main function is an ornament, it "happens to be" that it also has a seal. The seal is an addition, not the main thing. This is compared to a beautiful pen that's like an ornament but is actually a vessel whose primary use is forbidden — there the main function is writing, not ornament.

Law 4: A Woman Should Not Go Out with a Ring Without a Seal (Rabbinic Decree)

The Rambam's words: "A woman should not go out with a ring without a seal, even though it's her ornament, lest she want to show it to her friends as women always do. And if she went out with it — she's exempt, since it is an ornament. But a man is permitted to go out with a ring that has a seal, and it's not his way to show. The custom of all the people is not to go out with a ring at all."

Explanation: A woman may not go out with her ornament-ring (without a seal) because there's a concern that she'll remove it to show her friends, and then she'll carry it four cubits in the public domain not as clothing. If she went out — she's exempt, because by Torah law it's an ornament. A man may go out with his ornament-ring (with a seal) because he doesn't go to show. The custom, however, is not to go with any ring at all.

Insights:

1) What is the concern — Torah-level carrying? When a woman removes the ring to show, is this Torah-level carrying? She doesn't want to carry, she just wants to show — perhaps it's a melachah she'eina tzricha legufa? It could be actual carrying — she removes the ring, holds it in her hand, and brings it to her friend standing on the other side of the street — this is major carrying in the public domain. A technical question of uprooting and placing is also raised — if she removes it while walking, that's not uprooting.

2) Why is a man permitted — "and it's not his way to show": For a man there's no decree because a man doesn't go showing his ornaments to others. A man looks from the side for people to notice on their own, but he doesn't actively go to show.

3) "The custom of all the people is not to go out with a ring at all" — source: The Magen Avraham interprets the Rambam's custom based on the Yerushalmi — "The custom of the pious, those who left Chalach and all the places to be stringent" — we're stringent on both, even men.

4) Rabbeinu Tam's approach — "Leave them": Rabbeinu Tam (brought in Hagahot Maimoniyot) already noted that our women conduct themselves to go with ornaments on Shabbat, and we should leave them — "Leave them to be unintentional" — better they should be unintentional than intentional. We tried to find justifications: perhaps because today there's no Torah-level public domain (only a karmelit); perhaps because today we don't conduct ourselves so strongly to remove ornaments to show. But the distinction between public domain and karmelit doesn't appear in the law.

5) Practical application — watch, pen, and the like: This is also relevant to a nice watch — whether one may go with it on Shabbat. According to the Rambam's custom — no.

[Digression: Key in Belt / Tie-Clip]

The custom in America (and other places) where people made a key like an ornament on a necktie (tie-clip), or inserted into a belt, in order to carry on Shabbat. With a belt the key is nullified to the belt, because the belt is truly a garment. But with a tie-clip it's more problematic — the person wears it essentially because he wants to have the key, not because he wants an ornament — this makes the permission questionable.

If it's truly a Torah-level public domain, it's not such a good permission.

Law 5: Perforated Needle / Non-Perforated Needle

The Rambam's words: "A woman who went out with a perforated needle is liable... But a man is exempt. And a man who went out with a non-perforated needle is liable, and a woman is exempt."

Explanation: Perforated needle — a needle with a hole for thread, used for sewing. Non-perforated needle — a "pin" without a hole, which is an ornament.

Explanation:

- **Woman with perforated needle — liable:** Women sew with it, it's their way of carrying. It's not an ornament, and it is the way of carrying — therefore liable.

- **Man with perforated needle — exempt:** For a man it's not an ornament and also not the way of carrying, because it's degrading for a man to go with a sewing needle — people will think he's a tailor. (Unless he is actually a tailor — then he can be liable.)

- **Man with non-perforated needle — liable:** For a man a pin is not an ornament, but it is the way of carrying — therefore liable.

- **Woman with non-perforated needle — exempt:** For a woman it's an ornament, and a woman goes out with her ornaments. It's only rabbinically forbidden (decree lest she remove it and show it to her friend), but exempt by Torah law.

The Rambam's General Rule

Rambam: "This is the rule: Anyone who goes out with something that is not his ornament and not the way of his clothing, and carried it out the way that thing is carried — is liable. And anyone who goes out with something that is his ornament, but it's loose and likely to fall soon and he'll come to carry it — is exempt [but forbidden]. And similarly a woman who goes out with ornaments that she's accustomed to remove to show to her friends — these are exempt. Something that is an ornament, and doesn't fall and it's not the way to show it — it's permitted to go out with it initially."

Explanation — three categories:

1. **Liable** — not an ornament, not clothing, but carried out in the way of carrying.

2. **Exempt but forbidden** — it's an ornament, but (a) it's loose and can fall (for men and women), or (b) for a woman — it's her way to remove and show to her friends.

3. **Permitted initially** — it's an ornament, it doesn't fall, and it's not the way to show it.

Bracelet

Rambam: "Therefore, a bracelet that is placed on the arm or leg — one may go out with it on Shabbat, provided it's attached to the flesh and won't slip off."

Explanation: A bracelet on the hand or foot may be worn on Shabbat, on condition that it fits tightly on the body.

Insight: Such a thing is not the custom to remove, it's not something easily taken off — therefore the decree lest she remove it doesn't apply, and it won't fall off, therefore permitted initially.

Wool Threads, Linen Threads, Straps — Things on the Hair

Rambam: "A woman should not go out with wool threads or linen threads... or with straps... on her head."

Explanation: A woman should not go out with threads of wool or linen, or pieces of leather on her hair.

Explanation: All these things are perhaps the way of clothing or an ornament, but here there's a special reason why it's forbidden: **decree lest she undo them at the time of immersion.** Because at the time of immersion one must remove all things from the hair (because it's an interposition), there's a concern that she'll remove it in the public domain.

Insight/Question: How often does it happen that an immersion falls out exactly Friday night? It's a bit interesting that they decreed on such a thing that's relatively rare. Also, a girl who never goes to the mikveh, or a woman who's already pregnant — for them the concern doesn't apply. This shows that it's a broad decree that doesn't distinguish.

Frontlet, Golden Cheek-Pieces, Crown, Chains

The Rambam's words: "And not with a frontlet that is placed between her eyes, and not with golden cheek-pieces that descend from the frontlet onto her cheeks, and not with a golden crown that is placed on her head, and not with chains that girls go out with on their legs so they won't take large steps. All these are forbidden to go out with lest they fall and she carry them in her hand."

Explanation: These are various types of ornaments — jewelry on the forehead, golden pieces that hang down on the cheeks, a golden crown, and chains on the feet. For all of them the reason is lest they fall — we're afraid it will fall and she'll carry it in her hand.

Insights:

1) Distinction between two types of concerns: For the previous group of ornaments (ring, needle) the reason is lest she remove — she'll take it off to show. For the current group (frontlet, golden cheek-pieces, crown, chains) the reason is lest it fall — it will fall off. For things that lie right on the face (like frontlet, golden cheek-pieces) we're not afraid she'll remove it to show, but that it will fall off. For a ring on a finger, for example, the concern is that she'll remove it to show.

Necklace, Nose Rings, Perfume Flask, Kohl Container, Wig, Wool Band, Tooth

The Rambam's words: "And a woman should not go out with a necklace on her neck, or with nose rings, or with a perfume flask tied to her arm, or with a small or round purse in which they place fine oil called kohl container, or with a wig of hair that she places on her head to appear to have much hair, or with a wool band that she presses around her face, or with a tooth that she places in her mouth in place of a tooth that

fell out, or with a golden tooth that she places on a black or red tooth in her teeth. But a silver tooth is permitted because it's not noticeable. All these are forbidden to go out with lest she remove and show to her friends."

Explanation: A necklace on the neck, nose rings, a perfume bottle tied to the hand, a leather purse with fine oil, a wig, a wool band around the face, a false tooth, a golden crown on a black/red tooth — all are forbidden lest she remove and show to her friends. A silver tooth is permitted because it's not visible.

Insights:

1) Perfume flask and fine oil — why no measure of carrying? Fine oil has a measure of carrying (a small amount), so why do we speak here of the purse with the oil? Here we're not speaking of the measure of carrying (which is a Torah matter), but of a rabbinic prohibition — it would have been permitted because it's an ornament, but the Sages forbade it. The oil is nullified to the ornament — the whole thing together is an ornament made to smell good.

2) Wig — the great insight regarding wigs:

From this Rambam came a well-known responsum that says we see from here that one may go with a wig. But this is sharply disputed:

- **What is the Rambam's wig?** The Rambam isn't speaking of our wigs that are visible on the head. He's speaking of something a woman places **under** her kerchief — fake hair under the head covering — so it should look like she has more hair. Because in the times of Chazal women wore a kerchief over their own hair (not like Hungarian women who cut off their hair), and through the kerchief one could see how much hair a woman had.

- **Proof that it's under the kerchief:** If it were a wig like ours, there wouldn't be a concern of lest she remove and show — because she wouldn't go without a wig in the public domain (that would be a modesty problem). But if it's under the kerchief, she can remove it and show friends without any problem — because she has her own hair under the kerchief.

- **Against the argument that a wig is permitted because we don't conduct ourselves to remove it:** The same rabbis who say one may go with a wig, also say one may go with it on Shabbat because we don't conduct ourselves to remove it. This is weak — because for all ornaments we don't speak of modesty reasons, but of lest she remove. We can't say that for a wig it's different because modesty will prevent her from removing it.

- **Modesty is not the issue here:** All ornaments that are forbidden here have nothing to do with modesty. It's not a modesty problem for a woman to stand in the street and remove her ornaments. The prohibition is only a Shabbat prohibition (carrying), not a modesty prohibition.

3) Silver tooth vs. golden tooth: A golden tooth is forbidden because it's visible — lest she remove and show. A silver tooth is permitted because it's not noticeable — it's not so visible in the mouth.

General Rule: Forbidden Even in an Uneruized Courtyard, Except Chains and Wig

The Rambam's words: "Everything the Sages forbade to go out with in the public domain is forbidden to go out with even in an uneruvized courtyard, except chains and a wig which are permitted to go out with in a courtyard so she won't be repulsive to her husband."

Explanation: All ornaments that the Sages forbade in the public domain are also forbidden in an uneruvized courtyard. Only two exceptions: wool chains and a wig — for these they permitted in a courtyard, so she won't be repulsive to her husband.

Insights:

1) Further proof that a wig is under the kerchief: The Rambam says that without the wig it's "repulsive to the husband." If we're speaking of a wig worn on the head (like our wigs), why would it be repulsive? She has a kerchief on her head! But if we're speaking of something under the kerchief that makes it look like she has more hair, then without it one sees through the kerchief that she has little hair, and that's repulsive to the husband.

2) Against the claim "she has a kerchief anyway": A kerchief doesn't hide whether a woman has hair — one can see through the kerchief. In the times of Chazal women had hair under the kerchief, and one could see through the kerchief how much hair they had.

Hair Threads

"A woman may go out with hair threads, whether hers or her friend's" — a woman may go out with hair threads (hair strands) that are tied on the head, whether from her own cut hair, or from another woman, or from an animal.

Explanation: The reason hair threads are permitted (unlike wool/linen threads which are forbidden) is because **"there's no interposition with them"** — hair threads don't interpose at immersion (water goes through), therefore one doesn't need to remove them for the mikveh, therefore there's no concern that she'll carry them four cubits.

Insights:

1) Distinction between old woman and young girl: An old woman who gets beautiful young hair — this is **praise for her** (makes her look better), therefore there's a concern **lest she show to her friends**, and it's forbidden. But a **young girl** with old hair — this doesn't make her prettier, therefore she may.

2) "Anything woven one may go out with on her head": Anything that's woven (sewn/woven) may be worn on the head, because woven is porous, therefore there's no interposition, and there's no concern that she'll go to show it.

Threads on the Neck

"A woman may go out with threads on her neck provided she doesn't tie them as tightly as she ties herself with them" — may go out with threads on the neck, but only when it's loose (not tightly tied), because then it's not an interposition and she doesn't need to remove it for the mikveh. But if it's colored beautiful threads — forbidden, lest she show to her friends.

Golden Wreath

The Rambam's words: A golden wreath — only an important woman may go out with it, who is not accustomed to exchange and show.

Explanation: A golden wreath may be worn, but only by an important woman.

Insight — Distinction between golden crown and golden wreath:

A crown is indeed only for important people, but it's so important that even a rebbetzin goes to show it (therefore forbidden). A wreath is "something in between" — important enough that only important women wear it, but not so important that she goes to show it, therefore permitted.

Frontlet — When Tied

"When are we speaking? Of gold and with a cloth that's not tied to them, but if it's of silver or with a cloth that's tied to them, one may go out with it."

Explanation: When the pieces are tied to the net (small cap on the head) so it won't fall — there's no concern, one may go out.

Insight — Two types of concerns: If the concern is only **lest it fall** (it will fall off) — we can permit it by tying. But if the concern is **lest she show to her friends** — tying doesn't help.

Cotton in the Ear / In the Sandal / Prepared for Her Menstruation

"A woman may go out with cotton in her ear... and with cotton in her sandal... and with cotton she prepared for her menstruation even though it's not tied and even though it has a handle."

Explanation: Cotton in the ear (tied), cotton in the shoe (tied), and a pad for menstruation — even not tied, even with a handle — one may go with them. The reason for menstruation: **"If not, it's repulsive"** — no one will touch it because it's repulsive.

Insight — Third category of permitted things to carry on Shabbat:

Not just clothing and ornament, but also **something that serves the body / for bodily need** — not an ornament and not clothing, but it belongs on the body, therefore it's included in similar things one may carry. This is a **new type of permission** — a third category.

Pepper and Grain of Salt (in the Mouth)

"And they may go out with pepper and a grain of salt and anything they put in their mouths for bad breath."

Explanation: One may go out with pepper/salt in the mouth for bad breath. **But she should not put it in initially on Shabbat** — she shouldn't put it in on Shabbat, because it's a decree of medicine (grinding of spices). Carrying is permitted, but putting it in initially on Shabbat is not.

Splinters in Their Ears / Necklace / Bells / Buttons of Fur
"And women may go out with splinters in their ears" — piece of wood in the ear (earring). **"With a necklace on her neck or on her garment"** — pearl necklaces. **"Bells**

on her neck or on her garment" — bells. "And buttons of fur" — a garment that's closed with a stone (a type of zipper/button).

Insights:

1) "She may close it initially on Shabbat with the stone or nut and go out": One may even close it for the first time on Shabbat with a stone/nut (like a zipper). "Initially" means the first time, not "initially permissible."

2) She may not tie a nut as if for the garment, in order to then give it to her child — that's deception.

3) Coin: One shouldn't use a coin as a zipper/button initially, because a coin is muktzeh. But **"if she closed it"** (after the fact) — one may go out with it.

Splinter in His Teeth and in His Sandal (for a Man)

"A person may go out with a splinter in his teeth and in his sandal" — a piece of wood in the teeth or in the shoe, one may go in the public domain. "And if it fell he should not replace it" — if it falls out, he may not put it back, because he'll go scrape a new piece from a tree (concern of detaching).

Rule: All things that are somewhat medicinal — one may carry them as long as they're already serving the person, but putting them in initially on Shabbat is not permitted.

Cotton and Sponge on a Wound

Rambam: One may go out with cotton and sponge on a wound, but one may not tie a thread or ointment on it, because thread and ointment are important and not nullified to the wound.

Explanation: A gauze pad, piece of cotton, or sponge on a wound is nullified to the body — it's like part of clothing. But a thread/string that one ties with it is

Cotton and Sponge on a Wound

Rambam: One may go out with cotton and sponge on a wound, but one may not tie a thread or ointment on it, because thread and ointment are important and not nullified to the wound.

Explanation: A gauze pad, piece of cotton, or sponge on a wound is nullified to the body — it's like part of clothing. But a thread/string that one ties with it is a separate important thing that one will later put away, not throw away with the cotton, therefore it's not nullified to the wound.

Insights:

1) The principle: Something that lies on the wound is "nullified to the body" — it becomes almost like clothing. But an extra thing (thread/ointment) that's important in itself, is not nullified.

2) Garlic peel and onion peel on a wound — also permitted. **"Anything on the wound — one may open and tie and it's permitted on Shabbat" — one may open and tie the bandage on Shabbat (presumably a non-permanent knot).**

3) Band-aids with medicine (plasters soaked in medicine): One may also with such, because something placed on a wound for healing is permitted.

Stone of a Modest Person, Locust Egg, Fox Tooth, Crucifixion Nail

Rambam: One may go out with all sorts of things hung on oneself for healing — a small stone, a locust egg, a fox tooth, a crucifixion nail.

Explanation: These are old remedies/segulot that people wore on themselves.

Insights:

1) The Rambam's rule: "Anything hung for healing" — the Rambam sets a condition: **"Provided the doctors of that time say"** — it must be that the doctors of that time hold that it helps. If the doctors say it doesn't help, it's just nonsense.

2) The Rambam himself in Moreh Nevuchim writes that he couldn't digest the segulot. But he says clearly: **"It has nothing to do with what I hold"** — if in those times the experts held that it's a remedy (not just a segulah, but that it works), it's permitted.

3) Practical application today: If today we know it doesn't work — one may not. And not only may one not, it could even be **forbidden because of gentile practices.**

Tekumah Stone

Rambam: A woman may go out with a tekumah stone (a segulah stone for pregnant women). Also a stone that weighs exactly as much as a tekumah stone. And not only a pregnant woman, but all women may go with it.

Insights:

1) Why may all women? Because for non-pregnant women they go **for beauty and ornament**, not as a segulah.

2) Every woman is in concern lest she become pregnant — one can't know, not on Shabbat and not at other times. Therefore it's always a medicinal purpose.

Expert Amulet

Rambam: One may go out with an expert amulet. An amulet is expert if it has healed three people (the amulet is proven), or the writer has healed three people with other amulets (the man is proven).

Insights:

1) A non-expert amulet — initially one doesn't go, but **exempt** (exempt but forbidden). The exemption is because it's a **melachah she'eina tzricha legufa** — one didn't carry it with the hands but as clothing.

2) Practical application: May one go out with a paschal lamb's foreleg in one's pocket against the evil eye? **If it's a proven segulah — yes**, on the basis of "one may go out with an expert amulet."

Tefillin on Shabbat

Rambam: One who goes out with tefillin — is exempt.

Insights:

1) The Rambam places tefillin next to an amulet because **tefillin is similar to an amulet** — the same principle.

2) Exempt means exempt but forbidden — because Shabbat is not the time for tefillin, it's seemingly not truly a garment. Or perhaps because lest it fall.

Single Shoe — One with a Wound on the Foot

Rambam: One who has a wound on the foot may go out with a shoe only on the healthy foot. But the one who has the wound should not go out with one shoe (on the sick foot).

Insight: When one goes with one shoe it's obvious that one has a shoe — why is one going with only one? There's a concern that it will fall off (lest it fall) or it's not comfortable and he'll remove it and carry it.

Child in Adult's Shoe / Woman in Loose Shoe

Rambam: A child should not go out with an adult's shoe (will fall off). A woman should not go out with loose shoes or new hard shoes (will remove and carry).

Insight: But an adult's garment (large garment) on a child — yes, because it doesn't fall off.

The Amputee — His Prosthesis, Supports

Rambam: A person with an amputated foot may go out with his "prosthesis" (a type of prosthesis/fake foot) and "supports" (a type of shoe/support).

Insight: The amputee doesn't go on his crutches because they'll fall off — they're not tied, they're an extra thing.

Apikursin — Those with Boils

Rambam: People with boils on their heads may go out with "apikursin" — pieces of linen/wool that were dyed and tied. But only if one already went with them before Shabbat.

Insights:

1) "That were dyed and tied" — one dyed them and tied them, then it's **recognizable** that it's made for the head — it becomes a type of "hat."

2) If one didn't dye/tie them — it's just a piece of cotton on the head, not clothing, therefore forbidden.

3) Exception: If he already went with them before (even without dyeing/tying) — it's already become "his hat," his clothing, and permitted. The principle: **permanence** — when something becomes permanent as clothing/medicine, it becomes permitted.

Thick Sack, Thick Blanket, Curtain, Cloak — Because of Rain

Rambam: "One may go out with a thick sack, or with a thick blanket, and with a curtain, and with a cloak because of rain. But not with a box, or with a basket, or with a mat because of rain."

Explanation: One may go out on Shabbat with various coarse materials (a thick hair sack, a thick woolen blanket, a coarsely-woven fabric, a cloak) to protect from rain. But not with a box (tevah), basket (kufah), or mat (machtzeleth).

Insights:

1) The distinction is **the way of clothing:** All permitted things are something one can **wrap oneself** in like a tallit — one puts it on the body. A thick sack is truly not normal

clothing, but one can wear it (like sackcloth and ashes). But a box, basket, mat are not in the category of clothing at all — one can't wrap oneself in them, it's only like an umbrella that one holds over the head.

2) Question regarding plastic on a hat on Shabbat: This is a great dispute among the poskim. Plastic on a hat is more similar to a basket — it's not something one wraps oneself in, it's not a type of garment, just a piece of plastic lying on the hat.

Cushions — Soft and Thin vs. Hard

Rambam: "Cushions and pillows — if they were soft and thin like garments, it's permitted to take them out placed on one's head on Shabbat as clothing. If they were hard — they are like a burden and forbidden."

Explanation: Soft, thin cushions may be carried out on the head as clothing. Hard cushions are like a burden and forbidden (but not liable).

Insights:

1) Why only "forbidden" for hard ones and not "liable"? Because the person puts it on (wears it), it's a bit of a garment — one can still wear it. It's just a type of garment that one doesn't normally wear. Therefore it's **exempt but forbidden** — not enough the way of clothing to be permitted, but not enough the way of a burden to be liable.

2) Box and basket — discussion in the category of clothing: A box or basket is not something one can wrap oneself in — it doesn't cover one's head and most of one's body in the way of clothing. It's **not the way of clothing, not the way of a burden** — it's an unusual manner, and therefore exempt.

Law 18: Bells, Chimes, Slave's Seal

Rambam: "One may go out with bells woven into garments. And a slave may go out with a clay seal on his neck, but not with a metal seal."

Explanation: One may go out with bells that are woven into garments. A slave may go out with a clay seal (sign of servitude) on the neck, but not with a metal seal.

Insight: A metal seal — "lest it fall and he come to carry it out" (it has value, he'll pick it up). A clay seal — if it falls, it breaks, he won't pick it up.

One Who Wraps Himself in His Tallit and Folds It — Folded Tallit

Rambam: "One who wraps himself in his tallit and folds it and holds it in his hand or on his shoulder — if he intended to gather its corners so they won't tear or so they won't get dirty, it's forbidden. And if he intended to change his manner with them according to the custom of the people of the place, it's permitted."

Explanation: One who wraps himself in his tallit, but folds it together and holds it on his hand/shoulder — if he does it only so the corners won't tear/get dirty, it's forbidden. If this is the local custom how one goes, it's permitted.

Insight:

When it's the **custom** to go this way with a tallit, it's the way of clothing — a nice garment that comes folded. When it's not the custom, it's **exempt but forbidden** — it's a garment (not liable), but not enough the way of clothing (rabbinically forbidden). This is the "middle case" — half clothing, half burden.

One Who Goes Out with a Folded Tallit — Liable; Scarf on His Shoulder — Permitted

Rambam: "One who goes out with a folded tallit placed on his shoulder — is liable. But one who goes out with a scarf on his shoulder, even though there's no thread tied to his finger — is permitted."

Explanation: A folded tallit lying on the shoulders (not worn) — liable, because it's the way of a burden. But a scarf (shawl/kerchief) on the shoulders — permitted, even without a string tied to the finger.

Insights:

1) Thread tied to the finger: Usually one would tie a string from the shawl to the finger so it wouldn't fall off. The Rambam says that even without this it's permitted — because **the way of the scarf** is that one places it this way on the shoulders, it doesn't fall off.

2) Distinction between folded tallit (liable) and scarf (permitted): A folded tallit on the shoulders is not worn at all — it's simply carrying. A scarf on the shoulders is **the way of wearing** — that's how one goes with a scarf.

Scarf That Doesn't Cover His Head and Most of His Body

Rambam: "And any scarf that doesn't cover his head and most of his body — it's forbidden to go out with it."

Explanation: A scarf that's too small to cover one's head and most of one's body is not clothing and one may not go out with it.

Insights:

1) The measure of head and most of body is what makes a scarf into clothing. A small rag that doesn't cover enough — it's not the way of clothing.

2) Distinction between shawl, scarf, cloth: A **shawl** is clothing that goes on the neck — as clothing it doesn't need to cover head and most of body. A **scarf** is not clothing, it's a handkerchief/rag — therefore it needs to cover head and most of body to be considered a garment. In those times Jews used a handkerchief, and on Shabbat they wrapped it around the neck — they used the permission even without head and most of body when it becomes a shawl.

Narrow Scarf — Make Like a Belt

Rambam: "And if he added to it... narrow that's not wide, he ties its two ends below his shoulders, and it's found like a belt, and it's permitted to go out with it."

Explanation: A narrow rag/handkerchief that can't cover head and most of body — one can tie it below like a belt, and then it's permitted to go out.

Insight: The law of head and most of body is only when one wants to use it like a tallit/shawl. A belt is a separate category

of clothing. He says "**like a belt**" — it's not truly a belt, but it functions like one.

Tallit with Long Threads (Straps)

The Rambam's words: A tallit that has straps (long threads) at the ends, even though they are long threads — they are not an ornament to the tallit, but they are nullified to the tallit.

Explanation: Even if it's not for ornament, the long threads are nullified to the garment, and one doesn't need to worry that one is carrying out a bundle of merchandise.

Insight: The main permission is not because it's tied to the garment, but because it's nullified to the garment — the person doesn't care about them, it's like part of the garment.

Tallit with Tzitzit That Are Not According to Law — Liable

The Rambam's words: "One who goes out with a tallit that doesn't have tzitzit according to law — is liable, because his mind is on them until he completes their deficiency for them to be tzitzit."

Explanation: A tallit that has tzitzit but they're not kosher — the person is liable for carrying, because he has in mind to fix the tzitzit, and therefore they're not nullified to the garment.

Insights:

1) His mind on them makes it not nullified: For ordinary long threads (straps) one isn't particular, therefore they're nullified to the garment. But for invalid tzitzit — because the person has in mind to fix them, it's not nullified to the garment. It lies there like something external that he's dragging with him, and that's a burden.

2) Being tied is not enough for permission: Things that are tied to the garment — that alone is not a permission. The permission is only when it becomes automatically a part of the garment (nullified). Because the tzitzit is certainly tied, one can't cut it off in the middle of Shabbat — still one is liable. Tying something to the garment only helps for concerns of it will fall/he'll come to carry (rabbinic concerns), but a thing that's not a garment remains forbidden by Torah law even when tied.

3) Way of carrying vs. way of wearing: If it's nullified to the garment, that's the way of wearing (permitted). But if it's not nullified — because he needs to have it for tomorrow, external to the garment — it's external, a burden.

Kosher Tzitzit — Ornament of the Garment

The Rambam's words: "A tallit that has tzitzit according to law — it's permitted to go out with it both by day and by night. Behold, tzitzit is only an ornament of the garment and its adornment, like the fringe."

Explanation: Kosher tzitzit is like an ornament of the garment — just like a fringe (a nice addition to the garment), because the law says that's how a garment should come.

Insights:

1) Not that the mitzvah permits, but ornament of the garment: The Rambam says explicitly that we can't say that the mitzvah of tzitzit permits — because **a positive**

commandment without karet doesn't override Shabbat. The reason one may go with tzitzit on Shabbat is because it's an ornament of the garment.

2) But the mitzvah decides if it's an ornament: When tzitzit is kosher, that defines it as an ornament of the garment. But when it's invalid, it's not an ornament. So the mitzvah's validity determines whether it's an ornament or not.

3) Case of an ignoramus / scoffer: What about an ignoramus who doesn't know his tzitzit is invalid, and he has no intention to fix? For him it's perhaps an ornament of the garment, because he doesn't care about validity — he just wants the appearance. Therefore it's nullified to the garment, and permitted on Shabbat. This is discussed whether it's subjective or objective.

4) Practical applications:

- **Woman with tallit on Shabbat:** A woman who's not obligated in tzitzit — for her it's perhaps not an ornament of the garment, and she may not go with it on Shabbat.

- **Gentile who wants to convert:** If he goes with tzitzit, he's "in any case a vessel": On the side he's a gentile, tzitzit is a burden (because for him it's not an ornament of the garment), and he's not resting.

[Digression: Tzitzit at Night]

There's no obligation to go with tzitzit at night. The true reason why Hasidic Jews go with tzitzit at night is not because it's a halachic obligation, but because there's a segulah (holiness of Yom Tov) that when one sleeps at night one should go with tzitzit. But at night when one doesn't sleep (like at a wedding when one dances) there's no issue at all.

It's argued that tzitzit is a "uniform" in Hasidic communities. But this is rejected: if one tells the person his tzitzit is invalid, he immediately takes it off — this proves he doesn't go only because it's a uniform, but because he thinks it's a mitzvah.

Law: Tailor with a Needle Stuck in His Garment (Craftsmen)

The Rambam's words: "A tailor should not go out with a needle stuck in his garment, nor a carpenter with a chip in his ear, nor a wool-comber with wool in his ear, nor a money-changer with a dinar in his ear, nor a dyer with a sample in his ear."

Explanation: Various craftsmen may not go out on Shabbat with their work tools in their usual place.

Insights:

1) "Should not go out" — rabbinic, not Torah-level: The language "should not go out" shows that by Torah law he's exempt, because it's not the way of carrying — no normal person carries out this way. But rabbinically one may not.

2) "Perhaps he goes out in his craft's way" — why is he exempt? For the craftsman himself this is indeed his way — he indeed goes this way! The answer: "He didn't carry out the way of carrying" — we don't look at the specific person's habit, but at the way of all people.

3) What about a non-craftsman? For the tailor it's "closer" (nearer to liability) because it's his way, but even he is exempt by Torah law.

4) Muktzeh dimension: Even without the carrying prohibition, all these tools are muktzeh on Shabbat, and it's

also business dealings on Shabbat.

Cushion — Melachah She'eina Tzricha Legufa

Insights:

1) For a cushion the Rambam says "this cushion's way is not to carry it out except in this manner" — this is how one carries a cushion.

2) Melachah she'eina tzricha legufa regarding carrying: He doesn't want to carry out the cushion, but "so his garments won't get dirty" — he only needs it so his clothes won't get dirty. This is a melachah she'eina tzricha legufa. But according to the Rambam, melachah she'eina tzricha legufa is liable.

3) Question: Why does the Rambam bring the issue of melachah she'eina tzricha legufa specifically here, when he already had similar cases earlier? It remains an open question.

Davar She'eino Mitkaven vs. String Hanging from a Tallit

Insights:

1) Definition of davar she'eino mitkaven: Davar she'eino mitkaven is only when one does **another** action, and through a side effect a melachah can result (like dragging a bench that can plow the ground). But when one carries a garment and the garment has something hanging — he's not doing "something else," he's carrying the garment with everything that's with it. This is **not** davar she'eino mitkaven.

2) "I don't care" is not the definition: We can't say "I don't intend to carry the string" when one carries the garment of which the string is a part. The analogy: if one carries a coat and sings while walking — we can't say "I'm not intending to sing, I'm only intending to carry."

One Who Finds Tefillin on Shabbat in the Public Domain

The Rambam's words: "One who finds tefillin on Shabbat in the public domain — what should he do? He wears them in their manner, places the head tefillin on his head and the arm tefillin on his arm, and enters, and returns and goes out and wears them and returns and goes out until he brings them all in."

Explanation: Whoever finds tefillin in the public domain on Shabbat — he should put on the tefillin in their manner, go inside his home, take them off, and go out again and put on the next pair, until he brings them all in.

Insights:

1) Only one pair at a time: He can't put on more than one pair of tefillin at once, because that wouldn't be "the way of wearing." Rabban Gamliel says one can put on two pairs at once, but the Rambam doesn't rule this way.

2) And if there were many: When one finds many tefillin that one can't all put on as clothing, one must stay there until after Shabbat (wait over them until dark). With fear of gentiles — cover and leave. With fear of bandits — carry less than four cubits or pass from one to another.

3) Question on the obligation to wait over them until dark: How strong is the obligation to stay there? A person doesn't have an obligation for all the names in the world —

why should he nullify his Shabbat pleasure, meal, etc. for someone else's tefillin?

4) Why not immediately less than four cubits? Initially one must wait until dark, and less than four cubits is only when there's danger (bandits). This shows that less than four cubits requires a special permission.

Straps Tied Like Tefillin

The Rambam's words: "When they had straps tied like tefillin, that they're certainly tefillin."

Explanation: The permission to put on tefillin on Shabbat is only when one sees straps tied like tefillin, which proves that they're truly tefillin.

Insights:

1) The Rambam's reasoning: Perhaps it happens that someone makes an amulet that looks like tefillin. Without tied straps one can't be sure.

2) The Raavad's question: A person isn't troubled to make an amulet like tefillin — it's not a realistic concern.

3) Answer: The Rambam is speaking of the Gemara's times, when tefillin were simple leather pieces — not our orderly boxes with a shin. In such a reality the concern of an amulet is realistic.

One Who Finds a Torah Scroll

The Rambam's words: "One who finds a Torah scroll — he sits and guards it and waits over it until dark. If danger came — he leaves it and goes. If rains were falling — he wraps himself in the leather and enters with it."

Explanation: For a Torah scroll one can't put it on as clothing, therefore one must sit and guard until after Shabbat. With danger — leave. With rain — wrap oneself in the leather of the Torah scroll and enter the city.

Insights:

1) Distinction between Torah scroll and tefillin — "sits and guards it": For a Torah scroll it says "sits" — he must sit down and hold it, not leave it on the floor. For tefillin one may leave it lying. The distinction: for tefillin we have the solution of putting them on, but for a Torah scroll we don't have a solution, therefore we make it stronger.

2) The permission of rain — wraps himself in the leather: Initially he should sit and wait until after Shabbat. But when the waiting will destroy the Torah scroll (through rain), **then** the solution of wearing is activated — it's a pushed-off permission that's only activated when there's a loss. It's not that rain itself permits — normal people don't wear such things. It's an exempt but forbidden that only becomes permitted when there's a need to save the Torah scroll.

A Tailor Should Not Go Out with His Needle on Erev Shabbat Close to Dark

The Rambam's words: "A tailor should not go out with his needle nor a scribe with his quill on Erev Shabbat close to dark, lest he forget and go out with them on Shabbat. And a person is obligated to feel his

garments on Erev Shabbat at dark, lest there be something forgotten there and he go out with it on Shabbat."

Explanation: A tailor may not go out with his needle, and a scribe with his pen, on Erev Shabbat close to dark — because he'll forget and go out with them on Shabbat. One is obligated to check one's clothes on Erev Shabbat.

Insights:

1) "Obligated" — a strong language: The Rambam uses "a person is obligated to feel" — this is a real obligation, not just good advice. The reason: if he forgets something in his pocket, he'll transgress carrying unintentionally.

2) Custom to check pockets on Erev Shabbat: Shabbat clothing (special clothes for Shabbat) is perhaps even better, because then there's no concern that something remained in the pockets. This is also the reason for the custom that they announce in shul on Erev Shabbat about various things.

And One May Go Out with Tefillin on Erev Shabbat at Dark

The Rambam's words: "And one may go out with tefillin on Erev Shabbat at dark, since a person is obligated to feel his tefillin at all times — he won't forget them."

Explanation: Tefillin one may indeed go with on Erev Shabbat at dark, because one is obligated to feel one's tefillin at all times (not be distracted from them), therefore he won't forget them.

Insights:

1) Forgets and goes out — what does he do? If he indeed forgot and went out on Shabbat with tefillin — he must cover them (cover) until he gets home, and there take them off.

2) Two reasons for covering: (a) **Degradation of Shabbat** — people shouldn't see that someone goes on Shabbat with tefillin, as if he doesn't believe that Shabbat itself is enough as a "sign." (b) **He should take them off at home** — we won't make him take them off in the street (because that would be a carrying problem), but at home he should certainly take them off.

3) "Covers" according to the Rashba: "Covers" means he should cover them with his hand — from when he remembers, he must show that he's aware of it.

4) The permission of mitaseik: According to Tosafot, when one completely forgot that the object is there, the permission is mitaseik — not *davar she'eino mitkaven*, but mitaseik (he didn't know at all that he's doing an act of carrying).

5) Tefillin until the time of Shabbat: One should go with tefillin until the time (close to Shabbat), because specifically then one shows that Shabbat is a "sign" — when one puts away tefillin close to Shabbat. If one took off tefillin fifteen minutes after Shacharit early in the morning, it's not "recognizable" that Shabbat is a sign.

Conclusion of Chapter 19

Chapter 19 is mainly the end of the laws of hotza'ah (carrying on Shabbat). The coming chapter (20) will be about shevut — a shorter chapter.

Full Transcript

Laws of Shabbat Chapter 19 – Weapons of War and Jewelry

Introduction: Conclusion of the Laws of Carrying

Good. We are learning the Laws of Shabbat in the Rambam, Chapter 19, the nineteenth chapter.

The last four chapters have been about carrying (hotza'ah), and we've already discussed that most of the laws in the Laws of Shabbat, also in Tractate Shabbat, by far, are about carrying. I mean, carrying has more chapters than all the other 39 melachot (forbidden labors) combined. Also in the Gemara it's like this - a whole half of Shabbat and a large percentage of Eruvin is topics of carrying.

Rabbi Yitzchak said it's because carrying is the most spiritual melacha. You don't feel like you're doing anything - you've merely moved something, but you've actually done something.

And we've already covered most of the laws of carrying. This is the last chapter of the laws of carrying. This chapter will discuss carrying that has to do with clothing. We learned yesterday a law that when someone carries a living person in a bed, the bed is secondary (tafel) to him. Clothing is certainly secondary to the person - clothing is called carrying.

But there is clothing that isn't true clothing, as we'll see inside. It has the status of clothing, even though one always wears it, but it's more like a pocketbook. Let's say a pocketbook - a woman can view it as if it's a part of her that she wears, but it's not, because it's not clothing. And there are things that are indeed clothing, but there's a concern that one will carry it.

But before we learn the chapter inside, we must thank the sponsors of this shiur, and the Jews who support our shiur. We disseminate the shiur over Rosh Chodesh. The main sponsor, our friend Rabbi Yoel Eliezer Wexberger.

They are the true supporters who provide the brilliance for the shiur, certain aspects of brilliance, the physical ones, and "sacrifice of joy and gladness, they will rejoice together." One must be able to show who - we show everyone who sponsors our shiur, and about this one may on Shabbat, because on Shabbat one may not record and one cannot give money, so it's a weekday shiur.

Okay, it's already a whole nice piece of Torah. As long as one brings out from it praise for the sponsors, it's good. If one takes it seriously, I don't know how much it's correct from all sides, but it's nothing.

Law 1: Weapons of War on Shabbat

The Rambam begins the chapter with weapons of war. So, we're not talking here about during war, because we already had that in the - I mean in the third chapter we already had laws of war on Shabbat. War, yes, in Chapter 2 was about danger to life (sakanat nefashot). There at the end it stated when one may go to war and when not - if gentiles come for money, or when gentiles come to the border of the Land of Israel, one must go out to war. Then certainly one may put on all weapons of war.

We're talking here about when one doesn't do it because it's war, but because there is such a thing - one can sometimes see a former soldier who is very proud and he puts on his garments, his military garments. So, now there is a law.

The Language of the Rambam

The Rambam says thus: **"One may not go out with any weapons of war on Shabbat."** One may not go out with weapons of war on Shabbat.

Explanation: "One May Not Go Out" – Exempt but Rabbinically Forbidden

And there are two types of weapons of war. There are weapons of war that are in the manner of clothing. First of all, nothing is permitted. "One may not go out" means, as we've learned, "one may not go out" means one doesn't go out rabbinically. "Not," not obligated (chayav), but "not," like exempt (patur). This distinction we didn't... yes, and this is rabbinic.

Rabbinically, seemingly it's not clear why the Rambam says about this, says this. It could be because there's also a matter of "lest he remove it and carry it." A war item is also not... let's understand. A proper thing that one puts on, a shirt... ah, a uniform is certainly. We're talking about weapons of war, not saying garments of war. A shirt, anything that is a shirt that is in the manner of clothing in the Gemara, a shirt is a normal shirt. Let's say this way, a normal shirt that one wears every day is certainly not a question. It's permitted. I believe it's uniforms. The fact that it's military green doesn't make it not a shirt. On Shabbat, one must go for Shabbat, that's a different topic.

A thing that is jewelry (tachshit), that is, there is a level called jewelry, jewelry. You could say your pocketbook, by the way, I don't know, could be called jewelry. You can only take it out rabbinically, you can go with a pocketbook. There is a rabbinic prohibition, because it says that one shows it to another, it's a "lest" (shema). Lest he will take it off and carry it properly in the public domain and the like.

The Distinction Between Items That Are in the Manner of Clothing and Items That Are Not in the Manner of Clothing

There are intermediate things. Intermediate things are things that are first of all, there are garments that aren't really garments, for example a suit of armor from war that one will see - about this the Rambam says exempt (patur). Afterwards there are things that aren't clothing at all, but they can still be jewelry.

If, one must say before this there was a dispute in the Mishnah, if someone thinks that, like we say a woman with a pocketbook, a man goes with a sword, even if he holds the sword in his hand, or he places it on his belt, it's not clothing, it's jewelry, then there is a rabbinic prohibition to go with it, or a Torah prohibition, according to how the Rambam rules.

Example: The Sikhs and Their Sword

There was a great scandal about the Sikhs, yes, Sikh is a type of religion, an Arab religion. They always go around with a sword, and they view it as their clothing. One must go this way. It's a question... This is very dear to them, a great religious thing. It's a part of the clothing. Okay, it doesn't come in, no difference, but one sees such a thing that a sword is part of the clothing. The person goes with a sword because that's how he always looks, not because he needs to use the sword.

The Dispute of Rabbi Eliezer and the Sages: Is a Sword Jewelry?

This is the dispute in the Mishnah. According to what some say, but here by a sword, where here is that Tanna in the

Mishnah who said... that a sword is jewelry? So says the one who brings... Rabbi Eliezer said that it is jewelry, but the Sages said no, in the days of Messiah one won't need this, this is not jewelry, it's simply after the fact (bedi'eved) that one must go with a sword. A person doesn't go with a sword as jewelry, and so the Sages said. But it's after the fact, this is... it's a proof that in the days of Messiah one won't need it, one knows that it's after the fact.

Continuation of the Rambam's Language: The Distinction Between Armor and Spear and Sword

Okay. I just... I now wanted to say, so it will be clear, the Rambam says, the distinction is that regarding weapons of war, no difference if it's jewelry, it's a piece of clothing, it's a... but if it's a uniform that is entirely clothing we're not talking about. Weapons of war already means things... things of war. But initially one may not use any of them.

The Rambam also says: **"All weapons of war,"** the war implements, **"one may not go out with them on Shabbat."** If one... if one did go out, then there is already a distinction like this: **"If they were items that are not in the manner of clothing,"** if they are types of items that one puts on, it's not regular clothing, **"such as armor,"** a suit of armor. Armor is such clothing that one makes from metal, from pieces of metal, so that a sword shouldn't go in so easily. **"And a helmet,"** a hat. Sometimes they spelled helmet with a kuf. **"And greaves"** are boots, also made of iron, which are things that one doesn't usually wear.

The rest of the legs which is on the clothing, there is a great exemption. Initially... legs which is on the feet, yes. Yes, yes, yes. We thought that you don't know the meaning of greaves. In Hebrew the meaning is boots. I don't know if greaves means boots. It could be greaves means some sort of armor that one binds to the feet. Yes, we're talking that all three things are types of armor. Yes, yes, it's not clothing, the real clothing. It's armor that one puts on, one wears it.

But it's not in the manner of clothing, it's not clothing. It's not clothing. Would one go with an iron shirt? Has anyone ever seen someone go with an iron shirt? This is not a shirt. This is armor. One puts it on the body as if like a shirt, but it has no connection to a shirt. It's something a...

The Reason for the Law: Exempt but Forbidden

The commentators say why is it exempt but forbidden? Either because it's not something that one usually wears as clothing, or because it's a false appearance (marit ayin), it looks like he is weekday, like he's going to war. On Shabbat one only goes to war when it's an emergency. So, already. But it's not like simply like one goes, like a uniform. It's a thing that is not called normal clothing. Normally a person doesn't go dressed in iron clothing. It's very heavy, it's very heavy. It's not clothing.

One only wears it for the... for the... what it brings, the benefit that it brings that it's a piece of armor. Exempt, but initially it's not obligatory, because it's in the category of clothing, one puts it on oneself, so it's not in the manner of carrying, but initially one doesn't go.

Weapons That Are Not in the Manner of Clothing – Obligatory

But **"one who goes out with weapons that are not in the manner of clothing,"** other war implements that one doesn't put on oneself, but one holds, even let's say one binds

it on oneself, but it's not worn, **"such as a spear or sword or bow,"** types of swords or bows and arrows, **"or shields or bucklers,"** shields and bucklers means they are armor that one holds in the hands, or bow and shields and bucklers are three types of armor, the previous ones are what one puts on, but here is armor that one holds in the hands, **"behold he is obligated,"** he is obligated, because this is called proper carrying, because it's not clothing, so it's a proper carried burden, he is obligated for this.

The Question of the Lechem Mishneh: The Rambam Holds Like Shmuel, How Does He Rule Like the Sages?

The Lechem Mishneh asks a good question below, that in the Gemara it comes out that this is a dispute between Rabbi Eliezer and the Sages. Yes, Rabbi Eliezer said that it is clothing, he even has a verse "your majesty and splendor." Yes, the Gemara says that this has to do with learning the simple meaning of Scripture (peshuto shel mikra). Whoever learns the simple meaning of Scripture means that it says in the verse "Gird your sword upon your thigh, O mighty one, your majesty and splendor" - one sees that a sword is a beauty for a mighty one.

But the Gemara says that there, there is Rav Safra or Rav Kahana, one of them said that he didn't know that this is the simple meaning of Scripture, which doesn't mean that, it means words of Torah. It's not at all nice to go with a sword. It's beautiful for those who know Torah. This is metaphorically, that just as a gentile would think that a sword is beautiful, we know that the Torah is beautiful, not a sword, so says the Gemara.

But anyway, the Gemara also says that this is what the Sages say "Behold it says 'and they shall beat their swords into plowshares,'" and what does Rabbi Eliezer answer to this? The Gemara says that Rabbi Eliezer holds like Shmuel, and Shmuel holds that "there is no difference between this world and the days of Messiah except the subjugation of kingdoms alone." It comes out that in Messianic times one will also need a sword, because one will still win the wars, it doesn't mean there won't be any wars.

So the Lechem Mishneh asks a question, that the Rambam holds - as everyone knows that the Rambam holds like Shmuel, that the days of Messiah will be "the world continues in its natural way," only the Jews will win the wars, not the gentiles - so how can he rule here like the Sages that one may not go with a sword on Shabbat? Seemingly one should indeed go with a sword on Shabbat.

But the Rebbe did say that there will be rest and one will be able to learn, it means one will already be able to put down the sword. But the Gemara says that you can indeed go with the sword on Shabbat. Well, one must establish according to the Gemara yes. I must disagree with the Gemara a bit about this. One must know, according to what you say, whether one may go with a Gemara on Shabbat. If it is indeed jewelry, that's the true sword.

Laws of Shabbat Chapter 19: Laws of Going Out with Weapons of War, Nailed Sandals, and Jewelry

Law 2: Nailed Sandals

Speaker 1:

On the contrary, if one goes with a book instead of it not yet being in the head... I don't know what your answer is, one can think, the public should send in answers. A good question.

(prohibition of carrying), **"gazru shelo yetzei bo"**, one shouldn't go out with this, because the Gemara says that there was once a certain danger, because the shoes make very strong noise, and Jews were in a bunker, and they heard knocking from such a shoe, so basically a Jew came to the bunker, when they heard so much knocking, they thought a whole military group was coming, and there was great danger, and they fell one upon the other. Anyway, because there was once an issue of danger with this, it was forbidden.

It's not really a law in Shabbos, it's a law in danger. But the Rambam brings it here, yes, it's stated in the Mishnah this way, but the Rambam could have put it in Hilkhos Rotze'ach U'Shmiras Nefesh (Laws of Murder and Protection of Life), because the real reason is an issue of danger. But it was already placed in the category of clothing that was forbidden.

So, that's the question whether during the week one may go. It could be one actually may not during the week either.

Speaker 2:

No, one may yes, it explicitly says one may yes, only because specifically the incident was on Shabbos.

Speaker 1:

So, the answer to this is, as the commentators say, and whoever has looked a bit at history with pictures knows, that the sandal hamesumar, this was the garment of the Roman soldiers. The Romans used to make such sandals. You can look in the museums, there's enough. A Roman sandal is with nails. You can still see today in the museums, or on Google in the pictures.

And therefore, a Jew doesn't go in such a non-Jewish garment. It's very non-Jewish, the Roman soldiers who come to fight with Jews. A whole week it's not dangerous that one goes in a non-Jewish garment, but in honor of Shabbos, since the incident is brought to show how non-Jewish this is. You see, that when they thought there was someone with this, they already thought the non-Jews were coming. But that's the issue, it's something non-Jewish.

Speaker 2:

But why didn't they forbid it during the week for the non-Jewishness of it?

Speaker 1:

During the week one doesn't need to go so Jewish, only Shabbos. I hear. Okay, okay, okay. You know that Jews go on Shabbos with the longer coats, whatever, it's a normal thing.

During COVID I did have benefit from the sandal hamesumar. But they did forbid something because there was once a danger, and they remembered how much danger there was.

The Law of a Belt with Gold and Silver

"U'mutar latzeis be'avnet she'yesh alav chatikhos kevuos shel kesef ve'shel zahav kemin sharsheres she'hamelakhim osim." On the belt they sew on gold and silver, like the kings do. One may go with it, although generally one may not walk around with pieces of gold and silver on oneself, but this is sewn on, therefore it's considered a tachshit.

What does sewn on mean? Ve'khol she'eino shiur tachshit. Let's understand clearly, sewing things onto a shirt is not a heter (permission) to go with it on Shabbos simply. We're not learning here the heter. Not every thing, a person like they say

a seamstress, she has sewn the seamstress with Velcro to her things, don't become with her.

And on the contrary even, if it's not... let's not speak of the gezeira (decree), let's speak now more clearly of the law de'oraisa (from the Torah). The heter of tachshit is something that one puts it on because it's a tachshit, although perhaps not a normal person, but a king, a very great wealthy person can afford such a tachshit. But it's not the simple meaning that he's now carrying gold. There's such a thing, yes, I read that they killed the czar, I know what, they found his whole underwear was sewn with brilliants and diamonds. That's not a tachshit, one may not go on Shabbos with that.

I thought about the words **"chatikhos kevuos"**. That's the word. That if he puts on pieces of gold randomly today, it's not necessarily, because it's not fixed in that way. But I say that the heter is not the connection. The heter is truly this, that a tachshit is not a way of carrying. It's not a belt that he carries around his gold, he carries it around because he wants to show that he has a tachshit.

"Ve'hu shelo yihyeh rafui", says the Rema. This is only if it's not loose, it doesn't hang there weakly, but it's fixed, it's strongly sewn on. But if it's loose, one can take it out, then there's a concern **"shema yipol bireshus harabim"**, it will fall in the public domain, and it's a valuable thing, **"ve'yavo lehavi'o arba amos bireshus harabim"**.

Okay.

Halakha 3: A Ring That Has a Seal

Now one learns an interesting halakha of a ring. Yes? **"Taba'as she'yesh alav chosam"**. A ring has on it a circle, but it also has on it a seal, one can seal with it, meaning something is engraved, and one takes a bit, yesterday we learned lead for a seal, red, or one takes a bit, yes, red soft lead, or wax, and one puts in it the seal. So this thing is with a system how, it's something that has a practical use, and a man is the one who seals and he does business.

Ring With/Without a Seal — Man and Woman, and the Sages' Decree on Ornaments

Halakha 3: A Ring That Has a Seal — Men's Ornament, and Without a Seal — Women's Ornament

Reading and Explanation of the Rambam

A ring that has a seal on it - is from men's ornaments and is not from women's ornaments, and one without a seal - is from women's ornaments and is not from men's ornaments.

A woman goes with a ring that doesn't have a seal. A ring is only for beauty, a ring of a woman. So this is it, it's her ornaments. So a woman has nothing to do going with such a ring, because for her it doesn't mean an ornament. She'ein lah chosam, a ring that doesn't have a seal is from women's ornaments, a woman will be able to go with this, but it's not from men's ornaments, because it doesn't fit for a man. Therefore one won't be permitted to go.

U'mimeila, lefikhakh, isha she'yatz'ah be'taba'as she'yesh aleha chosam, o ish she'yotzei be'taba'as she'ein aleha chosam, chayavin.

They will be liable, because they went with something that doesn't mean a garment. A tachshit, excuse me. Here one sees very clearly... as you said that one doesn't look at each person,

because the person did go out, he did think it's a tachshit. But it doesn't go that way.

The Gemara's Question — Not in the Manner of Carrying

Not so fast, let's see. It could be... The Gemara asks, **ve'ima chayavin?** The Gemara asks another question. Okay, I hear that it's not a tachshit, therefore one should be liable. But **va'harei hotzi'uhum shelo kederekh hamotzi'in**, he carried it out not in the way that one carries out things. Why? **She'ein derekh ha'ish lehotzi be'etzba'o ela taba'as hara'ui lo.**

Wait, shelo kederekh hamotzi'in, I thought when he says it, because he put it on his finger instead of holding it in his hands. But that's not the word, because putting on the finger, if that's a way of carrying, would still be able to mean carrying. Like for example the romach... Okay, no, that's actually not a way of carrying, exactly, because it's not the thing that belongs to you.

She'ein derekh ha'ish lehotzi be'etzba'o ela taba'as hara'ui lo, it's not the manner that a man should carry this, because it doesn't have a seal. **Ve'khein isha ein darkah lehotzi be'etzba'ah ela taba'as hara'uyah lah.** If so, this is shelo kederekh hamotzi'in.

The Gemara's Answer — Sometimes a Man Gives His Ring to His Wife

The answer is that no, it's not a way to put on, but it's actually yes a way to go with it. Why? He says, no, **she'pe'amim, it does happen sometimes, that nosen ish taba'ato le'ishto lehatzni'ah babayis.** He gives the ring to the wife to take care of it, to put it away. **U'mani'ah be'etzba'ah ad she'magi'as leveisah.** She puts it on as long as she needs to take care of it, as long as she needs to have it.

Or, **ve'khein**, it happens sometimes, **isha nosenes taba'atah leva'aloh**, to go fix it **etzel ha'uman.** And what does a man do when the wife gives him a bag, go take care of it? The wife gives him, he puts it in one day, I'll do it. **Mani'ah be'etzba'o**, he puts it on his finger, **ad she'magi'a etzel ha'uman.** Until he comes to the craftsman.

So it comes out that it is yes a bit of a way to carry. It's not that you'll never find on a woman's hand a ring that has a seal. It's not that one doesn't find. One finds, it happens sometimes. Therefore, **she'hotzi'uhu kederekh she'darkhan lehotzi'an, lefikhakh chayavin.**

Fundamental Distinction — Way of Ornament Versus Way of Carrying

But here one must understand very clearly. There are two different things. There's the way to put on which makes a tachshit, and then there's the way to carry. Right? Derekh hamotzi'in means that one doesn't carry that way, right?

So the problem is that seemingly the question was that in the thing that you say that men don't carry such a seal and women don't carry such a seal, it actually includes two things essentially. First of all, a man doesn't go with such a tachshit, it's not a manly thing, it's on the women's side of the store. And secondly, he doesn't carry that way, not that way does a man carry. A woman can say she carries, but she may carry specifically because it's a tachshit, but a man doesn't carry that way.

The answer is no, that carrying one actually does carry that way. Not every time, but one carries that way. Why does one carry that way? Not because he wants to put it on, but because

he wants to schlep it. When a man gives his wife such a ring to schlep, she doesn't put it in a bag, she puts it on her finger. It comes out that it's a normal way of carrying, but it's not a normal way of tachshit.

So if he's a man, because it's not a tachshit, he's liable because it's a way of carrying. So I would say this, an interesting thing. If one holds it in the hand, certainly he's liable, like when one carries a bit of food, anything that has a measure when one carries.

Here we're speaking because it's put on. What is put on is this: either it's a tachshit, or it's shelo kederekh. To this he answers that it can be a bit kederekh, that one puts it on because one needs to take care of something, but not enough that it should become a tachshit ish or a tachshit isha. It's not a tachshit, he doesn't put it on because he's going with it, he puts it on functionally, he needs to schlep it to the craftsman.

You're right that so here one sees, okay, the person did actually... he wanted to say, so in the case of this he's liable, not because the person conducts himself yes to go with a ring, it's more because it's not an eino derekh hamalbush, it's a yes derekh hamalbush. Even if the specific person never had the incident that one was sent to fix. But if there's a custom completely, now is another question, if today is different, if you live in a city or in a culture where it is yes normal for men to go with rings, seemingly it should be permitted, so it actually says in Shulchan Arukh in the name of yesh mi shematir. Doesn't it say so?

Yes.

Discussion — Does the Halakha Change When Reality Changes

So how is the question, whether one looks at a specific person or a specific city, or the halakhos are as written, that's it? I would say that's it, it doesn't make sense. There are other things... It's not a gezeiras hakasuv (scriptural decree).

No, but the way halakha stands is, like we had for example the issue of weapons of war, checking, it says in the verse. One doesn't say there that we're going to ask the question in the city...

Right, but that's also because that one is a sharp question. We're not distinguishing in it, it's not a change in reality, everyone knows what a weapon of war is, and not all words look at it. But here the reality has changed. I have benefit from this Jew here from below who says that in Shulchan Arukh it says that biyameinu (in our days) they already practiced prohibition, he doesn't say biyameinu, in the time of the Shulchan Arukh, because in the Jew's region no men go with this.

But I'm concerned that he's going into a place where every region is already exaggerated. I would say that today men do go with rings, therefore it's certainly not liable. If someone wants to say that as a piety he doesn't want to go, okay, we don't go with rings anyway, but those who go should know that seemingly they may even on Shabbos. Generally I think that if it's a place of reshus harabim and one is strict about ornaments, one is concerned that it's not a reshus harabim, it's a karmelis.

Halakha 4: A Woman Shall Not Go Out With a Ring Without a Seal — The Sages' Decree

Reading and Explanation of the Rambam

A woman, now one will see... let's go clearly, because here one will see that everyone learns the next reason. Okay, he says so, **lo seitzei isha**, reason 4, **lo seitzei isha be'taba'as she'ein aleha chosam**. We discussed that a ring without a seal is a proper tachshit for a woman. But she shouldn't go out with such a ring, **afilu peshutei takhshiteha**, even if it's from her ornaments. Why? Seemingly a tachshit is like a garment.

There's a concern, a new concern that the Sages made, a decree, **shema tirtzeh leharos lachavrosah, kederekh she'hanashim osos tamid**. The woman, she puts on a tachshit to make herself beautiful, and she goes out with it in the public domain, so there's a concern that it won't stay on her finger the whole time, but she'll take it off and show it, and the friend will take it and examine it, and then there will be a concern when she goes the four amos in the public domain not in the way of clothing.

Question — Is This Carrying De'oraisa

But it's however, one must think, when she does such a way, will this mean carrying actually de'oraisa? Or is this a melakha she'einah tzerikhah legufa (labor not needed for its own sake)? No, because she doesn't want to carry, she basically just wants to stroll with her friend, she wants to show. If she's going to take it out from here to there, she'll take it off, hold it, and it doesn't say she's going to carry to show, she's going to bring it to her friend who's standing on the other side of the street, and she brings it to her. It was a very big carrying in the public domain, even without strolling, it was a very big carrying. Do you understand? It's a question of uprooting and placing, in the manner of walking, it's not an uprooting. It's already technical problems.

End of the Halakha

Okay, **ve'im yatz'ah bo**, if she went out with a ring, **peturah**, because essentially it's a tachshit, it's only a decree of the Sages. **Aval ish, mutar latzeis be'taba'as she'yesh aleha chosam**, meaning that it's a tachshit, for him this is a tachshit, **ve'ein darko leharos**, it's not his way of showing. A man doesn't go showing to people, a man is much more, he looks this way from the side for people to look, that yes, but he doesn't go showing. It's going to put on yourself to notice, says a man.

Minhag kol ha'am shelo yetz'u be'taba'as kelal. But in practice all the people conduct themselves, not just the custom of communities, but he sees that the Rambam wants that one should conduct oneself this way, that one shouldn't go with a ring at all, also not a man. Why? What's the stringency? Not clear.

Magen Avraham — Custom of the Pious

Discussion on Laws of Going Out on Shabbat — Rings, Needles, and Jewelry

Continuation of Discussion About a Ring with a Seal

Speaker 1: Yes, it makes sense, because it's not a stamp, it's a ring. Why would you put a stamp... It's not... Right, you put it on your finger. You want to have a way to carry the stamp. The stamp you can put in a drawer. It's something... I think, why would you put a ring so a person shouldn't steal it? That way you know it's your stamp? It could be that the stamp itself is a beautiful thing. The stamp was, for example, the initials of the person's name, so he made a beautiful graphic of his name. It's part of the beauty, and then one uses it for sealing.

Speaker 2: If you say so, I think, but if so, why may a woman not go with it? You see that it's not acceptable that the woman should go with it. The woman who doesn't go with functional things, only with...

Speaker 1: You mean to say, if the seal is what permits it for a man, it must be that the seal is an important thing. Therefore, there should indeed be a question of a utensil whose primary use is for prohibited work. If the reason why the man goes is because it has a seal, then the seal is indeed an important part of it. It's not just secondary.

Speaker 2: It's certainly important, but the simple meaning is... No, there they say, this type of ring men wear. In short, actually, yes, it's jewelry, I don't know. We're not sure about this. I mean, today, if there is a ring with a seal, that's certainly a beautiful signet. Ah, if someone has indeed a ring... It only says, they were accustomed to go out with a ring that has a seal. I don't know, perhaps in those times it was still that a king seals. I don't know, but I don't know anyone who seals with their little finger. I haven't yet met such a Jew. Perhaps here in Jerusalem in the Old City, the people who do all the customs of the sages, perhaps they seal things with signets. I don't know.

Digression: Key in Belt and Tie-Clip

Speaker 1: Okay. Yes. The latter part, yes. Yes. But what you say that we're lenient today, I remember that there was a custom, you read sometimes, when there wasn't yet everywhere an eruv, the more modern Jews had a key, and they made it like something on their necktie. They had such a nicer key, and they put it on the necktie. Yes, do you remember such a leniency that people used to use? It was a common thing in America. So you see that a functional thing that is jewelry.

Speaker 2: Yes, I think it sounds to me like a questionable leniency in this, according to what you say.

Speaker 1: Yes, the person is already going anyway, and it lies like that on his necktie. On the necktie there is sometimes such a piece of metal that one puts. It's something like... I remember it was a common thing.

Speaker 2: Yes, people still use it. One makes it and you put in the belt, yes.

Speaker 1: Or in the belt. But you see that...

Speaker 2: No, the belt perhaps is a different thing, because it becomes nullified. The belt is actually a garment. It becomes...

Speaker 1: It's not jewelry. The belt is not jewelry, it's part of the belt.

Speaker 2: I used to live... How does the world go in Williamsburg? Don't they go, everyone has a number?

Speaker 1: There are numbers, but...

Speaker 2: I used to live in Crown Heights. There it's still old times, the world still knows that one can make number locks on the houses. It still costs a hundred dollars in matchmaking money. So, they sell there, perhaps in Lakewood too, they sell such a belt where you stick in the key, and the key becomes like a part of the...

Speaker 1: It fastens to the belt.

Speaker 2: It fastens to the belt, and with this the world goes on Shabbat. It also seems to me like such a leniency, like... If

it's truly a biblically defined public domain, I don't know how good a leniency this is.

Speaker 1: No, but in this regard you can indeed see that a ring without a seal, I'm not saying it's a seal, and therefore it's not called jewelry, because the ring itself is jewelry. It also has functionality, so it's similar to that custom.

Speaker 2: No, that's different. That is... The people who do that, they actually make it so it should be functional, so it shouldn't work. He doesn't say, "I have a beautiful key, it lies here." That would have been the leniency of the ring without a seal. He wants a greater leniency, he wants perhaps a leniency like... One shouldn't need to rely on the leniency of the key.

Speaker 1: And he doesn't actually wear it as jewelry, he actually wears it because he wants to have the key.

Speaker 2: Not in the belt. In the case of the belt, he wants to have the belt for a simple thing, because he wears a belt. But for example, in the case when he wouldn't have put the piece of metal on the bow-tie, he does it because...

Speaker 1: Okay, but if it's jewelry, perhaps one may wear the jewelry. Just as he may go with the clip on the bow-tie initially, there is indeed a distinction. So, by the Jews one wears such a clip, for Shabbat one goes with a key. Very good.

Law 5 — Perforated Needle and Non-Perforated Needle

Speaker 2: Okay, section 5. Similar to the matter with the ring that has a seal, there is something else. There is a needle. There is a needle that has a hole, a perforation, where one puts in the thread, which is also a utensil, something that one uses for sewing. But what it says here is the opposite. Okay, let's see. **A woman who went out with a perforated needle**, a woman who goes out with a needle, but it's a perforated needle, **is liable**, because it's not called jewelry for a woman, **but a man is exempt**. The man is indeed exempt. But what is the way, yes? Right. **And a man who went out with a non-perforated needle is liable, and a woman is exempt**, exactly the opposite, women and their jewelry. It seems the beauty of a woman is that she doesn't need to do anything, and the man, his jewelry is being a servant of God, an honest person. Perforated needle, a woman who went out with a needle... ah, a woman with a perforated needle is liable, and the man is exempt. That means for a man it's not considered like carrying a burden. Not the opposite, like the ring. Because men don't go with this, not because it's jewelry.

Explanation of the Law

Speaker 1: There are two... Let's first explain, there are two types of needles. There is a "functional" needle with a hole, which as you say, one uses for sewing. There is a needle without a hole, which is simply a "pin," a beautiful "pin" that one wears. Okay?

Now, here however it's the opposite. Not that men use the needle with a hole, women use it, women sew with it. Therefore by them the way of carrying out such a type of needle stuck somewhere, "whatever." Therefore if she goes with it she is liable, because it's not jewelry and it is indeed the way.

A man who goes with this, also not jewelry, but it's not the way of this person to go with such a needle, because he says it's disgraceful for a person to go with this, it's a tailor. A person doesn't want people to think he's a tailor. Except if he is a tailor, of course. A tailor himself could be that he is indeed

liable, but the normal person is not liable. Why? Because it's not the way of carrying.

A woman is the opposite, because it's not called jewelry, therefore she is exempt. It's not carrying, it's not jewelry, but it's also not the way of carrying. But the woman, since there is something that she... that there is for her an object that she doesn't wear as jewelry, she is liable. Why is she liable? Because a needle without a hole is jewelry.

A man, however, with a needle without a hole, a man goes out with a beautiful pen, for him it's not called jewelry, so he is liable. **And a woman is exempt with a needle without a hole**, because a needle without a hole is jewelry, **and a woman goes out with her jewelry**, which is a pen, **and it's not forbidden**, it's not forbidden, **except like other jewelry, a decree lest she remove it and show it to her friend**, so it's forbidden initially, but it's not carrying, a complete prohibition.

The General Principle of the Rambam

Speaker 1: **This is the rule**, says the Rambam thus, **this is the rule, anyone who goes out with something that is not his jewelry and is not the way of his clothing**, it's not jewelry and it's not the way of clothing, **and it is the way to carry it out, in the manner that they carry out that thing**, it's carried out as one carries that thing, for example, placed on the hands, or in any manner, even if it's halfway worn, he means to say in the manner that they carry out that thing, **is liable**.

And anyone who goes out with something that is his jewelry, it is indeed jewelry, **and it is loose**, there is now here a rule, if it is weak, **and it's possible that it will soon fall, he will come to bring it**, the Rambam says here a new decree, that something that is loose, which we already had regarding loose, something that is weak and can easily fall, there is a new concern that he will carry it in the public domain when it falls off, it will no longer hold on the way.

And for a woman there is another reason why she shouldn't be carried to show, **and likewise a woman who goes out with jewelry that her way is to remove them**, which is the practice that the jewelry one removes **to show them to her friends, these are exempt**, they are forbidden initially as a concern of carrying, but it's exempt.

And when may one initially? **A thing that is jewelry, and it doesn't fall and it's not the way to show it**, it doesn't have the deficiencies that one will carry it in the public domain or to show or because it falls off, **this is permitted to go out with it initially**.

Therefore — Bracelet

Speaker 1: **Therefore, a bracelet**, a bracelet, **that they place on the arm or on the leg**, a bracelet that one puts on the hands or on the feet — in current times we don't practice much on the feet — **they may go out with it on Shabbat, provided that it is attached to her flesh and doesn't slip off**, it should be firm, it should lie well on the, it shouldn't be a bracelet that can fall off.

The Chayei Adam, listen to this, such a thing is not the custom to remove. It's not something that one removes easily. Either one doesn't go with it, or it's difficult, it won't fall off, one doesn't want to be beautiful for an hour with a headache.

Law 6 — Wool Threads, Linen Threads, Straps

Speaker 1: Further, he says all the garments, many of the Gemara basically of things that are still such earthly theirs, or basically what is, what is one of the two or three categories that we've just learned, yes? Yes, it is so, **a woman may not go out**, we're talking about a type of wig, a woman who puts on the hair puts on pieces of merchandise or hair, it is so, **a woman may not go out with wool threads or with linen threads**, with threads that she puts on the hair, **or with straps**, straps usually are of leather, pieces of leather, **tied to her head**, why all these things, also what is perhaps the way of clothing, or is jewelry that one would have been able to wear as jewelry, but on this there is also a concern, this is something not that one does to show but there is another reason why it's forbidden to go, because it sometimes happens that one removes it, since one puts it on the hair, so if one has an obligation of immersion there one must make sure that one doesn't have any interposition, there one must remove the things that are attached to the hair, so in immersion and at the time of immersion one is afraid that he will remove it at the time of immersion, like in the public domain at the time of the rabbi who will carry it around at the time of the rabbi.

Question: How Often Does Such a Thing Happen?

Speaker 2: This is an interesting thing, like the other things are things that happen, how often does an immersion happen every month, that it should be exactly Friday night, and on the way does one take it off forever? It's a bit interesting. So, one never removes it, only at the time of immersion. At the time of immersion is with the connection of the hair. What is the hair, after all it's... and one lives by the mikveh. By the mikveh is something saved and some place. And one has from a normal city, like the mikveh is somewhere in the middle of the market. The mikveh is only there?

Speaker 1: Okay, okay, what is... Besides this, an immersion where one must immerse the hair, if one touches something impure which one doesn't recognize. But, it means for example a girl who never goes to the mikveh, or a woman who is already past menopause and she can't go to the mikveh? It's not easy such a thing, because it's very unique, how often does it happen... Okay, but it's a very interesting decree. Because we're not today happy with reality, the sages didn't have a better reality for us, we're not today our reality, so

Laws of Jewelry That Is Forbidden to Go Out With on Shabbat (Continuation)

Continuation of Discussion: The Decree on Carrying on the Way to the Mikveh

Speaker 1: What does it mean for example a girl who never goes to the mikveh, or a woman who is already past menstruation doesn't ever go to the mikveh?

Speaker 2: What do you want. It's an interesting thing, because it's very unique. How often does it happen... Okay. It's an interesting decree.

Everything I mean they are happy with the reality. The sages didn't have a better reality than us. This was our reality. So every thing you can ask about Israel.

Good, you say, not because it's something that one sometimes removes. Lest she remove it, it doesn't matter. It's an interesting thing. It happens regularly. One regularly makes such things. Every week, let's say so, every week five hundred women go to the mikveh in the town where the rabbi said the decree. Okay? So you say, not every woman, what is the thing?

But the five hundred women go... You make a terrible assumption that the mikveh is our public domain, and the Baal Shem Tov said that one already makes a well in the public domain.

No, the mikvah is not... First of all, let's see what it says here. It will only remain with something in her hands for this or after this. First of all, let's see what it says here. It doesn't say that she goes to it in the mikvah. She goes to the mikvah. It's on the way to the mikvah. True, you do that. You say that she is in the board, right? She goes, and one may not take off, one doesn't put on... on the way there or on the way back. I understand the thing. She carries it with her on the way to the mikvah or after the mikvah.

It's a reshus harabim. The mikvah is in a reshus harabim. Okay, it's an interesting... It's a further gezeirah. You weren't there. You're holding in one being angry because you live here in a nice area in Lakewood, and the life is not exactly the same as the life in the earth. The Rav lived above the mikvah, he saw. He said, "You know what? One doesn't go on Shabbos with these things." That is the maaseh shehayah. You can see all such sorts of gezeiros. You can imagine that it happened, you can say that it was just, one thought that it would happen. But that is the reality. You say that you don't see the reality. Perhaps true, perhaps today the reality is different. I'm only saying what the halachah speaks about.

We divide, yes. Here stands a chiddush, that the gezeirah of perhaps you'll go take it off is not just something that happens let's say in a percentage, yes? Let's say shema tetateir chavrei seudah, happens among a thousand people it happens ten times. This among a thousand people it happens once. Let's say even it happens ten times. Every woman goes to the mikvah? I know, the ideas of what is metzius is not the same ideas of the Rav who made the rabbanus. I'm also very good with the Rav, I'm not attacking him chas veshalom, and we have very good feelings. The Rav didn't write so long anyway.

Halachah 7: Tzitz, Lechayim shel Zahav, Atarah, Kevalim

Okay, further. **Velo betzitz shemanichaso bein einav**, such a sort of jewelry that one places similar to a tzitz between her eyes. I mean in the Yemenite culture, a Yemenite bride puts on such jewelry on the forehead. Is it such a sort of jewelry that one places by the eyes, yes? **Velo bilechayim shel zahav sheyordin min hatzitz al lechayah**, from the tzitz hangs down on the face golden pieces that should land on the... from the tzitz, the tzitz is a shem davar for a jewelry that one places on the forehead, like the tzitz of a Kohen Gadol, and from this hangs down pieces of gold on the cheeks of the woman. What Menashe Eisenfehrer says here, if the lechayim shel zahav are not well sewn together, one may not. Velo... But I don't understand, the lechayim shel zahav, even to lead, but the tzitz one may not go. Let's say that it's included.

Velo be'atarah shel zahav shemanichaso berosh, a golden crown. I mean in the Mishnah it says Yerushalayim shel zahav, or ir shel zahav, yes, a crown shel zahav shemanichaso berosh. **Velo bikhevalim sheyotzin bahen habanos beragleihen kedei shelo yifse'u pesi'ah gasah**, one used to place such handcuffs on the feet so that one should walk properly, an interesting thing. **Kol elu asurim latzeis bahen**, because they are indeed a tachshit, but **shema yiplu**, one is afraid that it will fall, **vetevi'em beyadah**, she will bring it with her hands.

Chiddush: The Difference Between Shema Tetateir and Shema Yipol

Ay good. Further. Another sort of tachshitim. By these things is kulei, it could be that there's also shema tetateir, but it's certainly even here more shema yipol. I don't know on what the chalak things stand here, the chalak things stand here. This we will need to look in the Gemara to understand the chiluk. There are indeed things that one doesn't take off, because it lies mamash on her face. Something that is on a finger, it doesn't occur to me she'll go take it off. This lies on the face, one isn't afraid that she'll go take it off to show, one is only afraid that it could fall off. Okay, we'll need to look. There are things that are shinuyim, is maskil, okay. We'll need to go to a question.

Halachah 7 (Continued): Katla, Nizmi Ha'af, Tzelochas shel Flaiton, Kocheles

Further, **Velo teitzei islah bekatla shebe'al tzavarah**, with a sort of chain, wait chain, katla is chain. **Uvnizmi ha'af**, not with any nose rings. **Uvtzelochas shel flaiton hakevuah al zero'ah**, also not with a small bottle of perfume that smells good, which is kevuah al zero'ah, that means that one binds it up on the hand. **Velo bekis agud o katan o agol shemani'chin bo shemen hatov vehu nikra kocheles**, this is another sort of way of carrying perfume. There is a bottle, and there is also a small leather kis that one places on it the shemen hatov.

Kushya: Why No Shiur Hotza'ah?

Wait a minute, the shemen hatov we learned last night has a shiur hotza'ah, a small bit of oil. Are we speaking here even the kis without the oil? No, here we're not speaking of the shiur hotza'ah, this is indeed an issur miderabbanan. It would have been permitted because it's a tachshit, even the oil is permitted because it's a tachshit. No, the oil becomes batel to the tachshit, it's a tachshit because it's made that it should smell or whatever.

Halachah 7 (Continued): Pe'ah Nochreis, Goyil, Shen Velo bepe'ah shel se'ar shemanichah al roshah kedeci shetera'eh ba'alas se'ar harbeh. There was once such an invention that one takes hair from another woman and makes it nice, and puts it on the head so that, underneath one has one's own hair, but it should look like she has a lot of hair, yes. **Velo begoyil shel tzemer shemechaveshes oso saviv lefaneha**, and not with something such, what does the word goyil mean? There is a translation for this? A retzuah. A piece, yes, a retzuah, a piece of wool that she places around. Question or what? **Velo beshen shemaniches befiha bimkom shen shenafal**, a false tooth that one places in the place of a real tooth. One sees also apparently, not like today where one fixes the tooth. We're speaking of something that one can put in and take out. **Velo beshen shel zahav shemaniches al shen shachor o adom sheyesh bisheneha**, she has a tooth nebech that became black or it became red, and on this she covers it with a golden crown, one also may not. **Aval, shen shel kesef is yes mutar, lefi she'eino nikar.** Shen shel kesef is batel, if one doesn't see it so obvious in the mouth.

All these, **kol elu asur latzeis bahen**, why? **Shema titalosh vetarah lechavroseiha**, something that she can yes perhaps take off and show to her friends.

Chiddush Gadol: The Pe'ah Nochreis Is Not Our Sheitels

The interesting thing that he says, the strange thing, that one places another person's hair, that it should look ba'alas se'ar, which is called in Yiddish a pe'ah nochreis or a sheitel. And from here there was a very famous teshuvah, from here one sees that one may go with a sheitel. On the contrary, he says that one doesn't see, and the ba'al hateshuvah says that one does see.

But I understand, I, not only I, the other tzaddikim before me understood what's coming. I ask very much, here one sees clearly that the sheitel that we're speaking of one doesn't see. It's not like our sheitels that one sees on the head, you need to take it off so that your friends should see, hello, I'm wearing a sheitel. We're speaking of something a thing that one places under the whatever tichel whatever a woman wears. But, a tichel one wears indeed on the hair, not like us, I mean the Hungarian women who cut off the hair. One wears indeed a tichel on the hair. So when one wears a tichel one can also see how much hair one has. It's not pshat that one wears a tichel, is kulei alma doesn't have any hair. If a tichel also shows the hair. So someone who doesn't have enough hair, she placed underneath the tichel fake hair. And those nice pieces of fake hair she can take out from the tichel and show. Because if not it already doesn't make any sense, what, she'll go take it off and she'll go walk without a sheitel in reshus harabim? It can't be. But she has indeed underneath the hair, she doesn't have any problem taking it off. And reshus harabim we're speaking indeed here.

Against the Argument That Sheitel Is Permitted Because One Doesn't Lead Oneself to Take It Off

And the same rabbis who say that from here one sees that one may wear a sheitel, say further that one may wear it on Shabbos, true, because one doesn't lead oneself to take it off. You understand how the strength already... Let's not go into this, because I'm a Sanz grandson and one is machmir on sheitels, but precisely from here it looks like... One doesn't see that it's a minhag. I don't see how it's a minhag, and I understand the calculation that it's an issur from hilchos Shabbos, it's not any issur from hilchos tznius.

True, but to say that she can't be that she should take it off because of tznius is still further the question whether one uses such a kind of argument here. All these things are not any matter of tznius, one didn't say that it's a problem of tznius. It's not any matter of tznius that a woman should stand in the street and take off her tachshitim, it's not any problem of tznius.

Fine, the question is whether one meant something a chain that is... I said, the things that is more than a tachshit, it's something that she puts on. Indeed, it's stated explicitly that tzedudo, the Rambam didn't say it clearly, but one sees the mefarshim interpreted that tzedudo, which one said that a shuka, the reason why one doesn't take it off is because in order to take it off one needs to uncover oneself, so one won't take it off, and it lies from under the clothes, it's made for herself. But one sees yes that there are things that don't fall in the way of mishum tznius. I don't see how it can be daas ba'al habayis, it can't be such a kind of chukah that a sheitel is a way of tznius, daasi noteh simply that not. It doesn't mean that my wife doesn't wear a sheitel, I'm only saying what the halachah is. Not every thing that we say do the wives follow, you understand? It's like the Rav once said, they say that it's not any tachshitim. Anyway, yes, very good.

Halachah 8: Klal — Asur Even in Chatzer She'einah Me'ureves, Except for Kevul and Pe'ah

Says the Rambam further, **kol she'asru chachamim latzeis bo lirshus harabim**, everything that the Chachamim forbade to go out with to reshush harabim, the issur is not only reshush harabim, but the issur also goes on things that only miderabbanan one may not carry there. **Asur latzeis bo afilu bechatzer she'einah me'ureves**, one certainly may not in a karmelis, but even not in a chatzer that doesn't have an eruv, which is still less chamur. **Chutz mikevuli pe'ah shel se'ar**, the two things that were enumerated, the around the face kevel shel tzemer or the pe'ah shel se'ar, the pe'ah nochreis, **shemutar latzeis bahen lechatzer**, one may yes go out with this lechatzer, **kedei shelo tsgane al ba'alalah**. Both these things it looks like are more important than other tachshitim, it makes her look good, more so basically humanly, **kedei shelo tsgane al ba'alalah** one permitted to go in a chatzer. Even a chatzer that already someone more permitted.

Very good.

Proof: Pe'ah Nochreis Is Under the Tichel

So you see yes that it's not something under the tichel that it should look like she has more hair, because you see that without this it's genai lebalah.

Very good, because a woman without hair looks strange ugly. Yes, but you say that she has anyway a tichel.

Every time one goes with a tichel one sees whether one goes or not. A tichel is not any thing that hides whether the woman has hair. You're accustomed to women who wear shpitzels that they don't have any hair under it, it's not any proof.

Hilchos Shabbos: Tachshitin and Things That One Goes Out With

Tzelochas shel Flaiton

Speaker 1: Vehayotzei bitzelochas shel flaiton ein bah mamash klal. If one goes with an empty bottle of perfume, it's not any tachshit anymore. It's a simply carried bottle. It's a chov of the bottle. Interesting.

Speaker 2: Okay.

Speaker 1: Yes.

Chutei Se'ar (Sheitels / Pe'ah Nochreis)

Speaker 1: Let's go further. Says the Gemara further, "**Yotzah ishah bechutei se'ar bein shelah bein shel chavertah**". Earlier we learned about chutin of wool, linen, but chutei se'ar that one binds up on the head, one may yes go. What is this? Also something a sort of pe'ah nochreis such, yes? But it's chutin of pe'ah nochreis.

Speaker 2: Very good.

Speaker 1: I ask you, is this a proof that the chutei se'ar one may go without covering? A married woman? Because it says indeed that "yotzah bechutei se'ar".

Speaker 2: Okay, we're learning here hilchos Shabbos, let's see.

The Reason: Ein Bahen Mishum Chatzitzah

Speaker 1: "**Mai taama? Ein bahen mishum chatzitzah**". The previous one, the reason why one said one may not go with chutin, is because one needs to take it off before one goes to the mikvah, there's a chashash of carrying. But the chutei se'ar is not chotzetz. You see that the way how

one binds it up on the other hair, for some reason it's not any chatzitzah. It lets through water. The water goes through. If someone is chotzetz it, mamila someone is chotzetz it he'll go take it off mamila lo asi... until we decree a gezeirah shema totzi'enu beShabbos.

Speaker 2: Very good.

Speaker 1: Doesn't hold us back.

Bein Shelah Bein Shel Chavertah or Shel Behemah

Speaker 1: Says the Gemara, "bechutei se'ar, bein shelah bein shel chavertah", whether it's her own hair that was cut off and placed up, or shel chavertah o shel behemah. It's either a second woman or from an animal, yes. Not any difference which sort of chutin.

Chiluk Between Zekenah and Yaldah

Speaker 1: Says the Gemara, but if it's a nice sheitel, the chutei se'ar is very nice and it makes her look young, zekenah, an old woman, received something nice new young hair. This she doesn't do, because this is shevach lah, this makes her look, it's like mashbi'ach, it brings up her value, so yes something that she is proud, ushema tarah lechavertah. She will yes want, "See, did you see what a nice new sheitel from Machane Gendel?"

But yaldah yotzeis bechutei hazekenah, but a young woman, this is not, it doesn't make her look nicer with the old woman's hair, mamila she may. Mamila she may, yes. By him he doesn't say that it's a weak Rabbeinu Meir. Certainly not, it's something a help, something a reason good, but it's not so nice that she should show it to the friends.

Kol Shehi Arug

Speaker 1: Bechol shehi arug yotzah bo al roshah. Every thing that is arug, that is sewn, she may go on the head, because lekorah further because it's not chotzetz. Arug means that it's a thing that is holey, it's narer, mamila it's a holey thing and there isn't any chatzitzah, she may go out with it. And there also isn't the chashash that she'll go show it or something, yes.

Chutin Shebetzavarah

Speaker 1: Shmolter, more halachos of what is permitted, which jewelry is permitted. Further, **yotzeis ishah bechutin shebetzavarah**. A woman may go out with chutin that one places on the neck, **uvilvad shelo tehei onvassan ke'anivas atzman bahen**, because she doesn't place it tight, she places it loose, mamila it's eino chotzetz and she won't take it off before the mikvah. Umutaros, but if it is yes colored and it's nice chutin, then asurin shema tarah lechavertah. The same thing.

Kelil shel Zahav

Speaker 1: **Yotzeis ishah bichlil shel zahav berosho**. We learned earlier about atarah shel zahav, there is something else that's called a kelil shel zahav. "Kelil tiferes berosho nasata lah", it's still nicer, it's nicer than an atarah. I don't know clearly what is the difference.

Speaker 2: Okay.

Daas HaRambam: Kelil — Only for Ishah Chashuvah

Speaker 1: Says the Rambam that kelil shel zahav is more chashuv, **she'ein yotzah bo ela ishah chashuvah, she'ein darkah lehachalif ulharos**. The kelil shel zahav only the chashuv rebbetzins wear it, it's more such a kalpik, I

don't know, and such an ishah chashuvah won't go take it off and show.

Not clear, what is the difference between this and the atarah shel zahav? The Rashba doesn't know clearly, mamila he asks a kushya, he makes chilukim, needs birur.

Speaker 2: Okay.

Discussion: What Is the Difference Between Kelil and Atarah?

Speaker 1: Veyotzeis... I also don't know the translation, like kelil is, does he mean atarah is mamash the same thing? I don't know.

The same idea, it is a thing that only anashim chashuvos meod wear. He says that atarah is indeed true only anashim chashuvos, but it's so chashuv that this even the rebbetzin goes to show. A kelil is something in between.

Speaker 2: Okay, if you make in the Chefetz such a pshat, you can make such a pshat. You're probably right, it's not terribly difficult.

Tzitz and Lechayim

Speaker 1: Veyotzeis betzitz, the tzitz is the jewelry that one places on the forehead. We indeed spoke that one may not what can fall off.

Condition: Sheyihyeh Kashur Bisevachah

Gemara's Statement on Gold vs. Silver Ornaments

Speaker 1: The Gemara says, "**Bameh devarim amurim? Beshel zahav, uveshtichlah she'eino kashur bahen, aval im hu shel kesef, o veshtichlah shehu kashur bahen, yotzet bo**". This means that the little pieces that hang down from it, if it's made of gold, which is valuable, tavirin she'al roshah, when it's tied together with the sevachah — we learned yesterday in the shiur also that this is a little hat on the head — when it's tied to the hat on the head kedei shelo yipol, it's tied so it shouldn't fall off, then there's no concern, one may go out with it.

"**Vecheh kol kayotze bahen**", so too anything that is strongly sewn and won't fall off, one may.

Innovation: Two Types of Concerns

Speaker 1: If the concern is only shema tipol, if the concern is that she'll show it off, then no. But if the concern is only shema tipol, and something is well tied, there is a heter.

Moch She'be'oznah, Shebesandal, Veshehechina Lenidatah

Speaker 1: "**Yotzet ishah bemoch she'be'oznah**", if she has cotton in her ear, which is not a piece of jewelry, this is more for a... just an old lady, or I don't know what.

Speaker 2: Okay.

Speaker 1: But the Rishonim explain the word is, that this means derech malbush, "veshehu kashur be'oznah", when it's placed well, it won't fall off.

"**Uvemoch shebesandal**", also to make it soft, so it should be easier to walk, but also "veshehu kashur besandal", it's part of the shoe, it's part of the clothing.

"**Uvemoch shehechina lenidatah**", a pad that one uses lenidatah, "**af al pi she'eino kashur**", it's not tied, "**ve'af al pi sheyesh lo beit yad**", even if it's something that has a piece where one can also grab it to take it out, one may go with it.

Why? Im lav, al eino ma'us, indeed, one may go with this, lech'orah because it's derech malbush. It lies on the flesh, it lies there. And the concern would be that it will fall off, we say that something that is ma'us, is something you won't touch because it's ma'us.

Innovation: Three Categories of Permitted Things

Speaker 1: But one must say that this in itself is derech malbush. If it belongs on the body... it's a tzorech haguf, meaning everything that belongs on the body is like clothing. It's a new type of tachshit. I mean there is such a thing, tachshit kemalbush. It's the same way, it's for beauty.

This is the idea. There is a thing, there are three types of categories, so it appears from below. There is a type of category, a thing that serves the body, it's letzorech haguf, is also permitted. Is permitted a new heter, or is it a geder like clothing? Like a tachshit, yes. The same idea, but it's not a tachshit and not clothing. It's a third type of thing that's included in this type of similar things.

Pipul Vegargir Melach

Speaker 1: Veyotzot, ah, the next thing is also, one must understand that it's similar to a tachshit. **Veyotzot bepipul vegargir melach, vechol davar shenotnim letoch pihem lere'ach hapeh**. A woman, she once, okay, without going into sociological explanations, but there is a thing like putting in the mouth pepper or salt or something that will neutralize the re'ach hapeh, one may go with it.

Aval lo titnennu lechatchilah beshabbat. She shouldn't put it in her mouth, she had it put in her mouth for a long time, she shouldn't put it in her mouth on Shabbat. This is because there's a gezeirah of refuah. One may not do any refuah on Shabbat, which we'll learn later. If one puts it lechatchilah beshabbat, it's called a bit of refuah. With shechikot sammamin, sammamin one doesn't do, but carrying one may.

Kismin, Re'alah, Glecklech, Veviburin Deparva

Speaker 1: **Veyotzot hanashim bekismin shebe'ozneihen**, a little piece of wood in the ear, which is like an earring. **Bere'alah shebetzavarah o shebichsutah**. The shawl, re'alah is a shawl? No, re'alah means re'alot peninim. It's not a shawl, a garment is certainly permitted. This is little pieces that one puts on the garment. **Glecklech shebetzavarah o shebichsutah. Veviburin deparva**, this is a garment that one closes with some stone, something like that.

Speaker 2: Ah, like a zipper.

Speaker 1: Yes.

Porpet Lechatchilah Beshabbat

Speaker 1: He says, **porpet lechatchilah beshabbat al ha'even ve'al ha'egoz veyotzet**. She may also, lechatchilah means like the first time, or does it mean lechatchilah? The first time. It appears like a zipper, that one takes some stone and with it one closes. Without a zipper I don't know, but some such way how one closes with a stone. One may do lechatchilah beshabbat al ha'even ve'al ha'egoz veyotzet.

But, if she wants to have the nut, she may not now make a patent and tie up the nut as if she's doing it for the clothing, kedei lehatzil livnah hakatan so afterward they'll have the nut for her son, this she may not do. **Uvilvad shelo tipor al hamalbush lechatchilah**. She shouldn't use a coin from...

understand, a coin from the perifah, whatever it is, which is assur letaltelah, and a coin is muktzeh because it has kedushat melachah to count, it's muktzeh.

Ve'im pirpah, yes yotzet, one may go out with it, perhaps it was mevatel with this, or what, bedi'eved one may.

Discussion: Issur Leharim Dalet Amot

Speaker 2: Here lech'orah the issur leharim is the issur of that kistem that I spoke about earlier. It's properly arba amot.

Speaker 1: Arba amot, yes. Perhaps it's different because it's not sewn, whatever, one can make distinctions.

Speaker 2: Yes. Very good.

Kisem Shebeshinnav Uvesandalo

Speaker 1: Further. **Yotzei adam bekisem shebeshinnav uvesandalo**, a piece of wood that one puts on the teeth or on the shoes in reshut harabim, one doesn't fear it will fall off.

Ve'im nafal, of course, **lo yachzir**. There's a new concern, not about shema yitol veyavirenu dalet amot bireshut harabim, but because he'll go scrape off another piece of kistem from a tree.

Principle: Devarim Shehem Ketzat Refuah

Speaker 1: So this is lech'orah so in widespread halachah. All these things are a refuah or somewhat of a refuah, so one may not put them lechatchilah Shabbat. One may carry it, as long as it serves the person who may carry it. But to put it lechatchilah one may not, so I think.

Hilchot Shabbat Perek 19 – Moch Vesefog Al Hamakah, Segulot Verefuot, Tachshitim Umalbushim

Moch Vesefog Al Gabei Hamakah

Speaker: But why? Because he'll go scrape off another piece of kistem from a tree. So this is lech'orah so similar to refuah. All these things are a refuah or somewhat of a refuah, so one may not put them lechatchilah Shabbat. You may carry it as long as it serves the person who needs to carry it, but to put it lechatchilah one may not.

That's what they think not. No, he says perhaps shema ya'aseh kistem, yes? It's the same thing, even though it's so, it's the same idea of refuah, even if it's not sammamin. No, making a kistem is a melachah that we learned. Breaking off a piece from wood to make a kistem is... this one certainly may not. Even if he puts back the same one, right? No, but the concern is shema ya'aseh kistem.

Okay, **"bemoch uvesefog she'al gabei hamakah"**. One may also go out with cotton, but sefog, a gauze pad, whatever, a little piece of cotton on the wound. **Uvilvad shelo yikshor aleihem chut umeshichah, shehare chut umeshichah chashuvim etzlo**. The chut umeshichah are indeed important, it's not something he'll throw away afterward with the cotton, it's something he'll put away afterward. **Ve'einam beteilim lemakah**. They're not part of the... what lies on the wound is like batel to the body, or like clothing, is okay. But here he puts something extra that should lie next to it, we don't do.

Veyotzei biklipat hashum uviklipat habatzal she'al hamakah. Another way how one can have a band-aid is one puts a thin peel of garlic, which has a thin peel. This also means, there's no difference from cotton, from sefog, from another way how one does it. **Vechol davar she'al gabei hamakah**, some object that one binds around on the wound,

pote'ach vekosher umutar beshabbat. One may open and close the thing that one bound as a gauze pad, as a band-aid, one may bind on Shabbat. Of course, it must be lech'orah a kesher she'eino shel kayama vechdomeh.

Band-Aids with Medicine

But there are band-aids that come with medicine in them, yes? I remember, it's plaster meluchlach birtiyah, which also has on it band-aids that have a ko'ach merapei, a substance that heals. One may also all these things, because something that one puts on the wound...ummmm... is a long list of things that one does for refuah, which therefore one may go with it.

But I want to understand, therefore does it mean like a tachshit? Or therefore means what? Or does it mean like clothing?

Segulot Verefuot – Sela Shel Geva Tzanu'a, Beitzat Hachargol, Shen Shu'al, Masmer Hatzeluv

Well, further he brings more things that one goes for refuah. **"Sela shel geva tzanu'a"** – a little stone that one puts on the bobo tzanu'a, it's perhaps a term for a type of boil, I don't know, I don't want to know. And **"beitzat hachargol"** – among the grandmother remedies they had, who knows, perhaps it was better than our remedies. An egg, an egg from a type of grasshopper called a chargol. And **"shen shu'al"** – a tooth of a fox. And **"bemasmer hatzeluv"** – a nail that... what does "hatzeluv" mean? "Masmer hatzeluv" means a person who was hanged, "metzulav" being, was "crucified". Is this perhaps a Christian thing? I don't know. No, **"kol davar shetoolin oto mishum refuah"**, okay. If someone has a headache, he takes one of the nails that were nailed into a person on the cross, and this is a refuah, an old segulah.

The Rambam's Principle – Rofei Oto Hazman

But **"kol davar shetoolin oto mishum refuah"**, says the Rambam in a responsum, **"hu sheyihyu rofei oto hazman omrim"**, if the doctors hold that the "masmer hatzeluv" doesn't help, this is just foolishness. But as long as the doctors say it helps, it's called a refuah and one may carry it out on Shabbat. Interesting, the Rambam himself is indeed the doctor in our case, he lays it down.

Let's remember, the Rambam brings a proof from this chapter that's in the Gemara. They asked the Rambam, and the Rambam himself writes in Moreh Nevuchim about this problem, and the Rambam himself uses the language that he couldn't digest the segulot. He didn't think what the Rambam himself says. The Rambam says, it has nothing to do with what I hold. If in those times the experts held that this is a refuah, not that they held it's a segulah, that this brings that the god, forces, whatever it is, be merapei. They held that this is a refuah. Eh, they didn't know exactly how it works, but they saw that it works. If it works, one may. If today one knows it doesn't work, one may not. And not only may one not, it can be even an issur, because of darchei ha'emori.

Even Tekumah

"Yotzet ishah be'even tekumah" – a type of stone that is indeed a segulah for pregnant women. **Bemishkal even tekumah shenitkavnu veshaklu lirefuah**, or a stone that weighs exactly like the even tekumah, which was weighed and such a stone was made, is also called an even tekumah. **VELO ishah ubarah bilvad ela she'ar hanashim**, also other women may go with this stone, why? Because they go **leshem**

noy vetachshit, they don't go as a segulah that they shouldn't miscarry.

Discussion: May One Carry Out for Refuah?

You'll tell me, aha, so it means, something that one goes for refuah one may? **Veyotzet bekamei'a mumcheh**. This isn't motzi bireshut harabim? One takes it in the hand, motzi bireshut harabim, one must have the segulah, one must always go with the segulah. No, because the reason one goes is for refuah.

Ah, you'll tell me, doesn't one look at the specific woman needs it for refuah? No, one looks yes. One looks yes, but every woman is bechashash shema tit'aber. Now she goes out in the street for fifteen minutes, doesn't one take shema tit'aber vetapil? No, she goes with it all the time. She puts it in her bag as a segulah. **Yotzet bekamei'a mumcheh**. She's always bechashash shema tit'aber. You can't know not this Shabbat and not another time.

So, may one go out also with a zero'a of Pesach that one puts in the bag before the eye? If it's a segulah bedukah, yes.

Kamei'a Mumcheh

Veyotzet bekamei'a mumcheh. One may also go out with a kamei'a that an expert wrote, or that the kamei'a is an expert, the kamei'a is a professional kamei'a. Says the Rambam, how does one know that a kamei'a is an expert? **Shehi sheripah sheloshah benei adam**, that healed three people, **o sheha'yah adam sheripah sheloshah benei adam bekamei'a acherim**, or the person – in the Gemara it's called itmachei kamei'a, the kamei'a itself is an expert, or itmachei gavra, the person who wrote the kamei'a is an expert. So a kamei'a mumcheh is also a refuah, one may go with it.

But **yotzet bekamei'a she'eino mumcheh**, which doesn't have a record that it's a refuah, lechatchilah one doesn't go, because it's not called a refuah, so **patur**. Patur is yes, melachah she'einah tzrichah legufa, one didn't carry it with the hands, one carried it on the garment, or whatever the way is how it's called derech malbush.

Tefillin Beshabbat

For the same reason, **hayotzei betefillin**, the Rambam places it next to it, because a tefillin is a kamei'a, yes? We already went through this thought. The same idea. Because it's similar to a kamei'a. He says **patur** also for the same reason, because one does it derech malbush.

Ah, good.

Further, the Mishnah says, **yotzim betefillin**. Why? One doesn't go with tefillin because it's Shabbat, so patur, which is also assur? Ah, yes. Patur means, patur means patur aval assur. Right, right. It's Shabbat. Because lech'orah it wouldn't be truly a malbush. Or perhaps because it's shema yipol, or even not this reasoning. Because we'll see soon, we'll speak about tefillin explicitly.

Min'al Yachidi – One with a Wound on the Foot

Mi sheyesh beraglo makah, someone who has a wound on his foot, so on that foot he doesn't want to put on a shoe, **yotzei besandal yachidi beraglo haberi'ah**. The opposite, the opposite. He has on his foot a wound, it's hard for him to put on a shoe on that foot, it's swollen, I don't know what. He may go with only one shoe on the other foot. **Aval mi sheberaglo makah lo yetzei beyachidi**, he shouldn't go out with one shoe. Because when one goes with one shoe it's

evident that you have a shoe, why are you going with only one? It means, when one goes with shoes it's certainly derech malbush, but when one doesn't go with it, you hear the word? There's a concern that it will fall off, shelo yipol. But he says, one will notice him, it's not comfortable. He'll take off the shoe and will carry it lech'orah. In short, we'll see, he'll bring a proof, he'll see it below.

Velo yetzei katan bemin'al gadol, a minor shouldn't go out with big shoes, also for the same reason because it will fall off and he'll carry it. **Aval yotzei hu begadol**, a big shirt won't fall off.

Velo tetzei ishah bemin'al rafui, a woman shouldn't go out with loose shoes. **Velo bemin'al chadash, shelo yetzei bish'at chimum**, also not with new shoes that are very hard and tight, also for the same reason, because it will be uncomfortable, she'll take it off and carry it first.

Hakitei'a – Kav Shelo Vekatmin

Further, **hakitei'a yotzei bekav shelo**, a person who is a person whose foot was cut off, a person who has an amputated foot, may not go out with his... one makes some vessel, something, a kav, a type that is like similar to a... what's it called? One can walk with it, crutches? A type of similar crutches? Okay. The same thing, a katmin shelo. I mean a katmin is crutches. A kav is probably something that one puts on, or like a fake foot, a... what's the foot called that one puts on? No, katmin is some type of shoe.

A type of shoe, okay. And it has nothing to do, two other things. A kitei'a doesn't go on his head. Why? Because it will fall off, it's not a thing that's tied, it's an extra thing, therefore he won't bring it. And not cold his letz. Another thing, it's some type of shoe that's not normal to put on, something funny, I don't know exactly what. **"Ela yotzei bahen beshabbat, ve'ein yotzei bahen bederech hamalbush"**. Ein yotzei's exemption says that it's not derech hamalbush, but it doesn't mean carried, it's not a derech hotza'ah.

Third Category – Not Derech Malbush

The third category, lech'orah all these are assur, since it's not derech malbush one will carry it, it will fall off, lech'orah this is the reason. Or are there halachic rulings in the Rabbis that a thing that's only somewhat derech malbush one shouldn't go. They see perhaps also this in this chapter.

Apikursin – Ba'al Hachatatin

Okay. **One goes out with apikorion**. Yes, what is that? Something. **Flax combed**. That's simple, **on his head, the one with boils**, people who have boils on their head put on little pieces of merchandise on their heads. One may go with that. Also because one goes for healing purposes. **What is the reason? Because they dyed it and tied it**. One dyed it, the apikorion is a piece of flax or wool that one dyed and tied. **If one goes out with it on Shabbos**, yes, one goes with it already, it's already recognizable that this was made for the head. **But if one never went out with it**, he did nothing, he didn't dye and tie it, **if one didn't go out with it before Shabbos, it's forbidden to go out with it**, because one hasn't yet established that this is a way of healing, a way of clothing so to speak. That means, if he dyes it, it becomes a piece, that's his hat. He wears the hat because he has a boil, but it's a type of hat that he wears. If it's not dyed, it's just a piece of cotton on his head. Unless he already went with it,

okay, he goes already, it's already become his hat, it's already become his garment.

Thick Sack, Thick Blanket, Curtain

17. Yes, one goes out, one may go out with a thick sack, a thick sack, and with a thick blanket, a thick, I know, a blanket of wool. A curtain in winter, or a curtain, sack is made from hair, from... from... previously one used to make sacks. Blanket which one makes from wool. Curtain is a woven garment, but woven.

Laws of Shabbos – Laws of Clothing and Carrying (Continued)

Law 17 – One Goes Out with Thick Sack, Thick Blanket, Curtain, and Winter Garment

Rambam: One goes out with a thick sack, or with a thick blanket, and with a curtain, and with a winter garment because of the rains. But not with a box, and not with a basket, and not with a mat because of the rains.

But going with a scarf there's nothing to talk about.

One goes out with a thick sack, a thick sack, or with a thick blanket, a thick blanket of wool, and with a curtain, and with a winter garment. Sack is made from hair, from hair one used to make sacks. Blanket he says one makes from wool. Curtain is a woven garment, but coarsely woven. And winter garment is some other material. In short, various types, that is to say cloaks and coats, it's all types of things that one can hold over one's head in the rain. Hold over one's head, or put on over one's clothing. I don't think hold over one's head in the hands, but perhaps wrap oneself in it like a tallis. Because of the rains.

The Distinction Between Clothing and Vessel – The Way of Clothing

But not with a box, one may not take a box and put it over one's head, and not with a basket, and not with a mat, because of the rains, because all these things are not clothing. One may put on something that is in the category of clothing. All these things, thick sack, by the way, it's not clothing, a sack is a sack. But one can, one sometimes puts on sackcloth and ashes, it's something one can put on. But things that one cannot put on, it's only like an umbrella, one may not.

Speaker 2: What does it mean not clothing? You're wearing it.

Discussion: Plastic on the Hat on Shabbos

Speaker 1: The pillow and the cushion. A pillow like that. One must think, there's a great dispute among the poskim whether one may put plastic on the hat on Shabbos. There isn't a clear heter. It depends on the law of whether it's the way of clothing. If it's a matter of the way of clothing. It's more like a basket, which is not something one wraps oneself in.

Speaker 2: No, but a basket is something that's not any type of garment at all, it's a hard thing. Plastic is also not any type of garment, but when it rains one goes. But you wrap yourself in it. Something that you put on the hat is literally just a piece of plastic. It's a different inquiry. True, not necessarily a sack. How may one wear a hat on Shabbos at all when there's a concern of carrying? And "coverings".

The Pillow and the Cushion – Soft and Thin vs. Hard

Rambam: The pillow and the cushion – if they were soft and thin like garments, it's permitted to take them out placed on one's head on Shabbos in the way

of clothing. If they were hard – they are like a burden and forbidden.

The small pillow, pillow cover, "if they were soft and thin like garments, it's permitted to take them out placed on one's head on Shabbos in the way of clothing". Apparently like a tallis he means. "Placed on one's head" does he mean folded on the head? Or does it mean to say "the way of clothing", he puts it, he puts it on? "Placed on one's head" means like a tallis, or does it mean that it lies folded on the head? He says "placed on one's head", he doesn't say "wrapped in them". "Placed on one's head" can mean like one carries on the head. He says "the way of clothing".

But "if they were hard", and it's something that's hard, it's not something one can wrap oneself in, "they are like a burden and forbidden". It's like a burden and forbidden. One is not liable, it seems. Forbidden, not liable. Why? Because it's a piece of garment, it seems. Why is it a piece of garment? It's hard. Because he was wearing it, he puts it on, it's a bit hard, but in practice one can still put it on. He puts it on, the person. It's just a type of clothing that normally one doesn't put on.

Discussion: Exempt But Forbidden – Box and Basket

Speaker 2: So the thick sack is also apparently with the Rabbanan here, because he doesn't say liable, he says exempt. Right? Why is the explanation? A box and a basket in a basket, why shouldn't one be liable? One must think why. Yes? Why can't it be? He's holding a bundle on his head. He's carrying a table.

Speaker 1: No, he puts it on, not he holds it on his head. Let's be clear. He doesn't put on a basket, a turban. He does yes, he puts himself into a box, he sticks himself into a box. Yes, that's the meaning. If a box is not something that can become a tallis... No, no, no. If we're talking about he's holding a box on his head, the question doesn't begin about the fact that he's not wrapped. But he's wrapped in a box. The concern about that one doesn't do. But it's something that one is exempt. You can say that one is exempt. I don't know.

Let's look, if let's say they didn't rule like us. No. A box or a basket is not something one can wrap oneself in. The concern is, whether it's turned on the head, the majority of the head, the majority of the body. That doesn't make it. So that means properly carried.

Speaker 2: No, that's not properly carried. Okay, it's not the way of clothing, it's not the way of a burden, okay? It's not something in the way that one carries out. One must know an alteration, it can be one of the things, but one must know the clothing. He puts it on, but not enough. Furthermore, he puts it on, and only when he puts on a tallis I've never heard. One cannot put on a tallis like one can put on a box. You don't know? You know yes, you just don't want to know to ask yourself?

Speaker 1: No, we can just learn the Gemara here. Someone already said something, but I don't see that his basket can at all be the definition of clothing. I've already heard, but the reality is that a person stands and holds on his head.

Speaker 2: No, he puts it on. I've seen my children put on boxes, okay? I've seen how they put on boxes, they put them on. It's a joke, it's a way of carrying. It's a way of clothing.

Someone says, apparently the answer is the word "the way of carrying out". What does it mean the way of carrying out, or what does it mean the way of going out? It's not the way of

going out, but it doesn't mean put on. The fact that you stand, when you don't put on the question doesn't begin. You put it on. Let's go further. Yes.

Law 18 – Bells, Seal of a Slave, One Who Wraps Himself in His Tallis

Speaker 1: 18. Yes. "One goes out with bells and woven into garments". Bells, like the coat of the Kohen Gadol had bells on the bottom.

Seal of a Slave – Clay vs. Metal

Rambam: And a slave goes out with a seal of clay that's on his neck. But not with a seal of metal, lest it fall and he bring it.

"And a slave goes out with a seal of clay that's on his neck". A slave used to have a sign that he's a slave, a seal of clay. "But not with a seal of metal". A seal of clay he may, because we're talking about a slave has a law like a woman, that we don't want him to carry. So a seal of metal, "lest it fall and he bring it". A seal of clay, it seems it doesn't fall off, or if it falls off it's not worth anything. A seal of metal, it has some value, or it has value because it doesn't fall off. Eh, he says that a seal of clay, if it's going to fall off it will break, he'll go inside, he'll have to make a new seal. That's already Mordechai's, it's adorable, but it doesn't break, he can pick it up and carry it.

One Who Wraps Himself in His Tallis and Folds It – To Gather His Corners vs. Custom of the Place

Rambam: One who wraps himself in his tallis and folds it and holds it in his hand or on his shoulder – if he intended to gather his corners so they won't tear or so they won't get dirty, it's forbidden. But if he intended to change it in them according to the custom of the people of the places, it's permitted.

One who wraps himself in his tallis and folds it and holds it in his hand or on his shoulder, he wrapped himself in his tallis, but instead of letting it hang, he takes himself around with it, he rolls it up and he puts it together and he holds it in his hand or on his shoulder. If he intended to gather his corners, if his intention is only to gather the corners so they won't tear or so they won't get dirty, or like with a tallis also, he doesn't want the tzitzis to hang on the hand, one folds it up, so it won't get dirty, then it's forbidden. Ah, because it's not the way of clothing or what? He's dragging a tallis on his shoulders, or a part of a garment? But if he intended to change it in them, according to the custom of the people of the places, if there's an order that one does so, it's permitted.

So it turns, if the custom is to go like this with a tallis, then one may, because it's such a garment. You have a garment and it comes to go folded, it's not made to go the whole... It's forbidden, exempt but forbidden. That's the distinction between... I say, but the first is, it doesn't seem that it's as strong as a garment, it's a garment, but it's not... That's the halfway, the middle case that one speaks about the whole chapter, for whatever reason it's forbidden.

Law 19 – Folded Tallis vs. Cloth on His Shoulder

Rambam: One who goes out with a folded tallis placed on his shoulder – is liable. But one who goes out with a cloth on his shoulder, even though there's no thread tied to his finger – is permitted.

Okay, further. One who goes out with a folded tallis placed on his shoulder, is liable. Someone holds his tallis on his

shoulders, completely, not... and it lies on him, he's not put on with it at all, that's in the way of carrying, liable.

Cloth on His Shoulder – Thread Tied to His Finger

But one who goes out with a cloth on his shoulder, even though there's no thread tied to his finger, is permitted, he went with a thread, a cloth, excuse me, or a kerchief, a shawl on his shoulder, even though there's no thread tied to his finger. It seems that usually the shawl, when one wants to go with it, one ties a string to it, one holds it on the neck or what? On the hand, on his finger. That's something that people used to do sometimes so it won't get lost his shawl. Even when it's loose one may go when it's loose. Why? Perhaps it's a cheap thing and he's not afraid that he'll go... That's the journey. That's something that goes so-so. The way of the cloth is that one puts it like this. Even when it's not properly fastened, he says, even when it's not, he's not afraid that it will fall off, he'll go pick it up. It doesn't fall off. That's the way how it goes, that he sees this, he's not afraid of that. Okay.

Cloth That Doesn't Cover His Head and Most of Him

Rambam: And any cloth that doesn't cover his head and most of him, it's forbidden to go out with it.

But look, this is a certain order how one goes. And any cloth that doesn't cover his head and most of him, it's forbidden to go out with it. A cloth that doesn't take him around his head and most of him, it's not a tallis, it's forbidden to go out with it. What does it mean?

Speaker 2: Very good. So what we just spoke about, we're talking about such a large... a cloth means a rag, right? A large rag which is called a garment. Indeed even it's not a proper garment, but it's not tied to his finger, to whatever advice it would have been. But if it's too small, it doesn't cover him his head and most of him, one may not go with it, because then it will fall off, or it's not a garment. It's not the order, that's not the way how one goes, simply to say.

The handkerchief one indeed did like this then. Yes, that the Jews used to go with a handkerchief, and on Shabbos one wrapped it around the neck. One used the leniency, not his head and most of him, but...

Right, it's I ask you, I thought about this, that a person when he goes with a handkerchief to the mikveh, he puts it like a shawl, yes? Right. It seems that then one may, because then it's a shawl. But the tallis doesn't speak about that, so one must answer. Yes.

Law 20: Tallis with Long Threads – Nullified Relative to the Tallis

Speaker 1:

Okay, further. "It's permitted to wrap oneself in a tallis that has on its edges fringes", that has at the end straps, "even though they are long threads", even though long straps hang down from him, "they are not an adornment for the tallis", it's not an adornment, it hangs down from it, one didn't cut off the end of the threads, it still drags very much.

One would think that it's like you're carrying out a bundle of merchandise that's not a garment. But it's not so, "they are nullified relative to the tallis", it's nullified, even it's not for adornment, even it's... one makes himself between adornment and not adornment, it's a place where it still hangs. If he would have intended a fringe, it wouldn't mean that he... Right, as he says.

Tallis with Tzitzis That's Not According to the Law – Liable

Speaker 1:

"And likewise one who goes out with a tallis that doesn't have tzitzis according to the law", a tallis that doesn't have tzitzis like the law, is liable. That means, it has tzitzis, but the tzitzis is somehow not well made, or what? Or he didn't finish the work, it's not made for its sake, it's not tied, yes, whatever.

"Because he makes from them a seal, they're considered important automatically", the seal is not standard, yes, he doesn't care, yes, it's the corner of his garment. It's not the corner of his garment, it's tzitzis. "And his mind is on them until he completes their deficiency to be tzitzis", the thing is already tzitzis, it's good, it's a part of the garment.

But this is not a part of the garment, because it's tzitzis. It's not tzitzis, it doesn't belong there, it's not for adornment. But he thinks about it that he needs to fix it, and at the moment it lies there like something that lies off, he drags himself around with something that's not a garment string.

Here you see very clearly, but the actual obligation is interesting. But he says, I understood, here you certainly don't see derech hametzius (the normal way of carrying).

Discussion: Derech Hametzius or Da'ato Aleihem?

Speaker 1:

I will try to say that here he does rule based on derech hametzius, it's the way one carries things. It's the way one carries merchandise, that is, not merchandise, one carries the item this way, it has tzitzis, but he hasn't yet finished the tzitzis, he hasn't completed the tzitzis.

What I said earlier, that things that are tied is not a heter (permission) at all. The heter is only when it automatically becomes part of a garment. Because the thing is certainly tied, you can't cut it off in the middle of Shabbos, nevertheless it's obligated.

Do you understand what I'm saying? The heter is only when they spoke earlier about a tachshit (ornament), that if you tie something to your garment, that doesn't permit it. It perhaps helps for the question of yipol (it might fall) or yavo l'hotzi (he might come to carry it out), for that tying helps, that since it's already a garment there aren't the concerns of the Rabbis. But a thing that isn't a garment, you can tie it from today until tomorrow, you may not wear it on Shabbos. That's how it comes out to me. Yes.

Speaker 2:

But a tallis, yes, let's work it out.

Kosher Tzitzis — Ornament of the Garment and Its Adornment

Speaker 1:

But tallisim have tzitzis k'hilchasa (according to halacha). A tallis does have proper tzitzis. **One may go out with it both by day and by night**, even at night when there is no obligation to wear tzitzis. **For the tzitzis is nothing but the completion of the work**, tzitzis is not a work, **rather it is fitting as an ornament of the garment and its adornment, like the imra**. Just as a garment has an imra, I mean it's the collar or the cuffs, just as a nice garment comes with such a piece, so it's the same thing. When it's kosher

tzitzis, that's how a garment comes, because the halacha says that's how a garment should come. Yes.

A Positive Commandment Without Kares Does Not Override Shabbos

Speaker 1:

And if the threads of the tzitzis were going out according to their proper making, would you be obligated to go out with them even on Shabbos day?

You can't say that the explanation is because there's a mitzvah of tzitzis, therefore one may wear it on Shabbos. Because it's certainly true that the mitzvah of tzitzis is not enough to override Shabbos. The reason is something else. The reason is because it's not a masa (burden), rather it's from the ornament of the garment.

He says, **And if the threads of the tzitzis were going out according to their proper making, would you be obligated to go out with them even on Shabbos day, for a positive commandment without kares does not override Shabbos**. A positive commandment with kares one can override, but a positive commandment without kares one cannot override Shabbos. That is, a positive commandment overrides a negative commandment, but it doesn't override a negative commandment with kares, which is Shabbos.

Discussion: The Mitzvah Decides If It's Ornament of the Garment

Speaker 1:

It's very interesting words, there's a bit of difficulty, because the Rambam doesn't say the mitzvah permits it, because a mitzvah one may not do, one doesn't do chilul Shabbos (desecration of Shabbos). So what permits it? Because it's ornament of the garment.

But conversely, the mitzvah decides if it's ornament of the garment, because if it's exactly invalid, you ask the Rav, what's invalid? May I not wear it on Shabbos, because it's invalid. Someone will say, it's a normal thing that a garment should have at the end... the fringes one may have, yes, the fringes of the tallis. Ornament of the garment. Ornament of the garment. So tzitzis when it's k'hilchasan (according to their law) is also ornament of the garment. But when...

The distinction is the word is "da'ato aleihem ad sheyashlim chesronam" (his mind is on them until he completes their deficiency). So you can ask such a question: What happens if there's a Jew who isn't an ehrliche (honest) Jew, and it doesn't bother him that his tzitzis is invalid. He wants it to look like there's tzitzis, he's embarrassed to go in a garment without tzitzis. It looks good to him, it looks good on him and it's fine. It could be that for him it's ornament of the garment, he's such a shaygetz (scoundrel).

But as the law of Shabbos, for him it's... because he wants it to be that it should look like tzitzis. The Rambam is speaking about a Jew who's going to fix it. He adds the word, "da'ato aleihem ad sheyashlim chesronam" (his mind is on them until he completes their deficiency). His da'ato aleihem ad sheyashlim chesronam makes it so it's not batel (nullified). He puts on tzitzis there, he still needs to fix it. The da'ato aleihem makes it so it's not batel.

Because remember, a simple string is batel, because I don't care about it. You do care, because you're going to fix it, you're going to complete it. So if there's someone who's not going to

fix it, therefore it's a prohibition, because it's batel from the garment.

Speaker 2:

I don't agree with him. It will be batel.

Speaker 1:

It's not batel. It's actually batel, it's not a string. Like the Maharam. I agree even more than him. Even if he would cut it off when a thread hangs. But he wants it to look like he has tzitzis. He's not going to fix it. He doesn't go this way, he transgresses with the tzitzis.

But with the law of Shabbos, for him this is ornament of the garment, because he can't go out with tzitzis that doesn't have tzitzis on the side. He doesn't care about the kashrus of the mitzvah of tzitzis. He doesn't know. He's an am ha'aretz (ignoramus). An am ha'aretz who doesn't know that when tzitzis is invalid one needs to fix it, yes. An am ha'aretz doesn't know the halacha, he has no da'as (knowledge). An am ha'aretz who goes to shul on Shabbos. He doesn't know that the tzitzis is invalid. It doesn't bother him much, because it's a nice garment, it comes with tzitzis. Every Jew goes, the garment is tzitzis. And that's what he does, that's the way a garment comes to go this way.

Because here it's not the power that you don't know. If you have a mistake, maybe you're a shogeg (unintentional transgressor), because you don't know. I have no complaints against you. No, but I place on you that you'll need to make a restitution for its deficiency.

Speaker 2:

I understand what you're saying, therefore it doesn't become batel, but it's a good explanation.

Speaker 1:

But one can learn it differently too. One can learn that I learn that this also makes it a masa.

Speaker 2:

No, it's certainly a... it's a masa. What does masa mean? It's something of value. The question is why do you say it's not derech hotza'ah (the way of carrying out)? Why is it not called derech hotza'ah? Why? For the thing? Because that's how it goes.

Speaker 1:

The question is only if it's batel to the garment, is that derech levush (the way of wearing), which is permitted. But if it's not batel to the garment, because you do need to have it for tomorrow separate from the garment, etc., because you're going to make the tzitzis on this garment, I would hold that it's separate.

It's a bit of a refined halacha this. Refined I mean, the distinction is very not coarse. One needs to be a great scholar to understand this. Do you hear up there?

Practical Differences — Woman with Tallis, Doubtful Tzitzis, Non-Jew

Speaker 1:

One can find from this various chidushei Torah (novel Torah insights), because it comes out that a woman may not go with a tallis on Shabbos for example, because she's not obligated in tzitzis. It depends how one learns, do you understand? Or he brings further, if it's only a doubtful tzitzis, that's a problem. There are very interesting halachos that come out from this.

If one says that tzitzis is indeed something normal, as you want to tell me, then all these halachos can't be, do you understand what I'm saying?

Or for example, people say that a non-Jew, yes, you know the Torah of the Pri Chadash Zeracham, when a non-Jew serves you on Shabbos. So, what about a non-Jew who wants to convert, and they tell him he shouldn't keep Shabbos? So, you'll say that if he wears tzitzis, he's automatically in any case. Because on the side he's a non-Jew, it's a masa. Right. If he's a chacham (wise person), yes.

Proof from Contemporary Times — Tzitzis as Clothing

Speaker 1:

I want to bring you a proof that in contemporary times, people, tzitzis is a garment like the Chassidic young man goes dressed. Because he goes the same with tzitzis by day as by night. You won't see even one time a young man on the plane, without tzitzis, even if it's hard for him to go with tzitzis. At night is exactly like by day, he goes with the big woolen tzitzis.

The simple explanation is that this is clothing, he's not going for a mitzvah at all. At night there's no mitzvah. He goes around presumably walking in the greatest heat at night with woolen tzitzis. Why? Because this is clothing. So, from the aspect of clothing there's no difference whether the tzitzis is kosher or not. From the aspect of mitzvah, yes. From the aspect of clothing, he'll be embarrassed to go without tzitzis. And if it's torn he'll further not be embarrassed, because a young man comes with tzitzis on himself.

Speaker 2:

I hear that it's subjective, I hear what you're saying.

Speaker 1:

No, that's because he's an am ha'aretz. You're speaking about an am ha'aretz. The one who goes for example at night with tzitzis, even when it's hot and simply speaks about himself, he's an am ha'aretz, because he thinks...

Laws of Shabbos: Laws of Carrying Out in Garments and Ornaments — Part 10

Halacha 21: Craftsmen Who May Not Go Out with Their Tools

A tailor may not go out with a needle stuck in his garment, nor a carpenter with a chip behind his ear, nor a weaver with wool behind his ear, nor a comber with a cord around his neck, nor a money changer with a dinar behind his ear, nor a dyer with a sample behind his ear.

That is, the Rambam brings here a whole list of craftsmen who may not go out on Shabbos with their work tools in their usual place.

Speaker 1: A tailor – that's a seamstress – with a needle stuck in his garment, with a needle that's stuck in his garment. A carpenter – that's one who works with wood – with a chip behind his ear, with a piece of wood that he puts on the ear. Why? To measure or what?

And not a weaver – a weaver is a tailor – with wool behind his ear. What is wool? A little hair?

Speaker 2: Wool he says is a piece of cotton, a piece of merchandise.

Speaker 1: And not a comber – not one who measures things, yes? – with a cord around his neck, with a band that he has on

his neck. A komer, what is that? Okay.

And not a money changer – not anyone who exchanges money – with a dinar behind his ear, with money that hangs on his ear.

And not a dyer – not a painter – with a sample behind his ear, with the paint that he has in his ear.

It's an example of what people used to hold things in the ears. Can you tell me? Today too, one goes with... there are things in the ears, yes. Plumbers have a plunger coming out of their ear.

Law: Exempt from Torah Law, But Forbidden Rabbinically

And if he went out – he's exempt, even though he went out in the manner of his craft, because he didn't carry out in the manner of those who carry out.

Speaker 1: How did he go out? Exempt. Exempt. Perhaps he went out in the manner of his craft? He carried out something that he needs to have for his job. But why is he exempt? Because he didn't carry out in the manner of those who carry out.

So a normal person is even rabbinically essentially, only the person... he certainly may not, because all these things are buying and selling on Shabbos, and it's muktzeh.

It's interesting that the Rambam doesn't say, because in the Mishnah, I remember, it says that even erev Shabbos one may not. Close to the start of Shabbos. The Rambam I remember, on Shabbos itself one may not, because it's a needle, it's muktzeh. All these things are... I remember that the Rambam doesn't say it.

Ah, again, later it will be because we're talking about erev Shabbos. Okay, so until now he's speaking about on Shabbos.

Discussion: Why Is He Exempt If It's His Way?

Speaker 2: That is, seemingly, on one hand this is indeed the way, because he's a tailor, he goes with this. On the other hand, but it's not in the manner of those who carry out.

Speaker 1: So, the manner of those who carry out doesn't help that he does conduct himself this way, that's how it looks. We say the way for everyone.

Speaker 2: There rabbinically.

Speaker 1: No, he says even that a craftsman doesn't usually go this way, only I know when he has no other choice or what.

Speaker 2: Because you say that we do look at the profession, yes? You say that from Torah law he's exempt. Do you mean to say from Torah law he's exempt because it's not the manner of those who carry out. What happens when it's not a tailor? Would it be harder or easier?

Speaker 1: Not clear. He brings that Rav Yosef argues that regarding vessels no one may, only the bar kura is a fact. One can hear that it should be harder, because... The Rambam says that it's harder, because for the tailor this is his way.

Ah, even though he went out in the manner of his craft. But on the other hand, even if he's exempt, that's the novelty you want to say, that even he's also exempt because it's not the way, even though in truth it's not exactly the way.

Halacha 22: The Zav Who Went Out with His Pouch – Work Not Needed for Itself

The zav who went out with his pouch – he's obligated, because it's not the way of this pouch to carry it out except in this manner.

Speaker 1: Similarly, if he went out with bindings, as we had earlier, going out from vows. A similar thing. But he says that a pouch is something more than a piece of cotton. "It's not the way of this pouch to carry it out except in this manner", this is the way one carries the pouch. So a piece of cotton is not a normal way, one doesn't carry another thing this way, but a pouch one carries this way.

And even though he doesn't need the carrying out itself, but only so his garments won't get dirty, for work not needed for itself one is obligated for it.

So, "work not needed for itself is carrying out but only so his garments won't get dirty", he doesn't want to carry out the pouch, it's only something he does around, necessary, so his garments won't get dirty. But he says, the Rambam, so what are you making of this? At most it's work not needed for itself, but he's carrying nevertheless, it's work not needed for itself one is obligated for it.

Question: Why Does the Rambam Bring This Specifically Here?

Speaker 2: I could have said the same thing earlier with other similar things, why does he bring it here? About work not needed for itself? It's already been several times, for example the marrow on the niddah, or on the rain, whatever there in the...

Speaker 1: Ah, there in the Mishnah exempt. Okay, necessarily, I don't know. Okay. One needs to think, there are still a bit of refined parts that one can think in the Mishnah exempt.

Speaker 2: Yes, what about going out with a tallis that hangs from the back string only above, is also work not needed for itself, no? He goes dressed with a proper that, he now wants to carry out half of the tallis.

Discussion: Work Not Needed for Itself vs. Thing He Doesn't Intend

Speaker 1: The entire laws of Shabbos is the foundation of the law, which in my opinion doesn't stand, that a person does a thing and he doesn't grasp what he's doing, he's exempt. He carries the tallis, and the tallis comes with it. One needs to know, it's permitted, but I don't know, it's not he doesn't need for itself carrying out.

One who needs for itself carrying out, he should pick up the above that hangs there from the back? Certainly, he carries, he drags it, and it comes with his back. Because it's batel, actually therefore it's not relevant, batel to the back, but certainly.

The simple explanation of work not needed for itself is, I don't care about it. Caring is not the definition of laws of Shabbos. I haven't found a single case.

Speaker 2: You keep asking me such questions, each one of them is a real question.

Speaker 1: No, a thing he doesn't intend is that one does another thing. Not you do this, and you say I don't mean to do this. There's no one way a thing he doesn't intend.

And the thing he doesn't intend is like the story of the one who drags a bench, that he drags a bench, and perhaps through the back a bit will be plowed. But it's not true, he doesn't intend to plow. That's perhaps, because it's another thing, it's a matter of pesik reisha (inevitable consequence).

But when the thing he doesn't intend is because he does something else, not that someone thinks look what I do, I'm

wearing a coat. But he sings when he walks. That's not a thing he doesn't intend, because he means to carry and he means to sing.

Speaker 2: What? Ask him, a person goes out and from below hangs a small string. That is he intends like when he drags the bench?

Speaker 1: A thing he doesn't intend, yes, because what he does, but he walks with a tallis, he walks with a coat.

Okay. The whole time you say this, it's absolutely not relevant in any law at all. A thing he doesn't intend is when you do another thing, you mean to do something, you do another thing. Not that you're concerned to make a mistake. There's no such thing a thing he doesn't intend. We haven't yet learned a single such law.

Be well, it's not specifically, go in this your strength and you shall save Israel. Go in this your strength, even for a thing he doesn't intend. When you do something else, but you don't do something else. There's no such thing a thing he doesn't intend in this way. That's not the meaning. Okay.

Halacha 23: One Who Finds Tefillin on Shabbos in the Public Domain

One who finds tefillin on Shabbos in the public domain, how does he act? He wears them in their manner, places the head tefillin on his head and the hand tefillin on his arm, and enters and removes them in the house, and returns and goes out and wears a second pair and removes them, until he brings in all of them.

Speaker 1: What happens if a Jew finds tefillin on Shabbos in a public domain? We learned earlier that on Shabbos one may not go with tefillin, it's exempt. So what happens if a Jew finds tefillin on Shabbos in a public domain, and there is indeed a mitzvah, one may not leave tefillin in a public domain, even a piece of a sefer one must hide, one must take care of the tefillin.

How should he act? We learned that one cannot carry all the tefillin in his hands, that is certainly forbidden. So what does one do? He wears them in their proper manner, he places the shel rosh on his head and the shel yad on his arm. He puts on the tefillin, he puts on the tefillin shel rosh on his head and the shel yad on his arm, and he enters, and he goes in, and then he takes them off at home, and then he does it again. He goes back out and puts them on and goes back out until he brings them all in, until he carries in all of them.

That means, he cannot put on more than one pair at a time.

Discussion: Why only one pair at a time?

Speaker 2: Good question. Yes. The dispute is actually in the Mishnah. There is... Rabban Gamliel says one can carry two pairs at once.

So there are today many tzaddikim and rabbis who conduct themselves to go with more than one set at once, they certainly may. Regarding Shabbos perhaps it's different, I don't know.

Speaker 1: He has priority in carrying, or the way of wearing.

Speaker 2: Yes. For them it's not at all a way of wearing, and for normal people it's not at all a way for them.

Speaker 1: Ah, now you're carrying them.

[Digression: Tzitzis at night – Why Chassidic Jews wear tzitzis at night]

Speaker 1: That's the uniform in the city. You also shouldn't be so subjective. In the city all people go dressed this way, and it's embarrassing, it's very funny to go without a woolen tallis katan, even in the middle of the night, even at a wedding when one dances into the night and it's very hot, no one would think to take off his woolen tzitzis.

Ah, everyone is amei ha'aratzos. Everyone is amei ha'aratzos, because certainly there is a concept.

The real reason: A segulah for sleeping, not an obligation

By the way, I want to tell you why, if we're already talking. There is no concept whatsoever to wear tzitzis at a wedding at night when one is dancing. There is a concept to wear tzitzis during the day, one must wear tzitzis during the day.

First of all, there is, yes, there can be such a concept. "Kesus yom" – listen, we look, yes, we are Jews. I want to tell you something, I want to tell you that we are in a reality.

No, I don't agree. What reality? Let the world be amei ha'aratzos. But we are not people who do the style of Williamsburg. We are Williamsburg Jews. Ask them, they say God forbid not.

Listen, I'm not explaining myself now. From Williamsburg, and Boro Park, and Monsey, and Montreal, and Bnei Brak, and Jerusalem, and London, and Antwerp. Listen, I'm not explaining myself. We are people who do the Torah.

Now, a Chassidic Jew wears tzitzis at night, there can be two reasons. The real reason is not the first reason. One can say that there are poskim who say that ah... I mean so according to halacha, not certain that it's according to halacha, but there is a dispute whether "kesus yom" one wears at night. But at least there is no obligation to wear tzitzis at night.

The reason why one wears tzitzis at night is because it says it's a segulah that at night when one sleeps, in the holiness of Yom Tov it says that when one sleeps one should wear tzitzis. At night when one is not sleeping there is no concept whatsoever to wear tzitzis, it's just a beracha levatala.

Because of this, one who wears tzitzis and he's just exerting himself, he goes, at least he's dressed. But there is no concept whatsoever, yes one doesn't need to wear tzitzis at night. That's first of all. That's what people don't know.

Ask most people why they wear tzitzis, he doesn't know himself, he doesn't know that it's a mitzvah, he knows nothing. He's not fulfilling the mitzvah at all, it's nothing.

Rejecting the "uniform" argument

Yes, but let's say he's not fulfilling the mitzvah, but it's actually a garment, because that's the uniform that one wears in the city, fine, one goes with this, that's it.

But let's say he would change, let's say why? Because the same person, let's say, it's not true that he goes because it's a uniform. That's only if he's a very coarse am ha'aretz, he knows other details, he knows other things, he says "I don't care that it's invalid, I go with this".

But a normal person, you tell him, "Ah, it's invalid, I don't wear it", yes?

If you go to the am ha'aretz, very good, because he's not a uniform person, he's a Jew. You ask him, you tell him, "Come listen, the tzitzis is torn, it's invalid, you may not go with this garment because it doesn't have valid tzitzis". He takes it off

immediately, even if he's embarrassed, I know what, all these questions of kavod habriyos, he's not even embarrassed, because he'll ask, "Why am I taking it off?" Because there's a mitzvah to take it off, because it's invalid tzitzis.

Very good. If he didn't have a mitzvah to take it off, he wouldn't take it off, because from now it's not kosher. We're talking about this. That goes.

The same thing on Shabbos, if you tell him, "Invalid tzitzis, it's invalid, one may not go with this, it's a mitzvah of hotza'ah", he takes it off immediately. That's the problem.

Okay, very good. Enough, we've talked enough.

[Return to Halacha 23: Finding tefillin – Continuation]

Speaker 1: Now one can learn something, one may not go further because of the decree lest he take out, right?

The tailor may not go out with a needle stuck in his garment.

A tailor goes with a needle that lies in his garment, he may not go out, because it's not nullified to the garment.

"May not go out" means apparently that biblically it is indeed nullified, because it's not a normal way. But initially rabbinically one may not go out with a needle stuck in his garment, with a needle that is stuck in the garment.

And not a carpenter, a carpenter is one who works with wood, with a chip in his ear, with a piece of wood that he puts on his ear, why? To measure or what?

Further, and not a tailor, with wool in his ear. What is wool? A hair? Wool he says is a piece of cotton, a piece of merchandise.

And not a comber, not one who combs things, yes? With a string on his neck. A money changer, what is that? Okay.

And not a money changer, not anyone who exchanges money, with a coin on his ear.

And not a dyer, not a painter, with the sample on his ear.

It's an example of what people used to hold things in their ears. Can you tell me? Today too, one goes with... There are things in ears, yes. Plumbers have a plunger coming out of their ear.

Laws of Shabbos Chapter 19: Finding tefillin on Shabbos (Continuation) – And if there were many

Halacha: And if there were many tefillin

Speaker 1:

That means he cannot put on more than one pair at a time. They certainly may have. Regarding Shabbos perhaps it's already different. For them it's not at all a way of wearing, and the stringencies of the people is not at all a way for them.

Speaker 2:

Ah, now you're moving the prosecution. Okay, now I need to explain myself. Okay, let's continue.

Speaker 1:

And if there were many, if there are many pairs of tefillin, **and he cannot bring them in through wearing**, he won't be able to carry them all in this way, it will take him forever, **behold he waits by them until dark**, he may not throw them away, because it's waiting by them until dark, it's somewhat of an obligation on him. It's not easy, but... Yes, he stands there Friday evening, when he brings them in after

Shabbos. That means, he may not throw them away, but he also may not carry them.

Question: How far does the obligation of waiting by them until dark go?

Speaker 1:

One must think, for example, if he finds them now on Shabbos afternoon on the way to shul, does one say that he may not go to the beis midrash. But there are a million there, a huge pile of tefillin. Will he be nullified there not being able to eat a meal, he won't be able to have oneg Shabbos, if one punishes him because he threw away the first one? No, I need to understand if it's an obligation. How far does the obligation go that a person must guard someone else's tefillin? It's not his responsibility.

Speaker 2:

No, because I want to know the "behold he waits by them until dark". Does it mean to say that this is the only thing you can do, and it's an obligation that you should do it. Not relevant if you want to do it. It's certain that you should do it. I want to know how strong the obligation is. Is it really a burning obligation? I want to know, I don't have an obligation on all the names in the world. I have an obligation on my few things. Finding tefillin, so far he waits by them until dark, such a great service? Okay.

Speaker 1:

It's more a question of how much a person must exert himself for a mitzvah, even for listening or... Okay, it's a different question.

Halacha: And if there were few – Fear of gentiles

Speaker 1:

And if there were few, in times when one fears gentiles, where he cannot stand by the tefillin, if a gentile has come there he says, **and he fears to leave them lest the gentiles steal them**, then there is a permission **to cover them in their place**, he should do the best he can, he should cover them so they won't be exposed, they won't be... No, they should be with respect, **and leaves them and goes**. He goes.

Halacha: And if he fears because of bandits

Speaker 1:

And if he fears to leave them there because of bandits, he's afraid to stay there not because gentiles are going... It's not the government or I know what, the haters of Israel, but just bandits, **and he takes out all his vessels as one**, he takes all the tefillin, **and carries them less than four amos at a time**. He carries them less than four amos at a time. And less than four amos is indeed not... According to the Rambam, or **at least less than this measure** is permitted, or **gives to his friend within four amos and his friend to his friend**, as we learned earlier that there is a way, if each one goes less than the four amos one may, so one arrives at the outer courtyard.

Question on the Rambam: Why not initially less than four amos?

Speaker 1:

From these words, I think there is a question on waiting by them until dark. I also cannot be that the first one cannot do this, because apparently this itself, he does nothing with the tefillin, he must guard them, he must do it. So one must understand according to the Rambam, behold he waits by

them until dark, why doesn't one let him carry with his hands? Again, because he only does it in fear. If less than four amos one may according to the Rambam, why should one punish him that he must stay there?

Speaker 2:

I don't know why you make it a punishment. Why doesn't one give him the permission? He wants to do this, he wants to stay. Why can he not then make four amos? That's a good question. Why is it only "he fears to leave them there because of bandits"? Generally initially it should be waiting until dark. One doesn't give immediately initially the less than four amos? One must understand. According to this I have a question on the Rambam, I understand, but according to the Rambam one must understand. Here one sees that no, that less than four amos doesn't need permission, one must clarify as soon as one must understand.

Halacha: Straps tied like tefillin

Speaker 1:

Yes, we'll see. When can one bring the tefillin with this permission? **When they had straps tied like tefillin**, when one saw that it's tied like tefillin, **that they are certainly tefillin, but if they didn't have straps tied like tefillin** someone came to him, why?

The Rambam's reasoning and the Ra'avad's question

Speaker 1:

He argues, the Rambam... The Ra'avad says that the Rambam doesn't make sense, but the Rambam argues, perhaps it happens that a person makes an amulet, not tefillin. Just an amulet. He wanted to go around with tefillin, so he went to make an amulet. He wanted it to look like tefillin, so he went to make an amulet. He wanted it to have straps, you know, only straps one makes tefillin, only tefillin one makes straps with a knot of a shin, with a dalet, whatever one makes. But just things that look like tefillin, perhaps it's not tefillin, and therefore you don't need to be so worried, someone came and leaves it there.

The Ra'avad doesn't understand. He says, a person is not troubled to make an amulet like tefillin. Therefore, perhaps there's a different reason.

Answer: The Rambam speaks of the Gemara's tefillin

Speaker 1:

The Ra'avad already looked at our organized beautiful box-like tefillin with a shin. The Rambam speaks more of the Gemara's tefillin, you know, someone took leather, he tried to make something the best he could.

Anyway, therefore the Ra'avad argues that one must indeed do, save do what one must do, because there is no such concern that perhaps it's not tefillin. What does one do? The reality is he's right, but the Rambam understood from the Gemara that there was once such a thing, a reality.

Halacha: Finding a Sefer Torah

Speaker 1:

Good. **One who finds a Sefer Torah.** Someone finds a Sefer Torah. This was tefillin, what is with a Sefer Torah? **He sits and guards it and waits by it until dark.** A Sefer Torah one cannot put on oneself. So **he sits and guards it and waits by it until dark.**

Distinction: "Sits" — A stronger obligation

Speaker 1:

If danger comes — this is a different language than "waits by it until dark". It's "sits", it's a distinction, you must sit down and hold the Sefer Torah and not even leave it on the floor, which is not so with tefillin one may leave lying on the floor. No, he makes it stronger, because he doesn't have the solution of putting it on. He says immediately, **if danger comes, he leaves it and goes.** It doesn't say that he must cover it. Why doesn't it say here "waits by it until dark"? It doesn't say covered? Or he cannot? I don't know.

Halacha: If rains were falling

Speaker 1:

Okay. **If rains were falling** — if it's raining and the letters will be wiped off, then there is a way how to do it, because then there is a way how to do it, because then one cannot wait until night, because the Sefer Torah will be ruined from the rain. So he must do thus, **he covers himself with leather.** No, the leather of the Sefer Torah. Ah, with the leather of... Very good.

Discussion: Is this the same permission as before?

Speaker 2:

One can think, perhaps this, because here he has an answer why he may wrap himself with the Sefer Torah and travel, wrap himself around the Sefer Torah. Doesn't it make it a way of wearing?

Speaker 1:

No, no, no, no, no. But when it's raining we learned earlier that when something is raining, then there is a way of covering oneself with anything, there is a permission even a bag.

Speaker 2:

I don't agree. It's simple, because this is a permission, a forced permission. Can really crushed tumah, it's not a real way of wearing, it's a half way of wearing. It's even earlier, it was indeed forbidden, even exempt but forbidden. Very good. Therefore, if initially, sit and wait until after Shabbos and you'll take it. But if this waiting until after Shabbos will destroy the Sefer Torah, then the battle was made to do the solution of putting it on. Do you understand?

Speaker 1:

Completely fine. **And he goes back and covers it.** It's... You can say the opposite, one can say that then he has a way how to carry without it being a biblical carrying, because the other way he carries it... There is no such thing that only in the rain one may carry. There is no such thing. Normal people don't put on such crushed tumah. It's not that the rain permits. It doesn't say so. It doesn't say that if it's raining one may not. Normal people don't put on such crushed tumah. I don't agree.

And he goes back and covers it, he puts it on to cover it, why? Just respect, just that the Torah should be covered, not that it should become heavy, some become wet. **And he enters with it**, and he goes in with this manner to the city and he brings it home.

Halacha: The tailor may not go out with his needle on Friday

Speaker 1:

Okay, now one can learn the halacha of Friday, a new halacha. That means, until now we learned what one may go out with on Shabbos, now one can learn that there is even a decree of

the Sages on Friday. This is the time that one had to demand in the... There we said that the labors one may not begin on Friday. And the Mishnah indeed says it there, the Rambam put it here.

So thus, **the tailor may not go out with his needle**, even in his hand, that means, ah, specifically in his hand, because one said. **And not the scribe with his pen**, the scribe with his pen, **on Friday close to dark**, they may not go around with their tools. Why? **Lest he forget and go out with them on Shabbos**, he will forget and go out with them on Shabbos.

Question: When does "close to dark" begin?

Speaker 1:

Close to dark means from... When does "close" begin? I don't know. Perhaps this is what we call tosefes Shabbos? And the fifteen minutes, or the half hour, when does he say he should serve? He told him this? I don't know.

Halacha: And a person must check his garments

Speaker 1:

In short, at a time when he thinks, when is the measure of lest he forget? **A person is obligated to check his garments on Friday evening at dusk**. Obligated, it's a strong language, a mitzvah, such an obligation. **Lest there be something forgotten there, and he goes out with it on Shabbos**. Perhaps he forgot something in his pocket, and he will go out on Shabbos. And then he will transgress carrying b'shogeg (unintentionally). Okay, according to your argument it means literally carrying.

Discussion: Is This Actually Carrying?

Speaker 2:

And one may go out with tefillin on Friday evening at dusk. Yes, we spoke about this, whether when someone left something by mistake in his pocket, that's called carrying. It could be k'l'achar yad (in an unusual manner) in a certain case, when it's how it lies in his pocket, I don't know exactly how, but it's not likely k'l'achar yad. It depends if it's the normal way of carrying to take out things, if not, he will transgress.

Halacha: And One May Go Out with Tefillin on Friday Evening at Dusk

Speaker 1:

And one may go out with tefillin, tefillin one may indeed wear on Friday evening at dusk, one may wear until Shabbos. **Since a person is obligated to check his tefillin at all times**. For tefillin there is a mitzvah that one must constantly be checking the tefillin, also that one should not be distracted from the tefillin. Therefore, **he will not forget them**, he won't forget them and go out with them.

Discussion: The Leniency of Misaseik

Speaker 2:

If Tosafos says that there he completely forgot that the object is there, it will indeed be a leniency of misaseik (unintentional action). So, according to your approach, your leniency means misaseik, not davar she'eino miskavein (unintended consequence), but misaseik. One needs to know the leniency of misaseik, one doesn't need to die with the leniency.

Speaker 1:

It makes too much difference. I don't want to make you happy with your friends.

Halacha: If He Forgets and Goes Out with Tefillin — He Covers His Head

Speaker 1:

If he forgets and goes out and doesn't remember. Okay, anyway, ah, he did forget. He had tefillin and he forgot. He wasn't so careful, he didn't check the tefillin at every moment. **And he doesn't tie them, tefillin on his head, he covers his head**, but he must cover his head, **until he reaches his home**, so that he shouldn't walk with the exposed tefillin, so that there shouldn't be any disrespect, Shabbos is a sign, one shouldn't suspect that he is one of those... But this is the same leniency as before, even if one finds tefillin on Shabbos, when one finds tefillin one doesn't need to cover them, because there is no ervah (immodesty), there is no ervah that one needs to cover. But he should bring them in.

Two Reasons for Covering

Speaker 1:

So it could be two things: either cover it so that people shouldn't see that someone is walking on Shabbos with tefillin, so it's a bit of a desecration of Shabbos, that there's disrespect of Shabbos like this, as if he doesn't believe that Shabbos is enough of a sign. But he says, so that he should take them off immediately when he arrives home. We won't make him take them off in the street, but at home he should certainly take them off since it's Shabbos.

Conclusion of Chapter 19: Tefillin on Shabbos — Covering, and Customs

Continuation of the Discussion: Tefillin Found on Shabbos

Speaker 1:

But this is the same point as before, even if one finds tefillin on Shabbos, when one finds tefillin one doesn't need to cover them, because there is no issue, there is no matter that one needs to cover them. But if he remembered...

So it could be two things:

- Either cover it so that people shouldn't see that someone is walking on Shabbos with tefillin, so it's a bit of a desecration of Shabbos, that there's such disrespect of Shabbos — he doesn't believe that Shabbos is enough of a sign.

- But he says, the simple meaning is that he should take them off immediately when he arrives home. We won't make him take them off in the street, but at home you should certainly take them off because it's Shabbos.

Speaker 2:

So what does the covering accomplish?

Speaker 1:

He should keep his hands on them the whole time from when he remembers.

Speaker 2:

He holds it with his hand?

Speaker 1:

Yes, we're talking about a troublemaker, because he didn't really... he forgot again. So I, from when he remembers, don't take your hand off the tefillin. This is how the Rashba learns it there.

Customs on Friday Evening: Checking Pockets and Tefillin**Speaker 1:**

There is a great mitzvah on Friday evening to check the pockets. If one wears a Shabbos shirt it's perhaps even better.

Speaker 2:

Yes.

Speaker 1:

But this is actually the reason for the custom to announce in the synagogues on Shabbos which is a day after Yom Tov, one should cut one's nails. And also if one goes Friday afternoon with tefillin, one should not forget that one is still wearing tefillin.

One may wear tefillin, but one should not forget to take them off before Shabbos.

So, until here we have learned Chapter 19.

Discussion: Until When Should One Wear Tefillin on Friday Evening?**Speaker 2:**

I think that one should wear tefillin until the time, because then one shows that Shabbos is a sign. If one went fifteen minutes early with tefillin, it's not clear, it doesn't look recognizable that Shabbos is a sign.

Speaker 1:

There are righteous people and people who used to put on tefillin at Mincha, Friday evening at Mincha. Let's say that then Mincha is during bein hashmashos (twilight) after sunset, it becomes a problem, because you're already publicizing Shabbos. I don't know what the custom is.

Conclusion of Chapter 19 and Moving to Chapter 20**Speaker 1:**

Okay, until here Chapter 19. And basically this is the end of carrying, right? And the next chapter will be... Shevuos (oaths). It's a short chapter, not so short, but it's short.