

11 Iyar 5780
May 5, 2020



Shabbos Daf 60

Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamot of

Moshe Raphael ben Yehoshua (Morris Stadtmauer) o”h

Tzvi Gershon ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h

Mav the studing of the Daf Notes be a zechus for their neshamot and mav their souls find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

The *Mishna* had stated: A woman may not go out with an unpierced needle.

The *Gemora* asks: What is it fit for? [Since she is not liable for a *chatas*, it must be regarded as an ornament.]

Rav Yosef said: Since a woman tidies her hair with it (*it is therefore ornamental; if some wisps of hair stray out from under her hair covering, they are wound about this needle and pushed back*).

Abaye said to him: Let it be as a garter (*used so that the stocking will not fall down*), which is *tahor* (*for it is not regarded as a utensil*), and therefore permitted? [So here as well, since the needle is required to keep the hair in order, and uncovered hair is considered disgraceful, a woman will certainly not remove it for display, so why is not permitted?]

The *Gemora* offers a different answer: Rather, Rav Adda of Narash interpreted it before Rav Yosef: Since a woman parts her hair with it (*it is ornamental*).

The *Gemora* asks: What is it fit for on *Shabbos* (*where a woman does not comb her hair*)?

Rava said: It has a golden bar at the end of it: on weekdays she parts her hair with it, while on *Shabbos*, she places it against her forehead. [She sticks the needle end into her wig, letting the other end come over her forehead as an ornament.]

A man may not go out with a nail-studded sandal (*one whose leather uppers are attached to its sole with nails*), nor with a single sandal - if he has no wound on his foot (*either because*

he may be suspected of carrying its mate under his garments, or because he may evoke ridicule, which will cause him to take it off and carry it; when one foot is wounded, however, there is no concern for this), nor with *tefillin*, nor with an amulet - if it is not from an expert, nor with a coat of mail, nor with a helmet, nor with shin guards. Yet if he goes out, he does not incur a *chatas*.

The *Mishna* had stated: [A man may not go out with] a nail-studded sandal. The *Gemora* asks: What is the reason?

Shmuel said: It was at the end of the period of persecution, and some of the fugitives were hiding in a cave. They proclaimed: He who wishes to enter, let him enter (*as he could see beforehand whether the enemies' spies were on the watch*), but he who wishes to go out, let him not go out (*lest their whereabouts be disclosed*). Now, the sandal of one of them became reversed (*for these sandals were made in such a manner that one can insert his foot in them from either end*), so that they thought that one of them had gone out (*based on the direction of the footprint*) and been seen by the enemies, who would now be coming to capture them. Thereupon, they pushed (*and kicked*) against each other (*with their nail-studded sandals*), and they killed of each other more than their enemies did. [They therefore made a decree not to go out with these sandals on *Shabbos*.]

Rabbi Ila'i the son of Elozar said (*as a different reason for the decree*): They were stationed in a cave when they heard a sound from above the cave. Thinking that the enemy was coming upon them, they pushed (*and kicked*) against each other (*with their nail-studded sandals*), and they killed of each other more than their enemies did. [They therefore made a decree not to go out with these sandals on *Shabbos*.]



Rami bar Yechezkel said: They were stationed in a synagogue, when they heard a sound from behind the synagogue. Thinking that the enemy was coming upon them, they pushed (*and kicked*) against each other (*with their nail-studded sandals*), and they killed of each other more than their enemies did. At that moment it was enacted: A man must not go out with a nail-studded sandal.

The *Gemora* asks: If so, it should be forbidden on weekdays as well?

The *Gemora* answers: The incident happened on *Shabbos*.

The *Gemora* asks: Then let it be permitted on Festivals!? Why did we learn in a *Mishna*: One may not send a nail-studded sandal or an unsewn shoe (as a present) on a Festival (*for they must be usable on the Yom Tov*)?

The *Gemora* answers: What is the reason of the *Shabbos*? It is because there is a gathering of people (*and the incident took place amongst a gathering of people*). So on Festivals as well, there is a gathering.

The *Gemora* asks: But there is a gathering on a public fast day; let it be forbidden then as well?

The *Gemora* answers: The incident occurred on a day of assembly when (*they gathered because*) there is a prohibition against work; but here (*on a fast day*), it is a day of assembly when it is permitted to work.

The *Gemora* notes: [*It was taught: No man shall carry the waters of purification and ashes of purification across the Jordan River on board a ship, nor may one stand on one side and throw them across to the other side, nor may one float them upon water, nor may one carry them while riding on an animal or on the back of another man unless his own feet were touching the ground. He may, however, convey them across a bridge. These laws are applicable to the Jordan River and to other rivers as well. Rabbi Chanania bar Akavya said: They spoke only of the Jordan River and of transport on board a ship, as was the case in the original incident, for once a man*

was transporting the waters of purification and ashes of purification across the Jordan River on board a ship, and a piece of a corpse, of the size of an olive, was found stuck in the bottom of the ship.] And even according to Rabbi Chanina ben Akiva who maintained that they enacted a prohibition only in respect of the Jordan and a ship, just as the incident that occurred (*and perhaps here the decree should not apply to Yom Tov*) - that applies only to the Jordan, which differs from other rivers (*for the Jordan River is recognizable, based on its width or depth*); but Festivals and *Shabbos* are alike, for we learned in a *Mishna*: There is no difference between Festivals and *Shabbos* except in respect of food preparation (*which may be prepared on Yom Tov, but not on Shabbos*).

Rav Yehudah said in the name of Shmuel: They learned this (*decree regarding nail-studded sandals*) only where the nails are there to strengthen (*the sandal*), but where they are there for beautification purposes, it is permitted.

The *Gemora* asks: And how many is the maximum amount of nails that it still would be regarded as being ornamental?

Rabbi Yochanan said: Five in one sandal, and five on the other. Rabbi Chanina said: Seven in one sandal, and seven on the other. [*And if there are more, their purpose is to strengthen, not ornamental.*]

Rabbi Yochanan said to Rav Shemen bar Abba: I will explain to you (*their positioning*): according to me, there were two on one side of the sandal (*one by the toe, and one by the heel*), and two on the other, and one by the strapping, and according to Rabbi Chanina, there were three on one side of the sandal, and three on the other, and one by the strapping.

The *Gemora* asks on Rabbi Yochanan from a *braisa*: For an inclining sandal (*where the sole is thicker at one side than at the other; it is leveled by nails inserted at the thin end*), one inserts seven nails (*and it will then be permitted for Shabbos*); these are the words of Rabbi Nassan. Rebbe, however, permits thirteen. Now, as for Rabbi Chanina, it is well, for he rules as Rabbi Nassan, but according to whose view does Rabbi Yochanan state his opinion?



The *Gemora* answers: He rules as Rabbi Nehorai, for it was taught in a *braisa*: Rabbi Nehorai said: Five are permitted, but seven are forbidden.

Eifah said to Rabbah bar bar Chanah: You, as disciples of Rabbi Yochanan, should act as Rabbi Yochanan, but we will act like Rabbi Chanina.

Rav Huna inquired of Rav Ashi: What of five nails?

He answered him. Even seven are permitted.

Rav Huna asked: What of nine?

Rav Ashi replied: Even eight are forbidden.

A certain shoemaker asked of Rav Ami: What if it is sewn from within? [*If a leather shoe was placed inside a sandal and sewn inside, is it permitted?*]

He replied: It is permitted, but I do not know the reason for it.

Rav Ashi said: And doesn't the master know the reason? It is because it was sewn from within, it becomes a shoe; the Rabbis enacted a decree in respect to a sandal, but in respect of a shoe, they did not enact any decree.

Rabbi Abba bar Zavda inquired of Rabbi Abba bar Avina: What if he arranged the nails like tongs? [*He bent a nail with two sharp ends and inserted both heads into the sandal.*]

He answered him: It is permitted.

The *Gemora* notes that it was stated likewise: Rabbi Yosi the son of Rabbi Chanina said: If they are arranged like tongs, it is permitted.

Rav Sheishes said: If the entire sole of the sandal is covered with nails (*underneath*), so that the ground should not wear it away, it is permitted (*for the nails do not serve the same purpose as the nail-studded sandal which was prohibited*).

The *Gemora* notes that a *braisa* was taught in accordance with Rav Sheishes: A man may not go out wearing a nail-studded sandal, nor may he stroll in it from one house to another house, and even from one bed to another bed, but it may be handled in order to cover a utensil or support the legs of a bed with it; but Rabbi Elozar the son Rabbi Shimon forbids this. If most of its nails have fallen out, but four or five are left, it is permitted; while Rebbe permits it up to seven. If one covers it with leather underneath and drives nails into it on top, it is permitted. If one arranges the nails like tongs, or flattens them out, or like pegs, or if he covers the entire sole of the sandal with nails so that the ground should not wear it away, it is permitted.

The *Gemora* asks: Now, this is self-contradictory! You say that if most of the nails have fallen out (*it is permitted*), implying that even if many are left it may be worn; then it is taught, only four or five, but not more?

Rav Sheishes answers: There is no difficulty, for in the one case they wore down (*but they are still leveled with the sole; it is therefore apparent that it initially had many more nails*); in the other they were pulled out (*and we do not know that there were many to begin with; in that case, the sandal may not be worn*).

The *braisa* had stated: If four or five remain, it is permitted.

The *Gemora* asks: Seeing that it is permitted with five, is there any necessity to state four?

Rav Chisda said: It refers to four in a small sandal and five in a large sandal.

The *braisa* had stated: While Rebbe permits it up to seven.

The *Gemora* asks: But it was taught in the *braisa* cited above that Rebbe permits it up to thirteen?

The *Gemora* answers: An inclining sandal is different (*for they are all necessary for levelling and not for strengthening*).



The *Gemora* notes: Now that you have arrived at this distinction, according to Rabbi Yochanan's view too there is no difficulty, for an inclining sandal is different.

[*The braisa above had stated: A nail-studded sandal may be handled in order to cover a utensil or support the legs of a bed with it; but Rabbi Elozar the son Rabbi Shimon forbids this.*]

Rav Masnah said, and others state that it was Rav Achadvoi bar Masnah who said in the name of Rav Masnah: The *halachah* is not as Rabbi Elozar the son Rabbi Shimon.

The *Gemora* asks: But that is obvious, for where one disagrees with a majority, the *halachah* is always as the majority?

The *Gemora* answers: You might argue that Rabbi Elozar the son Rabbi Shimon's view is logical here (*for if he was permitted to handle it, he would end up wearing it*); therefore we are informed that we do not rule according to him.

Rabbi Chiya said: But that I would be called a Babylonian who permits forbidden things, I would permit more (*even the nail-studded sandal*).

The *Gemora* asks: And how many (*would he have permitted*)?

In Pumbedisa they said: twenty-four; in Sura they said: twenty-two.

Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak said: And your mnemonic (*to remember who held what*) is by the time he (*R' Chiya*) travelled from Pumbedisa to Sura, two nails were missing from his sandals. (60a – 60b)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Justifying a Custom Regarding Gebrochts

Shoel U'meishiv (I: 1:130) issues a novel ruling based on our *Gemora*. The *Gemora* cites the opinion of Rabbi Chananya ben Akavya, who maintains that when a decree was impelled

because of a certain incident, it is limited to the same situation as the original incident.

The Shoel U'meishiv says: The obligation of eating matzah on Pesach, which is *lechem oni*, poor man's bread (*water and flour*) is only on the first night of Pesach and not any other nights or days, including the second night. Eating *lechem oni* is because the Jewish people baked the dough before it had a chance to rise on the way out of Egypt. Since the mitzvah is based upon that incident and that occurred on the night of the fifteenth of Nissan, that is the only night that we have this obligation.

We know when the night of the fifteenth is, and we are not uncertain regarding the days of the new month. The Chachamim instituted that we must observe two days of Yom Tov since that is what they did in the times of the Beis Hamikdosh. Accordingly, we must fulfill all mitzvos on the second night, as well.

However, that is only regarding mitzvos that if we wouldn't fulfill, it would be degrading for the Yom Tov. We are required to eat matzah and marror since otherwise, it would be apparent that we are not recognizing this night as a Yom Tov; however, matzah which is not *lechem oni* would not degrade the Yom Tov at all and therefore it would not be necessary. He cites a Beis Yosef as proof to this.

I heard that this could be the justification for the custom of not eating *gebrochts* only on the first night of Pesach. If the reason for not eating *gebrochts* on Pesach is because there is a concern that it might result in chametz, there is no distinction between the first night and all the other nights; but if the reason is based on *lechem oni*, there can be logic to say that it is only applicable on the first night.

Special Shoes L'Kavod Shabbos

Our *sugya* tells of a Rabbinic enactment forbidding us to wear "nailed" shoes on Shabbos. The soles of these shoes are attached to the uppers with nails, which project, tooth-like, from the bottom. This prohibition was enacted as a response to a tragic incident that occurred during the time of the



Roman occupation of *Eretz Yisrael*, when it was forbidden to learn Torah. Jews would gather clandestinely in caves to learn Torah, for fear of the enemy. During one such gathering, the Roman soldiers suddenly assaulted the cave, and fell upon the Jews to kill them. The Jews ran for their lives, and in the ensuing turmoil, they trampled one another with their nailed shoes, killing more people than the Romans did. Since this incident occurred on Shabbos, our Sages responded by forbidding nailed shoes to be worn on Shabbos. They did not forbid wearing them on weekdays.

In regard to this distinction, the Talmud Yerushalmi (Shabbos 6:2) comments, "It is not the custom for people to have two pairs of shoes, one for weekday use, and one for Shabbos." The commentaries disagree over how to interpret this Yerushalmi. Based on the varying interpretations, they draw fascinating halachic conclusions in regard to the *mitzvah* of wearing special shoes *l'kavod* Shabbos, as we shall see.

Let us first begin by citing the Poskim who discuss this obligation, and then return to the Yerushalmi.

Are shoes considered garments? The focus of this discussion begins by determining whether the Torah classifies shoes as "*malbushim* – garments." The *Gemara* (113a) states that to honor the Shabbos, we must wear special clothing, "Your garments for Shabbos should not be the same as your garments for the rest of the week." This ruling is cited in halacha (Rambam hilchos Shabbos 30:3; Tur and Shulchan Aruch 262:2): "A person must make an effort to acquire special, nicer clothing for Shabbos Kodesh." If shoes are classified as garments, it would seem that they would be included in this *mitzvah*.

"Who has provided me with my every need": The Ben Ish Chai (Rav Poalim IV, O.C. 13) rules that shoes are not considered garments. As a proof, he cites that in the morning blessings, we recite two *berachos*: *malbush arumim* – Who clothes the naked; and afterward *she'asah li kol tzarchi* – Who has provided me with my every need. This second *berachah* refers to shoes. We see that *malbush arumim* does not include shoes, since shoes are not garments. Therefore, there is no obligation to wear special shoes for Shabbos.

Barefoot is not naked: Certain Poskim (Yakar Erech 85b) reject this proof, claiming that even if a shoe is indeed a garment, the lack of shoes does not deem one as "naked," but rather as barefoot. For this reason, the *berachah* of *malbush arumim* does not include shoes, and a special *berachah* of *she'asah li kol tzarchi*, was instituted to thank Hashem for shoes.

With this in mind, we now return to the Yerushalmi. The Korban Eidah (commentary on the Yerushalmi, *ibid*) and Ben Ish Chai explain the *Gemara* most simply. "It is not the custom for people to have two pairs of shoes, one for weekday use, and one for Shabbos." The Yerushalmi means to say that since people generally only have one pair of shoes, the prohibition against nailed shoes on Shabbos will also refrain them from wearing these shoes on weekdays. In any case, we see from here that it is unnecessary to buy special shoes for Shabbos.

Other commentaries (Pnei Moshe, commentary on the Yerushalmi, *ibid*) add a question mark to the end of the Yerushalmi's statement, and interpret it as a rhetorical question: "Is it not the custom for people to have two pairs of shoes, one for weekday use, and one for Shabbos?" The Yerushalmi means to ask why the Sages enacted their prohibition only in regard to Shabbos shoes. Since people generally have a second pair for weekday use, our Sages should have forbid nailed shoes on weekdays too. According to this interpretation, we see that it was the custom to wear special shoes for Shabbos.

Rav Betzalel Shafran *zt"l*, in his letter to Rebbe Yisrael of Bahush *zt"l*, cites a proof for the Korban Eidah from a different *Gemara* (Kesubos 64b), and therefore rules that one need not have special shoes for Shabbos (Teshuvos Ravav O.C. 12).

This discussion has ramifications in hilchos *tzedakah* as well. If a person pledges to clothe the needy, is he required to provide shoes as well? (See Shvus Yaakov I, 24; Sha'ar Ephraim, 124).

A special yarmulke for sleeping on Shabbos: The Chida (Chesed L'Avraham 3, cited in Kaf HaChaim 262:25) ruled that it is a pious custom to change all of our clothing *I'kavod* Shabbos, including our shoes and even the yarmulke we wear while sleeping. It is known that the Vilna Gaon also changed all of his clothes, from his head to his feet, in honor of the Shabbos Malka (Maaseh Rav, s.k. 147).

DAILY MASHAL

History of the Hobnailed Sandal

Our Gemora tells us about the ban on wearing a hobnailed sandal. Said sandal is held responsible for the tragic deaths of Jews hiding in a cave. Spotting the impression left in the ground by the shoe set off a panicked response, with many killed in the rush for the exit. The incident occurred on Shabbos; therefore the ban applied only to Shabbos.

The superficial understanding of the Gemara does not completely satisfy. Sandals don't kill; panic kills. Why ban the messenger? Isn't such a ban far-fetched? And if it isn't, shouldn't it apply on any day, even if the tragic incident took place on Shabbos?

Furthermore, asks Rav Chanoch Ehrentrau in [Iyunim B'Divrei Chazal U-v'leshonam](#), the Yerushalmi adds elements that make the sugya even harder to understand. It offers two other versions of the introduction of the ban. According to one, the sound of this sandal caused pregnant women to miscarry; according to another, the sight of it did the same. Just how did an unusual sound or a bit of metal trim on a shoe cause miscarriage? Additionally, the Yerushalmi asks why the ban should not have been lifted after the time of *shmad* in which the story took place ended. If the very sight of this garment was death-dealing, why should the end of a nasty governmental edict suggest that a ban meant to increase public safety be lifted?

Rabbi Ehrentrau, cited by Yitzchak Adlerstein in Cross-Currents, offers a wonderful suggestion. He demonstrates from both midrashic and historical sources that the hobnailed sandal was part of the battle gear of the Greco-Roman

soldier. Most likely, the Jews in the cave had fled the edicts against Jewish practice. They did not wear such sandals, but some isolated individual had come into possession of a pair. When he wore them, he left tracks in the vicinity of the cave. Someone spotting those tracks spread the word that they had been discovered by the enemy, setting off a mass panic. The sandals indeed were to blame for the tragedy, not because of anything intrinsic to them, but because they indicated the presence of the detested enemy soldiers. According to the other versions in the Yerushalmi, their sight or sound could cause a woman to miscarry in anticipation of what those soldiers might do. On the other hand, they were problematic only as long as the enemy imposed his will. When the decrees ended, it would be expected that the ban should be lifted. The Yerushalmi answers that the ban has not disappeared because *beis din* did not formally lift it. But why? Rav Ehrentrau suggests that the ban was left in place as a permanent reminder of those who fled to the caves in order to doggedly remain faithful to Hashem and His Torah, and ultimately paid with their lives. The ban remains "on the books" as a tribute to those who would not give in.