

17 Iyar 5780
May 11, 2020



Shabbos Daf 66

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

Prosthetics and Walking Aids

The *Mishna* says that one without a foot may walk out with his wooden foot, while Rabbi Yosi says that he may not. If it has a receptacle for padding, it is a utensil which can become impure. Leg supports of one who lost both feet can become impure through *midras* - a *zav* sitting on it, he may go out with them on *Shabbos*, and he may enter the courtyard of the *Beis Hamikdash* with them, since they are not considered shoes. The chair and supports of one with only the top part of his legs can become impure through *midras*, he may not go out with them on *Shabbos*, nor may he enter the courtyard of the *Beis Hamikdash* with them, as they are considered shoes. *Luktamin* are not a utensil that can become impure, and one may not go out on *Shabbos* with them. (65b – 66a)

What’s Considered a Shoe?

Rav asked Rav Nachman what the correct text of the *Mishna* is about the dispute about the wooden foot, and Rav Nachman said he didn’t know.

Rava asked him how we rule, and he said he didn’t know.

The *Gemora* cites Shmuel and Rav Huna saying that the *Mishna* begins with Rabbi Meir saying that one may *not* go out with a wooden foot, and Rav Yosef says that we should follow them and use this text for the *Mishna*.

Rava bar Shira challenges this, as they didn’t hear about the time that Rav Chanan bar Rava taught this text to Rav’s son Chiya in front of Rav, and Rav motioned that he should switch the text.

Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak says that the mnemonic to remember who prohibits is the letter ‘*samach*,’ which appears both in Rabbi Yosi’s name and the word *oser* – prohibits.

The *Gemora* says that Shmuel also reversed his position, as he identified Rabbi Meir as the author of the *Mishna* which says that *chalitzah* done on a wooden shoe is valid, as he says that a wooden foot is considered a valid shoe.

Rav Huna also reversed his position, from his resolution of two *braisos*. The *braisa* cites Rabbi Akiva saying that a plaster salesman’s wooden sandal is a bona fide shoe, and therefore can become impure via *midras*, a woman may do *chalitzah* on it, and one may go out with it on *Shabbos*. The *braisa* concludes by saying that others didn’t agree, while another *braisa* concludes that others did agree. Rav Huna says that the others who disagree are Rabbi Yosi, while those who agree are Rabbi Meir, indicating that Rav Huna identifies Rabbi Meir as the one who considers a wooden shoe a valid shoe.

The *Gemora* says that Rav Yosef identified the others who disagree as Rabbi Yochanan ben Nuri, as he has a similar dispute with Rabbi Akiva about a mat made from straw and reeds. Rabbi Akiva considers these utensils which can



become impure, while Rabbi Yochanan ben Nuri says they are not.

The *Gemora* asks why anyone would say that the plaster salesman's sandal can become impure via *midras*, as it is only meant for protection, and not for walking.

Rav Acha bar Rav Ulla answers that they are also used for walking, since the salesman wears them to get home. (66a)

A Wooden Foot with a Receptacle

The *Mishna* said that if the foot had a receptacle for padding, it can become impure.

Abaye says that it cannot become impure via *midras*, since it is not meant for the person to lean on, but to take the place of his missing foot.

Rava says that it can also become impure via *midras*, since he does sometimes lean on it.

Rava says that his position is based on a *Mishna* which says that a child's wagon can become impure via *midras*, presumably because he sometimes sits on it.

Abaye deflects this, as the child always leans on it, even when only playing with it, while the wooden foot is not generally leaned on.

Abaye says that his position is based on a *braisa* which says that a cane used by the elderly cannot become impure, even though people sometimes lean on it.

Rava deflects this, as a cane is meant to straighten one's steps, but never to support the whole body, while the wooden foot is sometimes used to support the whole body. (66a – 66b)

Chair and Supports in the Courtyard

The *Gemora* says that a *Tanna* in front of Rabbi Yochanan taught that one may enter the courtyard of the Beis Hamikdash with one's chair and supports. Rabbi Yochanan corrected him to say that one may *not* enter with them, as this is inconsistent with the statement that a woman may do *chalitzah* with them. (66b)

Luktamin

The *Gemora* asks what *luktamin* are, and offers the following possibilities:

1. A donkey outfit (Rabbi Avahu).
2. Shoes for walking on mud (Rav Pappa).
3. Masks (Rav Huna). (66b)

Permitted Items

The *Mishna* says that boys can go out with knots, and princes can go out with bells. The *Mishna* clarifies that everyone can go out with bells, but the Sages taught the usual case.

The *Gemora* asks what the knots in the *Mishna* means.

Ada Mari quotes Rav Nachman bar Baruch in the name of Rav Ashi bar Avin in the name of Rav Yehudah saying that it refers to tying the madder plant on someone for healing.

Abaye says that his mother told him that three knots of madder keep the patient from deteriorating, five heal, and seven can even counteract magic.

Rav Acha bar Yaakov says that it is only effective if it never saw the sun or moon, and never heard the sound of iron, a hen, or steps.



Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak remarked that this makes this medicine useless, as it is impractical to fulfill these conditions.

The *Gemora* challenges this explanation of the *Mishna*, since the *Mishna* refers to boys wearing it, but this medicine would be just as applicable to girls and adults as well.

Instead, the *Gemora* explains that the knots refer to the knot taught by Avin bar Huna said in the name of Rav Chama bar Guria. He said that if a son sorely misses his father, the father can wrap a strap from his right shoe on the son's left hand.

Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak says that the way to remember which side to use is *tefillin*, which one wraps with his right hand on his left arm.

The *Gemora* says that switching the sides (*by wrapping a strap from his left shoe on the son's right hand*) can be dangerous. (66b)

Permitted Health Activities

The *Gemora* cites statements of Avin bar Huna in the name of Rav Chama bar Guria permitting the following on *Shabbos*:

1. Turning over a cup with steam on top of one's stomach.
2. Rubbing the palms of one's hands and feet with oil and salt. The *Gemora* explains that this is a way of sobering someone who is drunk. Rav Huna, when he came from Rav's *Beis Medrash* inebriated, and Rav, when he came from Rabbi Chiya's, and Rabbi Chiya, when he came from Rebbe's, would spread oil and salt on their hand and foot palms, and say that just as these are dissipated, so should their alcohol dissipate. Another option is to put the cover of a jug in water, and say that just as it is

cleared up by the water, so should this person be cleared of his alcohol.

3. Turning someone upside down, to get one of his vertebrae back in place.
4. Swaddling a baby, to straighten his bones.

The *Gemora* says that Rav Pappa learned two statements about children (*tying the strap, and swaddling*) in the name of Avin, while Rav Zevid only learned the first one in his name, with the second one in the name of Rabbah bar Chanah. (66b)

Healing Remedies

Abaye says that his mother told him that in all incantations one mentions the patient's mother's name, and one ties items on the left. Furthermore, the standard amount of times that one must repeat it is 41, unless otherwise specified.

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa* that says that one may walk outside on *Shabbos* with a stone to prevent a miscarriage. Rabbi Meir says that one may even walk with something that weighs the same as such a stone. The *braisa* clarifies that this applies to any woman who may be pregnant, even if she's not at any high risk for miscarriage.

Rav Yeimar bar Shlamya quotes Abaye saying that one may use the weight only if it exactly matches the weight of the stone.

Abaye asks whether one may use a weight which was itself weighed against another weight, and the *Gemora* leaves this question unresolved.

Abaye says that his mother told him that to treat a fever that one gets every day, one should take a new *zuz* coin, and measure the same amount of salt from a salt mine. He should place the salt in the cavity near his neck and tie it with a string of hair. Alternatively, he should stand at a crossroads, and wait for a large ant carrying a burden.

When he finds one, he should take it and place it in a copper tube, and seal it very well (*with lead and sixty seals*). He should move it around, and then carry it, saying that he and the ant should switch burdens, thereby placing his fever on the ant.

Rav Acha the son of Rav Huna challenged this to Rav Ashi, as perhaps the ant is already carrying someone else's fever.

He therefore says that the person should say that the ant should add the patient's burden (*i.e., fever*) to his own. Alternatively, he can take a new container and go the river, asking it to borrow some water for a day guest he has (*i.e., the fever*). He should then fill the container with water, put it around his head seven times, and spill the water behind him, telling the river to take back its water, as his day guest has left the same day he arrived. (66b)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Prosthetics

By: R' Avi Lebowitz

The *Mishna* permits (*according to R. Meir*) a person who has an amputated leg to go out with his "*kav*" - prosthetic leg.

Tosafos has different approaches as to what function the *kav* actually served.

Tosafos assumes that if this is his primary method of moving around, we can prove from here that an amputee can also use a crutch or crutches, which is his primary method of movement. However, if the prosthetic leg that the *Mishna* is speaking about is more for appearance and aesthetics, we can't draw a proof from here regarding the use of a cane or crutches.

The Shulchan Aruch 301:17 rules that a person who can walk without crutches may go out with crutches on *Shabbos*. The assumption is that since he can't move without them, they are considered a "shoe" for him and permitted to be used on *Shabbos*. But the Shulchan Aruch continues that if he can move without them and is only using them to strengthen himself or hold himself better, it is forbidden.

It isn't clear from the Shulchan Aruch whether the problem is that since he can move without it, we are afraid he may come to carry it, or since he can move without it, it's not considered a shoe - hence a Torah violation of carrying.

The Biur Halachah cites the Levush who says that on a Torah level it is not considered carrying since he is leaning on it, but on a Rabbinic level we are concerned that since he doesn't need it that desperately, he will come to carry it.

However, the Biur Halachah rejects this approach based on our *Gemora*. The *Gemora* says that a cane used by the elderly is to enable him to walk straight and straighten himself up since his legs shake, but it isn't made for the leaning of one's entire body and therefore it is not *tamei* as a midras. From here we see that something which is used to strengthen oneself and not to fully lean on, such as a cane (*vs. a crutch*), is not *tamei midras* and therefore on *Shabbos* should be considered carrying. Therefore, the Mishnah Berurah (64) rules that an elderly person who can walk around inside his home without a cane, but when he goes out he uses a cane for the security and sturdiness, it is forbidden and is considered a burden.

The Mishnah Berurah holds that it's not only a concern that he may come to carry it, but is actually a Biblical prohibition of carrying. However, if he is so old that he can't even move around inside without it, it becomes like the *kav* of an amputee that can be used in the public domain.



Based on this, those people who use walkers to enable themselves to walk, the *halachah* would be that if they require those walkers inside, they can use it outside as well. But if they only use it when going out to secure themselves and prevent themselves from falling, it is forbidden to go out with it on *Shabbos* when there is no *eruv*.

Barefoot

The *Gemara* (*Zevachim* 24a) states that just as a *Kohen* must perform all tasks of the *Avodah* with his body, allowing nothing to interpose between his skin and the service vessels, so too there may be nothing between the skin of his feet and the floor of the *Beis HaMikdash*.

The *Gemara* (*Brachos* 62b) derives that one may not enter the *Har HaBayis* wearing shoes from the verse: *Remove your shoes from your feet*.

The *Ramban* comments on this verse, noting that the *Shechinah* was in the bush, and although Moshe was not near the bush, the entire area became sacred and he could not wear shoes there, just as the *Kohanim* served in the *Mikdash* barefoot.

Should not the *Ramban* have rather mentioned the *Gemora* in *Brachos* which is more on point, rather than the *halachah* regarding interposition, which would seem to be unrelated?

The *Midrash* (*Bereshis Rabba* 67:7) relates that after Geviha bar Kosem defeated the Egyptians' claim against the Jews before Alexander the Great for all the spoils that the *Bnei Yisroel* took with them from Egypt, Alexander wished to visit Yerushalayim. A Cuthean warned him that he wouldn't be allowed into the *Kodesh Kodashim* so Geviha adorned a pair of socks with jewels and suggested that the king put them on as they reached the *Har HaBayis*, which Geviha said was slippery.

Why should socks have been allowed?

The *Minchas Yitzchok* (3:19) cites our *Gemora* which implies that if footwear is ineligible for *chalitzah*, one may wear it on the *Har HaBayis*, thus permitting socks. Therefore, the *Gemora* which derives from 'Remove your shoes' that one must remove one's shoes does not present an absolute barefoot requirement, since socks and other footwear ineligible for *chalitzah* may still be permitted. However, the barefoot requirement for a *Kohen's Avodah* is because of interposition, which is unrelated to *chalitzah* eligibility and yet based on holiness, making it an absolute example for the *Ramban* to compare with Moshe.

DAILY MASHAL

Tefillah Needs to be Specific

The *Gemara* (*Shabbos* 66b) states that Abaye's "mother" (*i.e. the woman who raised him as an orphan*) told him that all prayers (*said on behalf of someone*) should mention the beneficiary's mother's name.

Most *Meforshim* understand the use of a mother's name rather than the father's name as based on the certain identity of one's mother.

The *Ben Ish Chai* suggests that women fare better against the *Mekatrigim* (celestial accusers) since they are held to fewer *mitzvos* and are less likely to transgress certain *aveiros*.

The *Magen Avraham* (O"C 119) rules that when one prays for someone, one need not say their name (*based on Moshe's Tefilah* – 'Keil na, refa na lah') unless they are not present, in which case their name should be said. However, the *Magen Avraham* (based on the *MaHaRil*) says nothing about the mother's name, indicating that it is at best, only recommended.



Why mention it at all? Wouldn't Hashem know for whom one is *davening* in one's heart?

The *Or HaChaim HaKadosh* comments on the verse which says that Moshe cried out to Hashem on the matter of the frogs 'with which He had afflicted Pharaoh,' stating: from here we see that one must be explicit with one's *Tefilah*.

The *Zohar (VaYishlach 169)* also derives from Yaakov's words: 'from the hands of my brother, from the hands of Esav' that one should clearly state what one is *davening* for.

Why is this necessary?

In *Beis Elokim (Tefilah 3)* the *Mabit* states that the *brachah* of *Shema Koleinu* in *Shemoneh Esrei* is structured to speak of our "voice" and our "mouth" so as to hopefully benefit from the sounds of our *Tefilos* that were said without *Kavanah*, while our thoughts were elsewhere. As such, in the absence of *Kavanah*, at least the right words will have been said.

Blessing a Person with his Father's Name or his Mother's?

In discussing a wide variety of supernatural remedies, the *Gemora* states that formulas recited for a person's recovery should include his name and his mother's name (See *Gittin 69b*, *Avodah Zarah 12b*).

The *Zohar (parshas Lech Lecha, 64)* learns the importance of mentioning the mother's name in our prayers from the *possuk*, "Rescue the son of Your maidservant," (*Tehillim 86:16*).

Some explain that the mother's name is used instead of the father's, since one can be absolutely certain who a child's mother is, but one cannot always be certain who is the father (See *Maharshal* here; *Pri Chadash* and *Shaarei*

Teshuva, beginning of *Shulchan Aruch*, 119).

The *possukim* of the Torah also seem to support this practice. *Yitzchak Avinu* blessed *Yaakov*, "The sons of your mother shall bow before you," (*Bereishis 27:29*). *Yitzchak* blessed him mentioning his mother, not his father. When *Yaakov* in turn blessed *Yehudah*, he said, "The sons of your father shall bow before you." This is only because *Yaakov* had children from many wives, and he wished to subjugate them all to *Yehudah*. Therefore, he included them all as the sons of one father.

The merit of the mother is greater: The *Ben Yehoyada* writes that since women have less *mitzvos* than men have, they are less likely to transgress them. Furthermore, they are not faulted with laxity in Torah study, since they are not commanded to toil in Torah. Therefore, we pray for people in the name of their mothers, to give the Accuser less opportunity to challenge our prayers.

All this is true in regard to our prayers for the living. As we know, *Ashkenazic* custom is to pray for the deceased using their fathers' names. This custom is based on the *Sefer Chassidim (242)*, and is also cited by the *Hafla'ah*, in his work *Panim Yafos (parshas Beha'aloscha)*.

Man is formed from the earth: The *Mekor HaChesed* commentary on *Sefer Chassidim (ibid)* writes an interesting explanation for this practice. The *Gemara* states that a person's flesh and blood are from his mother, and his bones are from his father (*Niddah 31a*). As long as a person lives, his flesh and bones are intact, and we pray for him in the name of his mother. After he dies and his body decomposes, all that is left is the bones he received from his father. Therefore we pray for him in his father's name. (He also offers a second interpretation, based on the *Ramban's* commentary to *Vayikra 12:2*).