HE DAILY RESOURCE FOR THOUSANDS OF DAF YOMI LEARNERS WORLDWIDI



This month's Daf Digest is dedicated

the Wedding of Yosef and Shoshana Sokolin

And לכבוד Israel Isser Ben Tzion ben Yaakov whose yahrtzeit is on 19 Iyar

## **OVERVIEW** of the Daf

#### 1) Wearing a single sandal

The Mishnah implied that if a person has a wound on his foot he may go out wearing a single sandal. The Gemara questions on which of his feet the sandal may be worn.

R' Huna said that it is worn on the foot with the wound because the purpose of the sandal is for protecting the foot from pain. Chiya bar Rav said that it is worn on the foot that does not have the wound because the purpose of the sandal is to provide comfort, and upon seeing the wound no one will suspect him of wrongdoing.

#### 2) The appropriate way to put on shoes

A story is told involving R' Yochanan being handed only one shoe, and the Gemara unsuccessfully attempted to prove that R' Yochanan follows the opinion of R' Huna.

The story is consistent with R' Yochanan's statement that when putting on shoes the left shoe should be put on first. This is contradicted by a Baraisa that rules that the right shoe should be put on first.

R' Yosef and Abaye disagree as to whether one can follow the ruling of R' Yochanan. Mar the son of Ravna would put on his right shoe without tying it and then the left shoe and tie it and then tie the right shoe.

A Baraisa discusses various instances where the right is given precedence over the left.

### 3) Tefillin

Rav Safra explains that the Mishnah's ruling against wearing Tefillin outside on Shabbos applies according to all opinions and is unrelated to the issue of whether Shabbos is a time to wear Tefillin. According to a second version, R' Safra was commenting on the latter part of the Mishnah which exempts a person who wears Tefillin outside on Shabbos from having to bring a chatas.

### 4) Amulets

R' Papa explains that for an amulet to be permitted on Shabbos it has to be written by an expert even if that particular amulet hasn't proven to be effective.

A Baraisa is cited that records different halachos of wearing an amulet on Shabbos. One of the halachos mentioned is that the amulet has to have cured three times, even the same person, and yet a second Baraisa rules that for an amulet to be considered effective it must have cured three different people.

The Gemara answers by distinguishing between establishing the effectiveness of the expert, requiring that he heal three people, and between establishing the effectiveness of the amulet, requiring that it be effective three times, even if it is the same person.

After presenting a series of cases that are obvious, R' Papa asks about three different amulets written by one person to treat a single patient for three different illnesses. Do the three successes establish this person as an expert or not? The Gemara does not resolve the issue.

The Gemara asks whether amulets are sanctified in that it would be prohibited to enter a bathroom while wearing them. Attempts are made to answer this question.

## **Distinctive INSIGHT**

Asking a Kohen to do a Favor

דאמר ליה רי יוחנן לרי שמן בר אבא – הב לי מסנאי

e know that R' Shemen bar Abba was a kohen (see Kesubos 23a). We also know that it is prohibited to use a kohen by asking him to do favors for us (see Shulchan Aruch, Rema O.C. 128:45). How, then, could R' Yochanan have asked R' Shemen bar Abba to pick up his shoes for him?

The Meshech Chochmah (Emor: "וקדשתוי") learns from this episode that if a kohen foregoes his honor, and he willingly offers to do a favor for another person, he can dismiss this privilege and do the favor.

The Taz (note 39), in his comments to the Shulchan Aruch, brings a story about a kohen who poured water for Rabbeinu Tam, and Rabbeinu Tam did not protest. When asked about the fact that the Yerushalmi (Berachos 60a) says that anyone who "uses" a kohen has transgressed, Rabbeinu Tam answered that in our days, there is no remaining kedusha for the kohen. They immediately asked Rabbeinu Tam, if that would be the case, why do we give him the first aliya, and why do we offer him Pidyon HaBen, etc? Rabbeinu Tam did not answer, but Rabbeinu Petter did answer by saying that a kohen is allowed to deny this honor. Meshech Chochmah concludes that Rabbeinu Tam himself also knew that the kohen involved had forfeited his honor in deference to his rebbe, as he considered it an honor to serve his rebbe. However, Rabbeinu Tam did not want to announce

(Continued on page 2)

# **REVIEW** and Remember

- 1. Which shoe did R' Yochanan put on first and why?
- 2. How did Mar the son of Ravna's practice accomadate the opinions of R' Yochanan and the Baraisa?
- 3. Is an amulet categorized as an ornament?
- 4. According to Rashi, what is the mazel that will contribute to the effectiveness of an amulet?

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
In memory of Rabbi Sholom Sklar \*\*

A founding member of our Beis Medrash on the west side

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated The Mermelstein family in loving memory of their brother נפתלי בן אלכטנדר הלוי, ע"ה

The procedure for putting on and removing shoes אמר רב נחמן בר יצחק: ירא ששים יוצא ידי שתיהו. ומנו שר בריה דרבנא. היכי עביד! סיים דימיניה ולא קטר, וסיים דשמאליה וקטר, והדר קטר דימיניה. אמר רב אשי, חזינא לרב כהנה דלא קפיד

▲ he Gemara brings two divergent opinions regarding how to put on one's shoes. Rabbi Yochanan says the left shoe should be put on first. He derives this rule based upon the mitzvah of tefillin, where we find that by binding objects on the body, the left is more important than the right. There is a Baraisa, however, that states that the right shoe should be put on first. Rav Nachman bar Yitzchok proposes that one who possesses a fear of heaven should adhere to both opinions. This can be done by putting on the right shoe, and then putting on the left shoe and tying it. Then the right shoe should be tied.

Ray Ashi said that he observed that Ray Kahana was not particular about how he tied his shoes.

Rabbeinu Yona (Sefer Havira), the Tur, and the Shulchan Aruch<sup>1</sup> rule according to Rav Nachman bar Yitzchok. Therefore, one should put on his right shoe, and then put on his left shoe. The left shoe should then be tied, and finally the right shoe should be tied. The reason we put the right shoe on first is found in Tosafos, where he notes that we find the right has precedence in regard to the sprinkling on the finger and toe of the metzora, and by chalitza. This is why Rema adds the comment of Tosafos<sup>3</sup> that even if shoes do not have laces, the right shoe should be put on before the left. As far as tying is concerned, the left shoe is tied before the right, in order to show precedence to the left, as we find by tefillin.

The Levush brings a beautiful connection between tefillin and shoes. The Gemara<sup>4</sup> tells us that when Avraham defeated the four kings, the king of Sedom offered him to take the spoils of war. Avraham refused, choosing to have his riches provided by Hashem, and not by a mere mortal of flesh and blood. Avraham said<sup>5</sup>, "Not a thread and not a shoe lace will I take from you!" In the merit of this remark, Avraham merited that his sons have the mitzvos of the strings of tzitzis and the straps of tefillin. Now, if the mitzvah of tefillin originated with this statement about shoelaces, it is most appropriate that the tying of shoes be done beginning on the left, as we find by tefillin.

(Insight...continued from page 1)

that this student, who was a kohen, desired to give honor to him.

further clarification, see Tosafos (Kesubos אותו היום) where the famous words of Rebbe Chaim the kohen are brought. He said that if he would have been there when Rabbeinu Tam died, he would have participated in the funeral, notwithstanding the fact he was a kohen. ■

Even though this halacha is based upon the tying of the tefillin, which is done on the left arm, women should also tie their left shoe first<sup>6</sup>. However, there are those who say that women need not be particular about this, and that it is actually preferable for them to tie their right shoe first.<sup>7</sup>

Aruch HaShulchan<sup>8</sup> discusses stockings that had to be tied, and he writes that once we see the left has precedence with regard to tying, this would be true by any type of clothing. This is also the ruling of the Kitzur Shulchan Aruch<sup>9</sup>. The Artzos HaChaim<sup>10</sup> notes that according to the Levush, this halacha would only be true by shoes, and not by stockings<sup>11</sup>.

The ruling of the Mishna Berura is that we need not tie and secure the left stocking before the right. And if gloves need to be fastened or tied, we can apply the comment of the Levush and not have to tie the left before the right.

As far as taking shoes off, Rabbeinu Yona says that the left shoe should be removed first, thus leaving the right shoe on for longer. The Chidushei Hagahos on the Tur writes one should untie the right shoe first, then untie the left and remove it, and then remove the right shoe. This is the reverse procedure for putting on the shoes. However, others conclude that the left should be untied and removed first<sup>12</sup>. This is also the ruling of the Shulchan Aruch. Beis Yosef wonders why the Tur does not record this halacha, and he concludes that the Tur must have felt that this is not a חיוב, but only a רשות. ■

שוייע סימן בי סעין דייה דעביד הכי שבת סא. דייה וי חולין פט בראשית יד:כג שויית דבר יהושע חייב סיי שויית אבני ישפה סיי אי סימן ג סעיף חי סימן ג סעיף ד הובא דבריו במשנה ברורה סייק וי וכו בהגהות רעייא אז נדברו חייה סיי כו

Cosmetics before going outdoors שלשה דברים מביאים את האדם לידי עניות... ושאשתו מקללתו בפניו. אמר רבא על עסקי תכשיטיה

■ he Ran explains that the becoming destitute is a fitting response for a husband who can afford to furnish his wife with jewelry, but he does not do so adequately. This person has conducted himself without compassion towards his wife, who is dependent upon him. Measure for measure, Hashem will not show mercy to him.

In a related issue, a question is addressed in the Shevet HaLevi about a woman who dressed and neighbors. This is when she cared to appear attractive. However, in her own house, she did not care to enhance her appearance. Was this conduct acceptable, or did it indicate some degree of a breach in the standards of modesty?

The answer given was that, although we find in the Gemara (Shabbos 62b) that our sages emphasized that a woman should care about her appearance, this is specifically in terms of not being repulsive in front of her husband (שלא תתגנה על בעלה). If a woman puts a great effort into being noticed by strangers, this is reminiscent of the sins of the daughters They intentionally sprayed perfume and dressed

nicely and put on makeup only when leaving the in an ostentatious manner to have the yetzer house, where she would be seen by her friends hara flare up. This aspect of dressing up before going into the public eye must be prohibited.

However, in general, while in the house, many husbands do not insist that their wives put on excessive makeup and jewelry. And even when they go out, it is generally the custom to put on a reasonable amount of cosmetics to appear respectful. This is understandable and does not have to be discouraged. Yet, if a lady uses excessive amount of cosmetics, and she wears flamboyant outfits in order to compete with the other women, this is sinful. She is not merely trying to be respectful, but she is intentionally trying to attract attention and to incite jealousy of Yerushalayim at the time of the destruction. among her peers. This is the cause of many serious problems, and it must be outlawed.

