

This month's Daf Digest is dedicated  
לכבוד the Wedding of Yosef and Shoshana Sokolin  
And לעלוי נשמת Israel Isser Ben Tzion ben Yaakov whose yahrtzeit is on 19 Iyar

## OVERVIEW of the Daf

### 1) Finger rings (cont.)

Rava resolves the discrepancy concerning the categorization of a signet ring for a woman by reinterpreting the Mishnah in Keilim to be in agreement with our Mishnah that a signet ring is not an ornament that a woman may wear outside on Shabbos.

R' Nachman bar Yitzchok disagrees with the premise of the discrepancy asserting that the laws of Shabbos and the laws of tum'ah exist on separate planes.

### 2) A needle that is not pierced

The Gemara explains that the needle referred to in the Mishnah is one that is used during the week to part a woman's hair, and on Shabbos a gold bar is attached to it making it into an ornament.

3) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah lists those items that a man may not wear outside on Shabbos.

### 4) The sandal with nails

Three different versions of the event that compelled Chazal to prohibit wearing a sandal with nails outside on Shabbos are presented.

The Gemara explains why this decree applies only on Shabbos and Yom Tov, and not during the week or on a fast day.

The restriction against wearing sandals with nails, explains R' Yehudah in the name of Shmuel, is limited to where the nails are there to strengthen the shoe, but if they are there for decoration it is permitted.

There is a disagreement how many nails would be considered decorative and the Gemara does not give a definitive ruling on the matter.

R' Ashi explained that the decree only includes sandals but not shoes, even when inserted into a sandal.

(Continued on page 2)

## REVIEW and Remember

1. According to R' Nachman bar Yitzchak, what are the different criteria for classifying an item as tamei and prohibiting an item from being worn outside on Shabbos?
2. Why are weekdays excluded from the decree against wearing sandals with nails?
3. Is one permitted to wear sandals with nails inside of their home?
4. Why was it necessary to rule in favor of Tanna Kamma over the opinion of R' Elazar the son of Shimon?

## Distinctive INSIGHT

### Combat Gear

ולא במגפיים וכו'

Rabbi Ovadiah from Bartenura explains that these were army boots, and they were worn by soldiers. Because they are only worn as part of a combat uniform, they cannot be worn on Shabbos.

Aruch Hashulchan (301:#52) writes that these are actual boots, which are worn as part of one's wardrobe. Therefore, people other than soldiers who wear such boots on Shabbos will not be liable for a chatas. Rather, others will only be in violation of a rabbinic prohibition. He concludes by saying that anyone who works in the army is permitted to wear these boots. Furthermore, it would follow that an active soldier would be permitted (מותר) to bear a spear or other weapon on Shabbos, but anyone else carrying it into the public domain would be liable for a chatas (חייב).

Rav Yosef Shalom Elyashiv points out that the Rishonim explain the reason for not wearing these boots is that anyone wearing them appears as if he is going to war on Shabbos (see Rashi 64b ד"ה חיוב חטאת), but for this alone it is not a שואר.

In fact, the Mishnah on 63a lists many implements of war, and Tanna Kama prohibits a man from going into the public domain while wearing them. R' Eliezer argues, pointing out that these items are ornamental to the one who bears them, portraying the man as mighty. Meiri compares the opinion of R' Eliezer to our case of boots, which Rashi explains as part of a battle uniform. Meiri concludes that both the boots and the war implements on 63a are only allowed to be taken into the public domain in terms of being exempt on a Torah level. However, the rabbis prohibit all these cases, for it appears to the onlooker as if the bearer is going to battle.

R' Elyashiv notes that, according to the Meiri, the boots are rabbinically prohibited for the soldier. Therefore, the explanation of the Aruch Hashulchan seems difficult, because he explained that the boots are a normal part of a wardrobe for an active soldier, and he says that wearing the boots would be totally permitted for the soldier. ■

## Gemara GEM

### The Tragedy of the Studded Sandal

סנדל המסומר מאי טעמא? אמר שמואל: שלפי הגזירה הו', והיו נחבאין במערה, ואמרו: הנכנס - יכנס, והיוצא - אל יצא. נהפך סנדלו של אחד מהן, כסבורין הם: אחד מהן יצא, וראוהו אויבים

It seems from Rashi's commentary that the deaths of the people in the cave were a result of their being trampled by the nails in the souls of the shoes. However, there are other approaches to explain what happened during that tragic event.

This cleated shoe was the type worn by the Roman soldiers as part of their uniform. The people in the cave were already living

(Continued on page 2)

# HALACHAH Highlight

## May one wear collar stays on Shabbos where there is no Eruv?

ולא בשריון, ולא בקסדה, ולא במגפיים. ואם יצא - אינו חייב חטאת.

One may not go out on Shabbos to a public domain wearing a coat of mail or a casque (= helmet) or greaves (= armor to protect the shins). If one did go out wearing these items, he is not liable a Chatas.

Rav Moshe Feinstein<sup>1</sup> was asked whether it is permitted on Shabbos to insert collar stays and go out wearing them into a public domain. The collar stays are thin strips of metal or plastic inserted into specially created sleeves in the underside of the collar of shirts in order to maintain the collar's appearance. From the responsum, it appears that the questioner thought that wearing the collar stays out into a public domain should be forbidden; however, Rav Feinstein responded that in his opinion it was clear that wearing collar stays are permitted. He explains that the collar stays serve a function in the wearing of the shirt. He cites as an example the **בירית** (garter) mentioned in a subsequent Mishnah<sup>2</sup>. The Gemara<sup>3</sup> explains that this garter was a band that was worn around a woman's calf. Rashi<sup>4</sup> understands that the purpose of this band was to hold up the woman's stockings. Thus, an item that serves a function for a garment may also be worn out on Shabbos. Possibly one would endeavor to distinguish between these two cases that only where the functional accessory serves to prevent embarrassment or the like, such as in the case of the band, where the band serves to prevent the stockings from falling and חייב revealing her lower leg, would functionality alone serve to permit the article, while where the function of the article is solely for cosmetic purposes, such as collar stays, whose use is to maintain collar rigidity, possibly it would be forbidden to wear the article. Rav Feinstein derives from Tosafos<sup>5</sup> that the calf band may be worn even if the stockings would not fall if the band was removed. He posits that if so, according to Tosafos, the purpose of the band would be to prevent the stockings from wrinkling, and yet the band is permitted because that is the mode of being worn **לבישה** (דרך). If so, collar stays worn in order to maintain the stiffness of the collar are needed for the wearing the shirt, and as such are categorized as a garment and thus are permitted to be worn.

The questioner opined that an ornament (**תכשיט**) cannot be permitted if it itself is not worn. Rav Feinstein rejected this position, and opined that an ornament is permitted even if it itself lacks weara-

(Insight...continued from page 1)

If the nails were bent to resemble tongs, the sandals may be worn on Shabbos. Similarly, if the entire sole of the sandal was covered with nails the prohibition does not apply. This last ruling is supported by a Baraisa.

The Gemara clarifies a number of issues that arise from the above cited Baraisa. ■

bility. Amongst the proofs is our passage. Rashi<sup>6</sup> explains that these items of armor are worn for war. Rav Feinstein explains that it is clear that the law accords with Chachamim's view<sup>7</sup> that these items are not ornaments, and as such cannot incur a Scripture-level transgression, being that they are worn and not carried. In fact, Rebbe Eliezer<sup>8</sup> opines that items of war such as swords etc. are ornaments and as such may be carried although they are not worn, and the Chachamim who argue with Rebbe Eliezer do so **only** because in their opinion weapons are not ornaments, and not because they are not worn. Thus, it is evident that an ornament would be permitted even if it is not itself worn.

The concern with ornaments, continues Rav Feinstein, is that women may remove them to display them to their friends. Given that collar stays are not attractive items, and the concern for them being removed to be displayed does not exist, they may be worn out into a public domain on Shabbos. Rav Feinstein also adds that collar stays may be inserted into the collar on Shabbos itself.

It should be noted that this topic is addressed as well by Shmiras Shabbos K'Hilchaso. He presents a general rule that any item intended to serve a garment is negated to that garment<sup>10</sup> and may be worn even where there is no Eruv. Rav Neuwirth includes the use of collar stays amongst his illustrations of the application of this concept. [Shoulder pads would seem to be another example for the application of this concept<sup>11</sup>.] ■

1. שו"ת אגרות משה (ח"א מחא"י ס' קז)
2. לקמן דף סג ע"א
3. לקמן דף סג ע"ב
4. רש"י שם (ד"ה תחת אצעדה)
5. תוס' שם (ד"ה בירית)
6. רש"י כאן (דף ס' ע"א בסוף המשנה ד"ה אינו חייב)
7. ע"י משנה לקמן (דף סג ע"א)
8. במשנה שם
9. שמירת שבת כהלכתה (פ"ח סכ"ט, ע"ב ריד)
10. ע"י בזה במשנ"ב (ס"י שא סוס"ק פב וס"ק קמח)
11. ע"י בס' לט מלאכות (אנגלית) לרבי דוד ריביאט (עמ' 1364) וכן בס' הלכות שבת הש"יכים לבית (אנגלית) לרבי שמחה בונם כהן ח"א (פ"ח עמ' 112) ■

(Gem...Continued from page 1)

with great fear and anxiety. According to Shmuel, one time they noticed footprints in the mud leading out of the cave. The impression was clearly that of a **סנדל מסומר**. The people were afraid that this indicated that they had been detected by a Roman soldier who had gone to get reinforcements. This caused the people in the cave to panic, and many people were killed in the crush to leave.

According to Rabbi Ila'ei ben Elazar, the loud banging noise of the sandals which some of the people wore is what caused the people

to panic, as the people who were hiding mistakenly thought that they noise was the arrival of an enemy brigade.

According to an opinion in the Yerushalmi, the entrance to the cave was near the bottom of an incline. The people inside the cave would look down and they were able to see only the bottom of the entrance. When they saw someone enter wearing a studded sandal, and they could not yet see the person himself, the people were temporarily gripped with fear. This was enough to cause the pregnant women among them to miscarry.

In any case, the people were not killed by the shoes, but rather due to the pandemonium which ensued which was caused by this shoe.

Sfas Emes points out that it could be that all three of these versions are correct, and they each refer to a different incident that occurred within a short interval of time. When the sages noted that all three tragedies involved this studded sandal, they issued their decree against wearing this type of sandal on Shabbos, as the Gemara explains. ■

