

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Converts serving as judges (cont.)

Rava presents the parameters of a convert serving as a judge.

2) The chalitza shoe

Rabbah and R' Yosef dispute the use of a minal and a sandal for chalitza.

The practical difference between their opinions is whether a minal may be used l'chatchila.

One of the positions is unsuccessfully challenged.

It is suggested that Tannaim dispute the same issue as Rabbah and R' Yosef.

The rationale of the opinion that does not allow a minal l'chatchila is explained.

Rav gives further descriptions of the chalitza shoe.

3) Three chalitza rulings from R' Yehudah in the name of Rav

R' Yehudah in the name of Rav teaches that chalitza is accomplished when the majority of the yavam's heel is removed from the sandal.

This ruling is unsuccessfully challenged.

The Baraisa that was cited supports a ruling of R' Yannai.

A number of unanswered inquiries of R' Yannai are presented.

R' Nechemyah asked Rabbah about the effectiveness of chalitza performed on a yavam wearing more than one shoe. The inquiry is left unresolved.

R' Yehudah in the name of Rav rules that a yevama who grew up in the home with her deceased husband's brothers may do yibum without concern that she may have done chalitza.

This ruling is adjusted in response to a challenge.

A second version of this teaching is presented.

R' Yehudah in the name of Rav rules that a sandal sewn with linen cannot be used for chalitza.

The source of this ruling is unsuccessfully challenged.

The issue of using a shoe made exclusively from hair is discussed.

4) The meaning of the word חלץ

The Gemara demonstrates that the term חלץ refers to removing the shoe rather than putting on the shoe.

A discussion between Rabban Gamliel and a heretic that revolves around the term חלץ is recorded.

5) Is a sock a shoe?

The Gemara infers from our Mishnah and another Mishnah that a sock is not the same as a shoe.

This assertion is challenged.

Abaye suggests a resolution that is refuted by Rava.

Rava offers an alternative resolution that is accepted and the Gemara declares that this resolution is logical.

A Baraisa is cited that supports this answer. ■

Distinctive INSIGHT

The power of a prophet

אם יבא אליהו ויאמר אין חולצין בנעל אין שומעין לו שכבר נהוג העם בנעל

Rambam writes (Introduction to Mishnah) that a prophet cannot tell us that he received a prophecy to detract or add to the mitzvos of the Torah. The authority to legislate Torah is not in Heaven. The verse instructs us (Devarim 17:9) to seek judgment by approaching the kohanim and levyim, who are the judges, but not that we should seek out the advice and ruling of a prophet. Therefore, if a prophet insists that he has been told to add or subtract from the mitzvos, this is a false prophet, and he is to be put to death. This is why our Gemara tells us that even Eliyahu cannot come and tell us that in the heavens it has been determined that chalitza must be done with a shoe, we would not be allowed to listen to him and act contrary to the traditional understanding that our sages have passed on to us.

Sdei Chemed cites the אהלי יצחק who explains that we would only reject the words of a prophet if he acknowledges that the halacha as we know it is correct, but that he was told that things will henceforth change to include either more or fewer details to the mitzvah. If, however, the prophet comes and informs us that we misunderstood the halacha, and that our understanding must be changed to be more accurate, in this case we would listen to the prophet, and we would change our observance.

שו"ת דברי יוסף explains that our Gemara seems to suggest the following distinction. If our custom is mistaken, but it was due to an error in logic, then we would maintain our custom, even against the technical halacha. As our Gemara states, "we will not listen to him, because we have already established our custom." If, however, the prophet informs us based upon his divinely directed vision that we are acting contrary to the Torah, we are obliged to listen to him. ■

REVIEW and Remember

1. What is the difference between a מנעל and a סנדל?
.....
2. Who is required to remove the shoe from the yavam's foot?
.....
3. What material must be used for a chalitza shoe?
.....
4. When is a sock a "shoe" and not a "sock"?
.....

HALACHAH Highlight

Wearing non-leather shoes on Yom Kippur

אבל מטייל הוא באנפילין בתוך ביתו

But he may walk around in his socks in his house

Although there was a practice amongst some Amoraim to refrain from wearing non-leather shoes on Yom Kippur, the conclusion of our Gemara and the Gemara Yoma¹ seems to be that halacha follows the majority opinion that allows wearing non-leather shoes on Yom Kippur. Rabbeinu Asher ben Yechiel², the Rosh, cites an opinion that limits this ruling to wearing non-leather shoes in one's home but prohibits wearing non-leather shoes in public. The basis for the position is derived from our Gemara that mentions wearing socks in one's home which indicates that it is only acceptable on Yom Kippur to wear socks in one's home but not outside of one's home. The rationale for this distinction, writes Korban Nesanel³, is that since non-leather shoes often appear like leather shoes people may mistakenly think that someone is violating the prohibition against wearing leather shoes. To avoid this suspicion, Chazal did not allow wearing non-leather shoes in public. Rosh, however, disagrees with this conclusion and

cites a Yerushalmi that indicates that it is allowed to wear nonleather shoes in public. Shulchan Aruch⁴ rules in accordance with the lenient opinion and allows wearing non-leather shoes even in a public domain.

Mishnah Berurah⁵ cites authorities who maintain that one should be strict, even concerning non-leather shoes, to wear shoes that do not provide much support or protection. The reason for this stringency is that wearing comfortable shoes, even if they are not made from leather, will detract from the suffering (עינוי) one is supposed to experience during the day. Rav Moshe Sofer⁶, the Chasam Sofer, also cites these authorities and favors their conclusion. Consequently, he writes that when walking in the street one should choose shoes that allow the person to feel the ground as he walks. Mishnah Berurah's conclusion is that although one should not protest against those who wear comfortable non-leather shoes on Yom Kippur one should strive to be strict and refrain from wearing shoes when walking outside on Yom Kippur. ■

1. גמ' יומא עח
2. רא"ש ליומא פ"ח סי' ז'
3. קרבן נתנאל שם אות ז'
4. שו"ע או"ח סי' תרי"ד סע' ב'
5. מ"ב שם סק"ה
6. הגהותיו לשו"ע הנ"ל ■

STORIES Off the Daf

Dreaming of wealth

יחלץ עני בעניו, בשכר עניו יחלצו מדינה של גיהנם

Once, a destitute man came to the Chofetz Chaim, zt"l, for a brochah. He started describing the terrible poverty in his home. "My floors are made of dirt, the house is often freezing, and I can hardly put bread on the table. The Gemara in Yevamos 92b, brings the verse from Iyov 36: 'A poor man will have his afflictions removed,' and explains that those who suffer destitution in this world have the tribulations of Gehinnom removed from them in the next world.

The poor man continued, "So we

see from this Gemara how difficult acute poverty is, since one who suffers it suffers their fair share of Gehinnom in this world! Isn't it fitting for me to request a blessing for wealth?"

The Chofetz Chaim, however, disagreed. "Quite the contrary! We see from the Gemara how worthwhile poverty is, since through the difficulties of acute poverty one is purified and need not see Gehinnom! Surely being exceedingly poor and bearing your suffering in this world is worthwhile since it means that you will never see Gehinnom!"

It was well known that the Chofetz Chaim practiced what he preached. For virtually his entire life he suffered from dire poverty and had no wish to be wealthy. He too had a dirt floor, his house was also often freezing, and

like others suffering from want he also had trouble putting food on the table.

One time, the Chofetz Chaim didn't eat, and he explained to his students who asked that he was fasting a taanis chalom, to mitigate an evil dream. When asked what he had dreamed, the Chofetz Chaim answered, "I dreamed that I became wealthy. So either way, I must fast. If this is a message from above that wealth has been decreed upon me, I certainly must fast to avert such an evil decree. And if not, then the dream was the result of some random thoughts flitting through my head during the day. And if I am thinking anything that makes me wish to be wealthy, it is even more important that I fast!" ■

