



Today's Daf In Review is being sent I'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

### Shabbos Daf Kuf Yud Beis

#### MIFTACH CHALUKAH

- **Q:** This is obviously mutar since it is opened daily!? **A:** There are 2 straps, so we may think that one of them remains permanently tied and should therefore be assur. The chiddush is that it is mutar because we assume that both straps will be opened daily.

#### V'CHUTEI S'VACHA

- **Q:** This is obviously mutar since it is untied after every use?! **A:** The chiddush is where a woman wears a hat which is loose on her, we may say that she leaves it tied and removes it without untying it. The chiddush is that a woman would not do that for fear that she may pull out some hair. Therefore, she will always untie it before removing it.

#### U'RITZUOS MINAL V'SANDEL

- **Q:** Regarding one who unties shoes and sandals, one Braisa says he is chayuv, one says he is patur but it is assur, and one says it is totally mutar?
  - **A:** With regard to shoes, the Braisa that says he is chayuv is talking about the knot made by the shoemaker to keep the laces from falling out, which is a permanent knot. The Braisa that says he is patur but it is assur is referring to knots made by the Rabanan in their shoes, which they sometimes leave tied for long periods of time (they slip their feet in and out of their tied laces). The Braisa that says it is mutar is referring to people who untie their laces every day.
  - **A:** With regard to sandals, the Braisa that says he is chayuv refers to the knots made by the shoemakers who tie the straps of the sandal to the sandal, meant to stay that way permanently. The Braisa that says he is patur but it is assur refers to knots made by the wearer of the sandals to hold the straps. Those knots stay in for a while, but are not quite permanent. The Braisa that says it is mutar refers to sandals that are shared by 2 people, so the knots are always untied and retied to fit whoever is wearing it.
    - **R' Yehuda** would share his sandals with his child. When **Abaye** was told this, he said it would be mutar to untie those knots.
- **R' Yirmiya** was walking behind **R' Avahu** in a karmelis and his sandal strap broke. He asked **R' Avahu** what to do with the broken sandal. He responded that he should find a soft reed that is fit for animal feed (and therefore not muktzeh) and tie the sandal to his foot with that so that he can bring it into the reshus hayachid.
  - **Abaye's** sandal strap broke (in a courtyard) and he was told by **R' Yosef** to leave the sandal where it was (it was muktzeh since it served no purpose). [The sandals of those times had 2 straps which were each fastened to a holder – one on the inside of the foot and one on the outside. If these holders broke, it would be very noticeable if it was repaired and therefore one would not wear a sandal whose holder on the outside of the foot had broken.]
    - **Abaye's** case was different than **R' Avahu's** case because **Abaye's** case took place in a guarded area, and he was not at risk of losing the sandal, whereas **R' Avahu** was at risk.
    - **Abaye** asked **R' Yosef**, why is it muktzeh? If I want, I can fix the sandal and wear it on the other foot, thereby making the repair to the holder on the inside of the foot. Since it is wearable, it should not be muktzeh?! **A:** **R' Yosef** said, since we find that **R' Yochanan** explained the view of **R' Yehudah** that when the outer holder breaks it is no longer considered wearable, it must be that we pasken like that and therefore it is muktzeh.
      - A Braisa says, if one strap or holder breaks off of a sandal, it retains its din of tumah. **R' Yehuda** said, if the inner strap holder breaks off it

retains its din of tumah, if the outer strap holder breaks off, it loses its din of tuma. **R' Yochanan** said, the same way they argue with regard to tumah, they would also argue with regard to Shabbos (whether it becomes muktzeh when the outer strap holder breaks off), but they do not argue with regard to "chalitza" done on a sandal with a broken outer strap holder.

- **Q:** If **R' Yochanan** says they don't argue by chalitza, who is it that says that chalitza is treated differently than tumah and Shabbos? **A:** The **Rabanan** say that a sandal missing a strap holder on the outside is a keili and therefore retains its din of tumah. That would mean that on Shabbos this sandal is not muktzeh because it is a keili. They would not say that for chalitza it is no longer considered to be a keili, because the halacha is that if the woman removes the left sandal from the right foot, it is a good chalitza, so this sandal should be no different! **R' Yochanan** must have said that it is **R' Yehuda** who holds chalitza is different than tumah and Shabbos. With regard to tumah, **R' Yehuda** said it is no longer considered to be a keili. That would mean, with regard to Shabbos, he would say that it is muktzeh because it is no longer a keili. If **R' Yochanan** said his statement about **R' Yehuda**, that would mean that **R' Yehuda** says, with regard to chalitza the sandal with the broken strap holder is considered to be a keili, since he can wear it on the other foot and the halacha is that if the woman takes the left sandal off the right foot, it is a good chalitza.
  - **Q:** That can't be right, because **R' Yehuda** would only apply that halacha for a sandal that is considered to be a keili. However, in this case, it is not considered to be a keili for tumah or for Shabbos, so why would it become a keili now?! **A:** **R' Yochanan** did not say that **R' Yehuda** would agree with the **Rabanan**. He said that with regard to chalitza, **R' Yehuda** would hold the same way he holds for tumah and Shabbos. Just like it is not considered to be a keili for those halachos, so too for chalitza it is not considered to be a keili. The chiddush is that we don't say that since it can be worn on the other foot it should be good for chalitza. This is where we find that **R' Yochanan** explained the view of **R' Yehuda**, and **R' Yosef** told **Abaye**, it seems that we therefore pasken like **R' Yehuda**.
- **Q:** How can we say that **R' Yochanan** paskens like **R' Yehuda**? **R' Yochanan** always paskens like an anonymous Mishna and there is an anonymous Mishna that says that if one strap of a sandal breaks off it retains its status of tumah. The Mishna doesn't differentiate as to which strap broke, so it must mean either strap. This is not like **R' Yehuda**! **A:** The Mishna is referring to where the inner strap broke. However, if the outer strap broke, it would lose its tumah status, just like **R' Yehuda** said.
- **Q:** The Mishna says, if the second strap breaks even after the first was repaired, it loses its status of tumah. If the Mishna agrees with **R' Yehuda**, the Mishna should say, if the outside strap broke it loses its status of tumah, why does it need to come onto a case with 2 straps having broken?! **A:** **R' Yitzchok ben Yosef** says, the Mishna is referring to a sandal with 4 straps (2 on each side) and when it says that it loses its status of tumah when 2 straps break, it is referring to the 2 straps on the outer side. The Mishna therefore can agree with **R' Yehuda**, and **R' Yochanan** can hold like the Mishna and **R' Yehuda**.
- **Q:** We find elsewhere that **R' Yochanan** clearly holds NOT like **R' Yehudah**?! **A:** There are 2 Amoraim who argue about what **R' Yochanan** said.

- A Mishna says, a wooden keili loses its status as a keili when it gets a hole the size of a pomegranate.
  - **Q: Chizkiya** asked, what if it gets a hole the size of an olive and the hole is patched, and it gets another hole of that size and then it is patched, and this happens enough times that if all the holes were combined it would be the size of a pomegranate? **A: R' Yochanan** said, we learned the answer in a Mishna (quoted above) that says if a sandal strap breaks and is fixed and then the other strap breaks, it loses its status of tumah. We explained there, that although it was repaired, once you have both straps being repaired, it is no longer the same keili it once was and it loses its tumah status. Same should be here, that enough holes, although repaired, should have it lose its din of a keili.
    - **Chizkiya** then said about **R' Yochanan**, "He is not human" (he is a malach). Others say he said, "A person like this is a great man."
    - **R' Zeira in the name of Rava bar Zimona** said, if the Chachomim of the earlier generations were malachim, we are considered to be human. If they are considered to be human, we are considered to be donkeys, and not the special donkeys of **R' Chanina ben Dosa** and **R' Pichas ben Yair** (which were at a high level), but rather like ordinary donkeys.

#### V'NODOS YAYIN V'SHEMEN

- The Mishna is referring to a jug that has 2 pieces tied down. The chiddush is, we may think that one piece stays permanently tied and is therefore assur to untie on Shabbos. The Mishna teaches that it is not assur since they both typically get untied.

#### KIDEIRAH SHEL BASAR

- The Mishna is referring to a pot with a spout. We would think that since there is a spout the cover will never be removed and is therefore tied permanently. The chiddush is that the cover is often removed even if it has a spout and it therefore is not considered to be permanent.

#### R' ELIEZER BEN YAAKOV OMER KOSHRIN...

- The Mishna is referring to where 2 ropes are strung across. We may have said that one will stay in place permanently and therefore should be assur to untie on Shabbos. The chiddush is that it is mutar because both ropes are typically untied.
  - **R' Yosef in the name of R' Yehudah in the name of Shmuel** says that we pasken like **R' Eliezer ben Yaakov**. **Abaye** asked, that seems to suggest that some argue on him, but we don't find anyone who does!? **R' Yosef** responded, since no one argues, I am surely correct that we pasken like him, so what's wrong with me saying that? **Abaye** said, it is not proper to teach in this way, to suggest that there is a machlokes when in fact there is none.