

1 At the end of the previous daf the Gemara asked the following question.

The Mishnah at the beginning of the Perek had listed among other תכשיטים which are only אסור מדרבנן out of concern that she may remove it to show off to her friends - ולא בטבעת שאין עליה חותם - a woman may not go out with a ring that does not have a signet on it - which implies היא יש חותם חייבת - if it does have a signet, she would be חייבת - because a ring that has a signet is not viewed as a תכשיט, an ornament, but as a משוי, a burden. This is actually clearly stated in a Mishnah later on ע"א דף ס"ב ע"א.

1

ולא בטבעת שאין עליה חותם

תכשיט

אסור מדרבנן

She may remove it to show friends

הא יש עליה חותם חייבת

משאוי

?

2 However, the Gemara asked from a Mishnah in מסכת כלים which lists

both types of rings - וטבעת בין שיש עליה חותם בין שאין עליה חותם - being susceptible to טומאה regarding being תכשיט נשים - being susceptible to טומאה, and presumably would also be considered a תכשיט regarding שבת.

The Gemara offers three answers to this question, the first of which was learned on the previous daf that the two משניות reflect differing opinions based on a מחלוקת between רבי נחמיה who holds the status of the ring is determined by the signet and not the ring, and the חכמים who hold that a ring's status is based on the ring and not the signet.

Our shiur began with the second answer.

רבה אמר לצדדים קתני - Rava answers that when the משנה in כלים stated

both types of rings are considered a תכשיט, it is referring to two separate cases. A signet ring is a תכשיט of a man - who often uses the signet for official business. A non-signet ring is a תכשיט of a woman - but a signet ring is indeed not a תכשיט for a woman.

2

ומטבעת: בין שאין עליה חותם

בין שיש עליה חותם

מקבל טומאה

רבה אמר לצדדים קתני

וטבעת: אין עליה חותם

יש עליה חותם

תכשיט דאשה

תכשיט דאיש

3 The third תירוץ is:  
 !?רב נחמן בר יצחק אמר טומאה אשבת קרמית -  
 Rav Nachman Bar Yitzchak rejects the premise of the question, for the criteria for טומאה are different than the criteria for שבת.  
 The תכשיט in כלים agrees that only a non-signet ring is a תכשיט for women, and that's the reason it's טומאה. A signet ring is טומאה for another reason -  
 כלי מעשה אמר רחמנא וכלי הוא - It's a vessel that was made for use.  
 As Rashi explains - when the כלים in משנה equated the two types of rings, it did not mean to say that they are both תכשיטים. It meant to say that they are both טומאה, albeit for different reasons.  
 However, regarding Shabbos, משום משוי אמר רחמנא - The criteria for the איסור of carrying is whether the item is a burden. Therefore, אין עליה חותם - If it has no signet it's a תכשיט. יש עליה חותם משוי - If it has a signet it's a burden.

3 רב נחמן בר יצחק אמר טומאה אשבת קרמית?  
 A signet ring is טומאה for another reason  
 כלי מעשה אמר רחמנא וכלי הוא  
 However, regarding Shabbos משום משוי אמר רחמנא  
  
 אין עליה חותם יש עליה חותם  
 תכשיט משוי

4 The final Halacha in the Mishnah was מדרבנן - ולא במחט שאינה נקובה - that a woman may not walk outside with a needle that does not have an eye, implying that the needle has some use, for if it had no practical use, it would be a משוי and she would be חייב to bring a קרבן for carrying it.  
 The גמרא explains פדחתה כנגד מניחתה בשבת - on weekdays she would part her hair with it and on שבת she would decorate her hat with it.

4 ולא במחט שאינה נקובה  
 מדרבנן  
 Implying that it has some use  
  
 שבת מניחתה כנגד פדחתה  
 בחול חולקת בה שיערה

5 The next משנה in middle of ס דף 5 lists items that are אסור בסנדל for a man to walk outside with on שבת. The first item on the list is לא יצא האיש בסנדל המסומר - a sandal with nails sticking out of it.

The Gemara explains that this איסור is based on an episode that occurred during times of decrees against the Jews. There are three versions of the episode, but all of them end with a large gathering of Jews growing scared, panicking and trampling each other with their nail filled sandals in their haste to escape. Sadly, והרגו זה את זה יותר ממה שהרגו בהן אויבים, they ended up killing more of each other than the enemy had killed.

The Gemara explains that since this gathering occurred on שבת the prohibition to wear these shoes was made only for שבת and יום טוב which is also a day of gathering when there is איסור מלאכה.

The Gemara adds that even if you hold like ר' חנינא בן עקיבא that איסורים are only applied in exactly the same cases as the basis for the גזירה, you would still extend the איסור of these shoes to יום טוב since יום טוב ושבית כי הדדי נינהו - the rules of שבת and יום טוב are the same with the exception of נפש, food preparation, which may be done on יום טוב but not on שבת.

The Gemara then makes several exceptions to the איסור of wearing the מסומר.

First, if the nails are only there לנוי, for decorative purposes, and not לחזק, to strengthen the shoe, it is permissible.

Second, תפרו מבפנים - if a shoe was sewn onto the inside of the sandal it is מותר because לא גזרו ביה גזרו ביה, the decree was only made regarding a sandal, but this is now considered a shoe.

5

## לא יצא האיש בסנדל המסומר

Based on an episode that occurred during times of decrees against the Jews



והרגו זה את זה יותר ממה שהרגו בהן אויבים

Since this gathering occurred on שבת the prohibition to wear these shoes WAS MADE ONLY FOR

יום טוב

שבת

Even if you hold like ר' חנינא בן עקיבא איסורים דרבנן Are only applied in the same cases as the גזירה



יום טוב ושבית כי הדדי נינהו ❌

לנוי ✓  
And not לחזק

תפרו מבפנים ✓  
בסנדל לא גזרו ביה גזרו ביה

עשאו כמין כלבוס ✓  
Since these are different...

אמר רב ששת ✓

חיפהו כולו במסמרות כדי שלא תהא קרקע אוכלתו

# מותר

6 Third, עשאו כמין כלבוס, if he made the nails in a semi-circular shape it is permissible since these are sufficiently different from the original type of sandal.

Fourth, אמר רב ששת חיפהו כולו במסמרות כדי שלא תהא קרקע אוכלתו, - if the entire sole was covered with nails to protect the sole from rotting, it is permissible because it is sufficiently different from the sandals worn in the original story.

Regarding the first exception of לנוי - that if the nails are there for decorative purposes - and not לחזק, to strengthen the shoe - it is permissible, the Gemara has a lengthy discussion of various opinions as to the amount of nails allowed. The principle of them all is that a smaller amount of nails indicates that it's for decorative purposes, while a larger amount of nails is used to strengthen the upper part to the sole of the sandal.

הייא later comments, that if not for fear that he would be called שרי איסורי, a Babylonian who is overly permissive, he would have allowed a sandal that has as many as 22 or 24 nails in it.

7 The Gemara cites ברייתא which records a מחלוקת whether these sandals may be used for other functions on שבת.

תנא - אבל מטלטלין אותו לכסות בו את הכלי ולסמוך בו כרעי המטה - holds that you can move them, like any שמלאכתו כלי, to cover a utensil or support the legs of a bed. ורבי - לאיסור, R' Eliezer b'Rabi Shimon holds it is not permissible to move them because we are concerned that he will wear them.

We pasken like the תנא קמא, because יחיד ורבים הלכה כרבים, we always pasken like the majority opinion.

6

**לנוי**

|                       |                      |
|-----------------------|----------------------|
| <b>SMALLER AMOUNT</b> | <b>LARGER AMOUNT</b> |
| Decorative purposes   | To strengthen        |

**רבי הייא**

If not for fear that he would be called **בבלאי שרי איסורי** He would have allowed a sandal that has 22 or 24 nails in it

7

אבל מטלטלין אותו לכסות בו את הכלי ולסמוך בו כרעי המטה

**רבי אלעזר ברבי שמעון**

**אוסר**

יחיד ורבים הלכה כרבים