

**שבת קודש פרשת וישב | מסכת כתובות דף ס"ה**

**INSIGHTS FROM OUR CHABUROS**

**Buying shoes at the proper time**

אמר ליה רב פפא לאביי האי תנא שליח ערטיילאי ורמי מסאני

The Mishnah (64b) taught that a husband must furnish his wife with “shoes from festival to festival, and clothes worth fifty zuz from year to year.” Rav Pappa asks Abaye how it could be that the halacha requires that the woman be provided with new shoes each festival (three times a year) while she can purchase new clothes only once a year. As Rashi explains, it would seem more important for her to have new clothes more often than to have new shoes.

Abaye answers that, in fact, we furnish her with shoes once a year—only as often as we do clothing, which is once a year. However, the Mishnah was written referring to a couple living in a mountainous area, where people’s shoes wear out more often. And, incidentally, Abaye notes that the Tanna is also teaching us an additional lesson, and that is that it is advisable for a man to buy new shoes for his wife every festival in order for her to be happy.

The Gemara seems to suggest that Abaye notes this additional lesson of the Mishnah is only understood once we establish that the Mishnah is speaking about a case where a woman lives in the mountains. In other words, originally, we would have understood that the only reason a man must buy shoes for his wife at the time of the festival is in order to help her rejoice during the holiday. This is why we asked that it would be reasonable to buy her clothes as well. If shoes are not bought due to their being worn out, but only due to the happiness factor, then clothes certainly would have the effect of making the wife happy. Abaye therefore explains that shoes are bought in order to serve a need, as the shoes get worn out about three times a year in a rugged terrain. If they already have to be bought regularly, then the Mishnah teaches that a husband might as well buy them at intervals to coincide with the festivals, and in this way he will also accomplish the virtuous goal of causing his wife to be happy at the time of the festivals. Therefore, according to the conclusion of the Gemara, purchases of shoes and clothing are done primarily in order to replace items that are getting worn out. In a mountainous area, shoes are bought three times a year, and clothes must be bought once a year. These purchases should be made in a timely manner, whereby the husband can maximize joy for his wife at the festivals while doing so.

**POINT TO PONDER**

The Gemara asks **גמרא** מאי אוכלת and offers 2 possibilities. Why did the **גמרא** question it in the first place? What was bothering the **גמרא** that it wasn't satisfied with the obvious **פשט** which means eating?

**Response to last week's Point to Ponder:**

The **גמרא** says that we don't write an **אגרת מרד** for a **ישומרת** יבם, because we tell her that she is not obligated in **ורבו**. If this is the case, why would we write a **אגרת מרד** for a **נשואה**? She too is not obligated to have children.

Although a married lady is not obligated in **ורבו**, she can claim that she is entitled to **עונה** based on the fact that it's one of the obligations of a husband to his wife. This is different than a **ארוסה** or **ישומרת** יבם where such an obligation doesn't exist. (See **שיטה מקובצת** quoted in **ריטב"א**).

**STORIES OF THE DAF**

**The Insurance Policy**

“שבסתר לה שני חלקים ולא אחד...”

A certain man once rented an apartment for a reasonable price. He had a somewhat nervous temperament and wished to take out a policy for fire damage. In the event of fire, at least his damaged property would be repaired.

Although the owner of the apartment agreed to pay the price of the policy, he somehow never gave a cent. Every time the tenant requested reimbursement, the landlord would claim that he couldn't pay at that moment. When the tenant suggested that the expense should be deducted from the rent, the owner objected once again and promised to pay “in the near future.”

After many months passed without the owner paying, there was a fire. The owner was delighted that the tenant had paid the cost of the policy the entire period. He thanked him from the bottom of his heart and guaranteed to pay the money owed for the policy to the tenant as soon as the money from the insurance company came through.

“I have been meaning to discuss this issue with you. There is no need for you to pay for the policy. However, since I paid it and had it not been for my initiative and payment, you would be getting no insurance disbursement payment, I believe that your halachic obligation is to give whatever you get out of the insurance company to me!” Not surprisingly, the owner argued, “You paid for me! I agreed to pay and would have paid you!”

They went to Rav Yosef Shaul Natanson, zt”l, for a psak. “Each of you has a strong claim...so the two of you need to come to an understanding since the halachah here is not clear. I think that the building owner should receive two thirds and the tenant one third. In Kesuvos 65b we find that when someone's wife is embarrassed and receives **בושת** for an embarrassment perpetrated in private, two thirds of it goes to the wife and only one third to the husband. I think that is a fair arrangement in your case as well.”

For putting off paying for the insurance, the owner had to pay a third of the damage from his own pocket!

## HALACHA HIGHLIGHT

Is one required to have Shabbos shoes?

תנא במקום הרים קאי דלא סגיג בלא תלתא זוגי מסאני

*The Tanna refers to a mountainous place where it is not sufficient to have less than three pairs of shoes*

**R**av Yosef Chaim of Baghdad<sup>1</sup>, the Ben Ish Chai, was asked whether a person should have shoes specifically for Shabbos the same way one is required to have special Shabbos clothing<sup>2</sup>. He responded that it seems logical that shoes are not categorized as clothing that would necessitate having special Shabbos shoes. One proof to this assertion is that in Birchos Hashachar there is one beracha that is recited for clothing— ערומים מלביש and another beracha that is recited for shoes— לי כל צרכי שעשה. The necessity for separate berachos indicates that shoes are not part of one's clothing. An additional proof can be found in the Yerushalmi<sup>3</sup>. The Gemara is discussing why it is prohibited to wear spiked sandals on Shabbos, and after presenting three reasons for the restriction the Gemara asks why the restriction does not include wearing spiked sandals during the week. The Gemara answers that it is uncommon for a person to have separate shoes for the weekday and for Shabbos and consequently, the spiked sandals that are prohibited on Shabbos are prohibited during the week as well.

The second proof is consistent with the Korban Edah<sup>4</sup> commentary to the Yerushalmi but Pnei Moshe<sup>4</sup> understands the Gemara differently which leads to a different outcome. According to Pnei Moshe<sup>5</sup> the Gemara's response to the question of why the restriction applies only to Shabbos is that people wear different shoes on Shabbos than they do during the week. Therefore, since the incident that triggered the decree occurred on Shabbos the restriction is limited to Shabbos. This seemingly indicates that the question of whether a person needs special Shabbos shoes is a dispute that revolves around the correct understanding of the Yerushalmi. Rav Betzalel Ze'ev Shafran<sup>5</sup> cites our Gemara as proof that one is not obligated to wear Shabbos shoes. The Gemara explains that the necessity for a husband to provide three pairs of shoes applies in mountainous areas where shoes wear out quickly. The Mishnah is thus teaching that in order to add simchah to Yom Tov a husband should give his wife the shoes before Yom Tov. By omitting any mention of a necessity to provide one's wife with Shabbos shoes it is evident that a husband is not obligated to provide a different pair of shoes for Shabbos.

1. שו"ת רב פעלים אורח ח"ד סי' י"ג.

2. ע' גמ' שבת קי"ג.

3. ירושלמי שבת פ"ו ה"ב.

4. ע' בפירושים לירושלמי הנ"ל.

5. שו"ת רבי בצלאל זאב שפראן ח"א סי' י"ב ומובא דבריו במתיבתא למס' כתובות ח"ד פניני הלכה סה: ד"ה אם צריך.

## MUSSAR FROM THE DAF

Being A Giver

מתני' המשרה את אשתו על ידי שלישי ... גמ' לארחי ופרחי

**T**he Gemorah discusses the requirements that a husband has towards his wife when he is away. These halachos seem to be rooted in detailing what are the essential needs of the wife. However, one can ask, why did the Gemorah earlier (64b) state that in a case when the husband is supporting his wife from afar ידי שלישי (food for a guest and a traveler) לארחי ופרחי (food for a guest and a traveler) he is obligated to give her לארחי ופרחי (food for a guest and a traveler) How can that be considered as part of her needs?

Let's look at Avraham Avinu to perhaps gain clarity in our sugya. Chazal tell us that even though Avraham was suffering the highest pain from his Milah, he was in greater pain that he couldn't host guests. Therefore, Hashem sent angels (dressed as men) to be Avraham's guests. Why was he in such pain?

Rav Dessler in his Kontras Hachessed (Michtav M'Eliyahu Chelek 1, page 32) explains that every human being has a Tzelem Elokim and that Tzelem Elokim in a person is represented by a person's ratzon to be a giver.

Therefore, When a person is not able to fulfill that ratzon, there will naturally be tension in a person. Avraham was not able to express his Tzelem Elokim.

This could answer why food for a guest is considered part of the meals that a husband is obligated to give his wife. His wife has spiritual needs, and he has to give her the opportunity to be a giver.

Being aware of this spiritual need of a person is very helpful. We need to find ways to express our Tzelem Elokim and therefore always look for ways to resemble Hashem and become a giver.

## PARSHA CONNECTION

**In this week's daf** the גמרא discusses whether it's appropriate for women to drink wine. Wine is also the subject of the המשקים dream which יוסף interpreted in פרשת וישב, when he told the שר that פרעה will return him to his previous role in the palace. In the פרשה the word כוס is mentioned four times and חז"ל in פרעה בידי מכאן קבעו חכמים: כוסות של לילי פסח וכוס פרעה write as follows: ד' כוסות של לילי פסח. How is the dream of the drink master related to פסח? The כלי יקר offers a fascinating explanation. When someone escapes a difficult situation, they should celebrate with wine, like it says ישוועה כוס ישועות אשא וכו' meaning I will toast to my ישועה. The שר המשקים who was held in captivity had reason to celebrate his salvation with wine. Furthermore, since he was held captive he has 4 reasons to celebrate as the גמרא בבא בתרא says that captivity is worst than all, because it includes all other potential tragedies. רעב, חרב, חרבו, etc, since a captive knows that his capturers may starve him, murder, him, etc.

"שבי קשה מכולם דכולהו איתנהו ביה" (דף ח ע"ב) This is why the story contains 4 cups, and we too on פסח celebrate the same salvation from captivity, which includes these 4 reasons for expressing thanks. יהי רצון that our learning will be a זכות for the current hostages and they will find salvation ASAP.

For more points to ponder by Rabbi Yechiel Grunhaus, or insights by Rabbi Yitzchok Gutterman, please visit our website, [dafaweek.org](http://dafaweek.org), or download the app

To share an insight from your Chabura please email [info@dafaweek.org](mailto:info@dafaweek.org)

The shavua matters is published by the Daf a week program under the rabbinical guidance of Harav Meir Stern shlita and Harav Shmuel Kamenetsky shlita

To sponsor a publication, please contact Rabbi Zacharia Adler, Executive Director at [info@dafaweek.org](mailto:info@dafaweek.org) or call 507-daf-week. Sponsorship for one week is \$100

Sections reprinted with permission from the Chicago Torah Center