Toa

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) The Miracle of the sun standing still

Tangential to the disagreement regarding the songs sung by the cows that returned the Ark from the Plishtim, the Gemara presents another disagreement between R' Elazar and R' Shmuel bar Nachmani about the meaning of a verse.

A second version of this dispute is presented.

A Baraisa teaches that the sun also stood still for Moshe Rabbeinu and Nakdimon ben Guryon.

Different sources are cited that demonstrate that the sun stood still for Moshe Rabbeinu.

The assertion that the sun stood still for anyone other than Yehoshua is unsuccessfully challenged.

2) Book of the upright

Sefer Shmuel II uses the term ספר הישר – the Book of the Upright – and the Gemara cites different explanations of that term.

Tangentially, the Gemara presents another instance in which the same three previously-cited Amoraim disagree.

3) Women in seclusion with idolaters

The Gemara searched for the circumstance in which it was necessary to forbid seclusion with a non-Jew.

It is suggested that seclusion should be forbidden out of concern for murder.

Two answers to this question are recorded.

The practical difference between these two explanations is identified.

A Baraisa is cited that supports one of these views.

4) Men in seclusion with non-Jews

A Baraisa elaborates on the enactment prohibiting a man from being in seclusion with a non-Jew.

REVIEW and Remember

- 1. How many hours of sunlight were there on the day that Yehoshua made the sun stand still?
- 2. What is the ספר הישר?
- 3. Why doesn't a woman have to worry that an idolater will kill her?
- 4. How should one respond if an idolater asks a person where he is going?

Distinctive INSIGHT

Identifying Sefer HaYashar

רבי שמואל בר נחמני אמר זה ספר שופטים וכו' והיכא רמיזא למען דעת דורות בני ישראל ללמדם מלחמה וגו'

Lt the beginning of today's daf, the Gemara cites a verse from Sefer Yehoshua (10:13) which is interpreted in varying ways by R' Yochanan, R' Elazar and R' Yehoshua bar Nachmeni. This verse was said by Yehoshua when he came to battle the five nations which had come to fight against the Givonim. Yehoshua came to defend the Givonim, and in this verse he appeals to Hashem to have the sun stand still and to prevent the moon from rising, so that he could succeed in pursuing his enemies. In this verse, Yehoshua refers to this miracle being mentioned in "Sefer HaYashar." There is also a reference to a "Sefer HaYashar" in the eulogy which Dovid offered for Shaul. There, Dovid said that it would be important for the members of Yehuda to learn to shoot with arrows, "as it is written in Sefer HaYashar." The Amoraim present differing opinions regarding the identification of this Sefer HaYash-

R' Shmuel bar Nachmani says that the Sefer HaYashar refers to Sefer Shoftim. It is called by this name due to the verse (Shoftim 17:6), "In those days there was no king in Israel, every man did that which was correct in his eyes (הישר בעיניו)." The reference for the tribe of Yehuda to learn to use weapons is the verse found in Shoftim (3:2), where it says, "in order that the generations of Bnei Yisroel become knowledgeable in battle."

Maharsha explains that for all of the years when Yehoshua led the people in battle it was not necessary for them to be trained in warfare, as Hashem fought the battles for them. This was a fulfillment of the promise (Yehoshua 1:5), "Just as I was with Moshe I will be with you." With the death of Yehoshua, the nation had to develop combat skills in order to continue with their military campaign. The nation called out (Shoftim 1:1), "Who will rise up first against the Canaanites to battle them?"

R' Yochanan identifies Sefer HaYashar as Sefer Bereshis, with the term Yashar referring to our patriarchs. R' Elazar identifies it as Sefer Devarim (Mishneh Torah), and the term Yashar referred to the verse which commands us to act in a manner which is ישר וטוב restraight and good.

In his commentary to Ein Yaakov, Ri"f explains the underlying basis for these opinions. R' Yochanan feels

HALACHAH Highlight

Seclusion with one's mother and another woman אבל ישראל אשתו משמרתו

But for a Jew, his wife watches him

L eshuvas Yosef Ometz¹ notes that the only leniency discussed in our Gemara is for a man to be in seclusion with a woman if his wife is also together with him. Other women, however, do not protect a man from violating the prohibition against seclusion. For example, although it is permitted for a man to be in seclusion with his mother he may not go into seclusion with another woman if his mother is present. This principle is evident from our Gemara since the Gemara only mentions the leniency of one's wife being with husband and wife do not violate the prohibition against sehim and doesn't mention this leniency by any other women. The rationale behind this ruling is that a wife will carefully watch her husband to make sure that he does not do something inappropriate. A mother or other female relative, on the other hand, will not be as cautious and may even cover up for inappropriate behavior of their son/relative.

to a debate between Rambam and Tur as explained by Beis Yosef³. Rambam and Tur disagree whether two women may be in seclusion with many men if amongst the group is a husband and wife. Tur maintains that it is prohibited since there is no one there to protect the woman who does not have a husband to protect her. Rambam holds that it is per(Insight...continued from page 1)

that the main power of Yehuda to wage battle was the blessing delivered to Yehuda by his father, Yaakov, at the end of Sefer Bereshis. R' Elazar feels that their merit is rooted in their own good deeds, highlighted in the verse in Sefer Devarim. R' Shmuel bar Nachmani holds that if their own deeds were worthy, Yehuda would have succeeded without having to wage war. The need to be trained to use weapons was due to the condition noted in Sefer Shoftim, "each man did what was correct in his own eyes."

mitted since the woman who does not have a husband present is afraid that the other woman would reveal any inappropriate behavior. In other words, Tur maintains that the clusion because they have a guard - שומר - to watch them but the others do violate the prohibition since there is nobody to guard them. Rambam, on the other hand, holds that once there are people who will not behave inappropriately they become a guard for the others and no one is in violation of being in seclusion. Therefore, according to Teshuvas Beis Shlomo² asserts that this matter is subject Rambam if a man is together with his mother she will serve as a guard and another woman may be with them in seclusion. Since Rambam's opinion is cited in Shulchan Aruch it may at least be relied upon in a pressing circumstance.

שויית יוסף אומץ סיי כייו.

שויית בית שלמה אהייע סיי מייח דייה שלישית שאל.

בית יוסף אהייע סיי כייב.

The Semblance of Falsehood

יירחיב...יי

n today's daf we find that when a Jew travels with an idolater, he should tell him that he is going to a more distant destination than his intention. Sometimes, for the sake of safety of one's person or property, it can be necessary to bend the truth.

Once, the Chofetz Chaim, zt"l, summoned a certain student who learned in his yeshiva in Radin. When the young man arrived the sage explained why he had been sent for.

money for seforim that a certain messenger sold for me. Since people often come to me, trying to solicit a donation for what I know to be unworthy causes, I wish to give this money to you as a matanah al m'nas l'hachzir. This way, when I tell them that I don't have any money to give, I will not be speaking falsely, chas v'shalom."

When Rav Chaim Kanievsky, shlit"a, recounted this story he added, "Yet my father, the author of Kehilas Yaakov, zt"l, held that even if one had his own money on his person, it was not a falsehood to say he has none, if circumstances warrant such a response. For example, if someone known to re-

"Today I received a very large sum of nege on loans asks to borrow money, one is permitted to say he has no money that he can lend. This is permitted since he doesn't necessarily mean that he has no money on him, but only that for one reason or the other he cannot lend money to the person asking.

> "The story of the Chofetz Chaim's is not a contradiction to this point, since he presumably would not have argued. Nevertheless, because the Chofetz Chaim was exceedingly careful to avoid even the slightest semblance of falsehood, he resorted to giving the money to his student instead."

> > 1. דרך שיחה, פרשת משפטים ■

