

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Entering a state of mourning when one is supposed to marry (cont.)

The Gemara concludes citing the Baraisa related to the halachos of a bride or groom who enter into a state of mourning at the time they are scheduled to marry.

The Gemara emphasizes that the leniency of the Baraisa is limited to when it is the father of the groom or mother of the bride.

Rafram bar Papa in the name of R' Chisda limits the halacha to when the meat was rinsed, but the wedding should be delayed if the meat was not yet rinsed.

This ruling of R' Chisda is qualified.

A Baraisa is cited that supports R' Chisda's ruling.

The Baraisa's ruling that the bride and groom must sleep in separate rooms supports R' Yochanan's ruling that inconspicuous mourning practices must be observed during Yom Tov.

Rava is cited as limiting the ruling that bride and groom must sleep separately to where they did not yet cohabit.

This qualification is unsuccessfully challenged.

The premise that laws of mourning are treated more lightly than the laws of niddah is challenged.

The challenge is resolved by distinguishing between when the husband is in mourning and when the wife is in mourning.

The assertion that there is a difference between his mourning and her mourning is unsuccessfully challenged.

R' Ashi asserts that our case of mourning of the groom or bride is unique and is not relevant to the general rule of the relative severity of mourning practices.

The lenient feature of the mourning observed by the bride and groom is identified.

2) Relations on Shabbos night or after Shabbos

The reason cohabiting the first time is not permitted on Shabbos as mentioned in the Baraisa is that of the concern for causing a wound. The Gemara asks why, though, is it prohibited to have relations the first time after Shabbos? ■

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
In loving memory of my mother
Sorah Nechama bas Shneur Zalman
By her son Zalman Zlotnick

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
By Mr. and Mrs. Marty Weiss
In loving memory of their father
ר' מאיר בן ר' יחזקאל הלוי ע"ה

Distinctive INSIGHT

What constitutes a financial loss—an אונס?

לא שנו אלא שנתן מים על גבי בשר וכו'

Rashi explains that if water has not yet been placed on the meat to rinse it, it can still be sold in the market. Rashi's point is that the meat has to be able to be sold easily, where many buyers congregate together. This is only in the market, and this was only done when the meat still had some of a "shelflife." Once water was placed on the meat, it could still be sold, but only to individuals. This is considered as if the meat could not be salvaged, and a huge financial loss might occur unless the wedding would take place immediately.

Ritva points out that we are no longer concerned once the meat could be salvaged before the water was placed upon it, even if the wine had been diluted. The wine can easily be sold under these conditions, albeit with a small loss. This is why the situation hinges only upon the meat. In his comments, Rashba also notes that the words of the Baraisa deal with more than just meat. Rashba states that although several items are listed (bread, meat and wine) we do not need to be faced with a catastrophic loss of every item on the menu before scheduling the wedding to take place immediately. Rather, the Baraisa means that if any of the items listed will be lost by waiting until after the mourning period, this is enough of a financial reason to allow the wedding to commence before the funeral begins.

Rambam (Hilchos Eivel 11:8) seems to agree with Ritva. He discusses where the bread was baked and the meat was slaughtered, and then the father of the groom dies. He then writes that the funeral may be delayed "if the water was placed upon the meat, and it now cannot be sold." We see that he makes no mention of the loss of the wine at all, or of the bread which was already baked. ■

REVIEW and Remember

1. When is it no longer possible to preserve meat?

2. What mourning halachos are observed on Yom Tov?

3. What are the tasks that a niddah may not do for her husband?

4. In what way is the mourning in this case (involving the death of the father of the groom) treated more stringently than in the case of typical mourning?

HALACHAH Highlight

Is a chassan permitted to cut his hair?

ונוהג ז' ימי המשתה ואחר כך נוהג ז' ימי אבילות

He will observe the seven days of feasting and afterwards he will observe the seven days of mourning.

Rav Ovadiah Yosef¹ cites Teshuvos Sha'arei Rachamim² who expresses uncertainty whether a chassan is permitted to shave or cut his hair during the week of sheva berachos. The basis for his uncertainty is that the week of sheva berachos is a Yom Tov for the chassan and the chassan is prohibited from doing melacha³. Accordingly, it should be prohibited for him to shave or cut his hair as well. On the other hand, a king is also prohibited from doing melacha and nonetheless he is not only permitted but is even obligated to cut his hair every day. This indicates that melacha that involves enhancing one's appearance is not included in the prohibition against melacha.

Rav Ovadiah Yosef⁴ expresses astonishment at the suggestion that a chassan is prohibited to cut his hair during the week of sheva berachos based on a comment of Ramban⁵ to our Gemara. Our Gemara relates that if the father of the chassan dies the deceased is put into a room, the wedding ceremony is held and the couple consummates their marriage. Following the burial of the deceased the chassan observes

seven days of sheva berachos followed by the seven days of mourning. Ramban writes that in contrast to a burial that takes place on a Yom Tov the seven days of sheva berachos do not count towards shloshim. The reason for the distinction is that during the remainder of Yom Tov, although conspicuous observances of mourning are not observed, inconspicuous observances are followed and therefore those days can be applied towards shloshim. In our case during the week of sheva berachos the chassan is permitted to wash his clothing and cut his hair because during that week he is a king who must be seen as well groomed, consequently, those days do not count towards shloshim since there is no observance of mourning during that week.

This clearly indicates, notes Rav Yosef, that a groom is permitted to cut his hair during the week of sheva berachos. Furthermore, although there are opinions cited in Pischei Teshuvah⁶ that prohibit a chassan from cutting his hair during sheva berachos, nonetheless, these authorities do not have weight to prohibit a practice that is explicitly permitted by the Rishonim.

¹ שו"ת יביע אומר ח"ד אה"ע סי' ח' אות ו'.

² שו"ת שערי רחמים יו"ד סי' ל"א.

³ שו"ת אה"ע סי' ס"ד.

⁴ שו"ת יביע אומר שם.

⁵ תורת האדם דכ"ד ע"ג.

⁶ פת"ש אה"ע סי' ס"ד סק"א. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

Uncommon Halachos

ונוהג שבעת ימי המשתה ואחר כך נוהג שבעת ימי אבילות...

Rav Moshe Feinstein, zt"l, the Rosh Yeshiva of Mesivta Tiferes Yerushalayim and Yeshiva of Staten Island, issued countless semichos. The syllabus for semichah included the laws of mourning, halachos that are known to be exceedingly complex and difficult. Generally, each section takes a significant amount of time to master.

Once, a group of talmidim in Rav Moshe's semichah program were up to the laws of mourning, but Rav Moshe noticed that a certain pair of chavrusos were significantly ahead of the rest of the group. He approached them personally.

"How is it that you are ahead of everyone else? Did you stay up nights?" asked Rav Moshe.

The bochurim were a bit taken aback that the difference in their approach to the material had come to the attention of the Rosh Yeshiva. They were forced to admit that they had skipped the very first section of the laws of mourning, Hilchos Aveilus #342.

"Why did you skip the first section?" asked the Rosh Yeshiva. The סימן in question explains the laws that apply to a chosson or kallah who have already prepared completely for the chuppah when they suddenly lose a close relative, Rachmonah litzlan. The סימן details, based on Kesuvos 4 primarily, which laws of mourning they are to observe before the wedding, during the wedding, the seven days of sheva berachos, and afterward.

The bochurim explained, "The circumstances described in that section are so improbable—they're almost never applicable in real life—so we decided to skip it and focus instead on the sections that cover the halachos that one is more likely to come across."

Upon hearing their reasoning, Rav Moshe was clearly unhappy. Even so, he merely looked at the pair in a marked manner and left them without saying another word.

Despite the clear signal of disapproval, the two bochurim elected to continue with their plan and completely ignored the סימן. Later, however, when it was time for both young men to marry, tragedy marred their weddings. Both lost a parent immediately preceding the wedding; both unfortunately found that #342 סימן applied to him personally. ■