

## OVERVIEW of the Daf

### 1) Influencing children (cont.)

The Gemara concludes enumerating how different activities of the mother will effect her children.

A related incident is presented.

### 2) Nursing (cont.)

R' Huna, in response to R' Huna bar Chinana's test, elaborates on a woman's obligation to nurse.

### 3) Maidservants

The Gemara explains the Mishnah's rulings related to the tasks a wife must perform if she brings maidservants into her home.

R' Chana or R' Shmuel bar Nachmani rules that as long as she is fit to bring maidservants into her home she is exempt from the tasks mentioned in the Mishnah.

A Baraisa rules that the halacha of the Mishnah applies whether she brought maidservants into her home as part of her dowry or whether she saved money to bring into the marriage.

### 4) Teachings of R' Yitzchok bar Chananyah in the name of R' Huna

R' Yitzchok bar Chananya in the name of R' Huna rules that even a woman who brings four maidservants into her home has certain tasks that she must perform.

R' Yitzchok bar Chananya in the name of R' Huna enumerates the tasks that a niddah may not perform for her husband.

The activities of making her bed and mixing his drink are clarified.

R' Yitzchok bar Chananya in the name of R' Huna rules that the only food that must be shared with the waiter during a meal is fatty meat and old wine.

R' Chisda further clarifies this ruling.

Related incidents and the underlying principle of these matters are presented.

Additional incidents are presented as well as examples of the dangers involved when one does not eat when he is overcome by a craving.

Another incident is recorded related to one who does not eat when he has a craving.

### 5) Clarifying the Mishnah

The Mishnah that rules that a woman works with wool is consistent with R' Yehudah's position on this matter and R' Yehudah's position is clarified.

R' Malkiyo rules like R' Eliezer that no matter how many maidservants a woman brings into her home she must work with wool to avoid idleness that leads to lewdness (זימה).

R' Chanina the son of R' Ika identifies which halachos were ruled authored by R' Malkiyo and which authored by R' Malkiya.

R' Pappa categorizes the rulings differently and the difference between the two versions is articulated.

The Gemara identifies the difference between the positions of R' Shimon ben Gamliel and Tanna Kamma.

(Overview...Continued on page 2)

## Distinctive INSIGHT

### *The tasks a wife performs for her husband*

אבל מוזגת לו כוס ומצעת לו את המטה ומרחצת לו פניו ורגליו

Rabbi Yitzchok ben Chananya quotes Rav Huna who says that although the Mishnah allows a wife who brings four maidservants to "sit in an easy chair," it is recommended that the wife not remain idle. She should "add water to his wine, make his bed and wash his face, hands and feet."

Rashi notes that the Mishnah taught that once a woman is able to bring three maidservants into her house, she is not required to make her husband's bed. Why, then, does Rav Huna say that the wife should still do so when she has enough maids?

Rashi explains that the Mishnah excuses the woman from the tedious and demanding aspects of making the bed. Rav Huna, however, does not require the wife to work hard, but he does recommend (השיאורה עצה טובה) that she perform light activities, particularly those which express affection and endearment for her husband.

ר"ן has a text in the Mishnah which reads "מצעת המטה—the wife generally has to make *the beds*," which does not refer specifically to her husband's bed. This means that the woman must tidy up the house and keep the furniture in order. When she brings enough maids, she is excused from this general housework. The statement of Rav Huna, however, is that she should still perform the task of "מצעת לו המטה—she should make *his* bed."

This גירסא in the Mishnah and Gemara supports the explanation which Rashi offered. ■

## REVIEW and Remember

1. What is the source that a woman is elevated to her husband's social position?  
\_\_\_\_\_
2. What tasks must a woman perform for her husband regardless of the number of maidservants that were brought into the marriage?  
\_\_\_\_\_
3. How did the Roman fellow convince a woman to marry him?  
\_\_\_\_\_
4. Explain the dispute between Beis Shammai and Beis Hillel?  
\_\_\_\_\_

# HALACHAH Highlight

## Endangering oneself to save another

אמר להו חזאי רוח צרעת דקא פרחא עילויה

He said to them [the rabbis] I saw a spirit of tzara'as floating around him.

Rashi, cited in Shitah Mikubetzes<sup>1</sup>, writes that R' Ashi was explaining the reason he put his life in danger. In other words, since R' Ashi sensed that Mar Zutra was in danger he put his life at risk to save Mar Zutra's life. This seemingly indicates that it is appropriate and perhaps even obligatory for a person to submit himself to possible danger in order to save others. This principle, however, is not so simple. Rav Dovid ben Zimra<sup>2</sup>, the Radvaz was asked to rule on a frightening inquiry. A Jew was given the following choice by a non-Jew: Either you allow us to sever a non-life threatening organ from your body or we will kill your friend. The one posing the question to Radvaz asserted that it should be obligatory for the Jew given this choice to give up his limb to save the life of his friend. His reasoning was based on a combination of different halachic principles. Saving a life overrides Shabbos and Shabbos overrides danger to a single limb. Therefore, saving a life must certainly override any consideration of a single limb. Radvaz disagreed with this conclusion for a number of reasons and referred to the suggested approach as foolish piety (חסידות של שטות).

Rav Moshe Sofer<sup>3</sup>, the Chasam Sofer, analyzes and questions Radvaz's conclusion at great length. At the end of his analysis he writes that if the offer involves cutting off a limb with a sword the conclusion of Radvaz seems reasonable but if the limb will be removed by the use of some sort of acid or poison (סם) the matter is uncertain. Accordingly, Chasam Sofer explains that the worst pun-

(Overview...Continued from page 1)

6) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah begins with a discussion related to a man who takes a vow against having relations with his wife. The Mishnah concludes with a presentation of the conjugal rights of the wives of different professionals.

### 7) The dispute between Beis Shammai and Beis Hillel

Beis Shammai and Beis Hillel identify the source for their positions and the exact point of their dispute.

Rav and Shmuel disagree regarding the exact case disputed by Beis Shammai and Beis Hillel.

After noting that Beis Shammai and Beis Hillel already dispute this point the Gemara explains the necessity for them to disagree in two different contexts.

### 8) A student leaving with permission

The Gemara inquires how long a student may leave his wife if he has permission. ■

ishment that R' Ashi would have received would be that his finger would be removed with acid or poison, therefore, he felt it obligatory to take that risk to save Mar Zutra from the tzara'as that would have endangered his entire body.

Rabbi Yechiel Michel Epstein<sup>4</sup>, the Aruch Hashulchan, rules in general that a person should not endanger himself to save another. He adds, however, that all cases must be judged carefully because one should not be overly cautious since Chazal teach that anyone who saves a Jewish soul is considered to have saved the entire world. ■

1. רש"י מהדו"ק ומובא דבריו בשיטה מקובצת בסוגיין.
2. שו"ת הרדב"ז ח"ג סי' תרכ"ה.
3. חידושי חת"ס מהדו"ק.
4. ערוה"ש חו"מ סי' תכ"ו. ■

# STORIES Off the Daf

## Open Miracles

"מאי טעמא סמכת אניסא..."

On today's daf we find that Rav Ashi once interfered with the king's dish in a sudden effort to help the ailing Mar Zutra. He did so despite the fact that the waiter would inevitably notice, and his action entailed relying on an open miracle to prevent severe punishment for ruining the king's repast.

A certain Jewish man was traveling along a deserted Israeli road. Suddenly, a group of armed terrorists appeared who clearly wished to kill him. The moment before they acted, a truck appeared to be heading their way and the group got frightened and ran off. As it turned out, they

fled prematurely. The truck driver was an Arab who zoomed past, and he most likely wouldn't have lifted a finger to halt the innocent's demise.

The saved man was filled with gratitude to Hashem for this miracle. As he stood shaking with spent adrenaline after his harrowing experience, he noticed a wad of bills lying in the road. In their haste to flee, the would-be perpetrators had apparently dropped a large sum of money.

The reprieved asked if the money was permitted to him since it had come into his possession because of a miracle. Perhaps he should act as Avraham Avinu did, by refraining from taking profit from his miraculous victory over the four Kings? Perhaps anyone who lived through a miracle is required to give any gains to tzedakah?

This question was raised before Rav Chaim Kanievsky, shlit"a. He said, "Although this man must bentch hagomel, according to the letter of the law he may keep the money. This miracle is not in the same category as the miracle Avraham Avinu experienced which was completely not natural. Avraham was victorious by throwing sand at his enemies. In our case, the miracle happened naturally."

Rav Yitzchak Zilberstein, shlit"a, added, "Even so, one who experienced a miracle should give as much money as he can afford to tzedakah to support those who learn Torah with the intention that the money take the place of the Todah sacrifice he would have been obligated to bring when the Beis Hamikdash stood." Here, the tzedakah is meant to express one's gratitude to Hashem for having received a new lease on life!" ■

