

## OVERVIEW of the Daf

### 1) Rosh Chodesh reading (cont.)

Rava replies that he never heard anything explicit regarding the way the Rosh Chodesh portion is read, but he did hear a ruling on a similar question regarding the מעמדות. In that case, Rav holds that one verse is repeated whereas Shmuel holds that one of the verses is divided into two.

The Gemara explains each one's position and why each one disputes the other's suggestion.

An unsuccessful challenge to both their opinions is presented.

### 2) Torah reading

R' Tanchum in the name of R' Yehoshua ben Levi rules like the opinion in the Baraisa that when beginning a new paragraph one must read three verses.

R' Tanchum in the name of R' Yehoshua ben Levi rules that one may not end the reading with less than three verses at the end of a paragraph.

The necessity for the second ruling is explained.

The Gemara explains why the first opinion in the Baraisa is not concerned that someone coming late might think that one may read less than three verses at the beginning of a paragraph.

R' Yosef rules, regarding the מעמדות, that one of the verses is repeated.

### 3) The number of readers on a fast day

The Gemara inquires whether there are three or four readers on a fast day.

After numerous attempts the Gemara succeeds at demonstrating that there are three readers on a fast day.

R' Ashi unsuccessfully challenges this proof.

### 4) Prostrating

In the earlier mentioned incident the Gemara reported that Rav did not fall on his face when he recited tachanun.

The reason, the Gemara explains, is that there was a stone

(Continued on page 2)

## Distinctive INSIGHT

*Bowing upon a stone floor in the Beis HaMikdash and beyond*

רצפה של אבנים היתה ותניא ואבן משכית וגו' עליה אי אתה משתחוה בארצכם אבל אתה משתחוה על אבנים של בית המקדש

Turei Even notes that the verse clearly states that one may not bow on a stone floor. The Baraisa does not seem to add any information about the prohibition mentioned in the verse itself. What does the Baraisa add to our understanding of this halacha?

He points out that without the clarification of the Baraisa, we might have thought that the restriction not to bow on a stone floor only applies in Eretz Yisroel, as the verse uses the word בארצכם. We would have thought that the case involving Rav, who lived in Bavel, would not have been in violation of this law. The Baraisa teaches that the word בארצכם comes to clarify the law, and that, indeed, this law only applies in the land. However, the point is that one may bow down on a stone surface in the Beis HaMikdash, not that it is permitted to do so outside the land. Turei Even adds that this is a reasonable interpretation of the verse, because bowing is a function of the person (חובת הגוף), and not of the land, per se. Therefore it is logical that this prohibition applies whether a person is in or outside of Eretz Yisroel.

Sefer HaChinuch (Mitzvah #349) explains that the reason we are not allowed to bow upon a stone floor is that this appears as if one is bowing to the stone itself. Accordingly, this act is allowed in the Beis HaMikdash, because there it is clear that a person is bowing to Hashem.

Rambam writes that the reason for this law is that we are not allowed to mimic the conduct of the Emori, and bowing upon stone surfaces is one of the customs which they practiced. Chasam Sofer (Commentary to Torah, Vayikra 26:1) wonders, according to Rambam, why is this allowed in the Beis HaMikdash? This is precisely why a solid altar was abolished in the Beis HaMikdash, because Hashem despises the actions of the pagans (see Rashi to Devarim 16:22). Why should bowing upon a stone floor be tolerated within the Beis HaMikdash if it is abominable?

Chasam Sofer answers that from a practical standpoint, the floor in the Beis HaMikdash had to be made of stone. The floor was often covered with blood of the offerings, and it had to be cleaned, even on Shabbos. If it would have remained a plain dirt surface, rinsing it down on Shabbos would violate the laws of Shabbos. This is why the floor had to be made of stone, and bowing on it was therefore permitted. ■

## REVIEW and Remember

1. How many pesukim of a new paragraph must be read before the reader may top?  
\_\_\_\_\_
2. If Shmuel was a Kohen, why did he allow Rav to have the first aliyah?  
\_\_\_\_\_
3. Is it permitted to prostrate on stone?  
\_\_\_\_\_
4. What is "kidah"?  
\_\_\_\_\_

# HALACHAH Highlight

## Melachah on Rosh Chodesh

ושאין בו ביטול מלאכה לעם כגון ראשי חדשים וכו'

And days where there is no loss of work for the nation, like on Rosh Chodesh etc.

Rashi<sup>1</sup> explains that the reason an extra aliyah on Rosh Chodesh does not cause a loss of work is because women have the custom to refrain from melachah on Rosh Chodesh. Since Rashi does not qualify this custom, it would seem that they refrain from all melachah. Rabbeinu Yerucham<sup>2</sup> also expresses this position. He noted that some women mistakenly claimed that the only restriction against work was to refrain from sewing. He therefore emphasized that those who maintain the custom of not working on Rosh Chodesh must refrain from all work and there is no middle ground on the matter.

The Tashbatz<sup>3</sup> justifies the practice of women refraining only from sewing. The rationale behind the custom is not only that the women refrained from participating in the sin of the golden calf, but it is also based on the fact that the women played an active role in the construction of the Mishkan, especially the weaving of the curtains. Since the men were lazy concerning the construction of the Mishkan and the women were quick to respond, the prohibition against working was taken from the men and given to the women. Furthermore, it was specifically the restriction against sewing which was adopted since the source of the custom is derived from the women's participation in sewing the curtains.

# STORIES Off the Daf

## Calling up the Kohen

דחא רב הונא קרי בכהני

Rav Yechezkel of Shinova, ז"ל, the author of the Divrei Yechezkel, was exceedingly meticulous in following the Shulchan Aruch. He couldn't bear to see anyone deviate from the Shulchan Aruch even the slightest bit.

During his youth, Rav Yechezkel once went to see and be inspired by Rav Aizik'l of Ziditchov, ז"ל, and indeed, the Rebbe's prayers were very heartfelt and moving.

When it came time for Torah reading, however, Rav Yechezkel was shocked. Even though he knew that several kohanim were present, the gabbai summoned the Rebbe

for rishon instead of one of them!

"How can you call the Rebbe instead of a kohen?" Rav Yechezkel accused the gabbai. "How can you possibly act contrary to the words of the Shulchan Aruch and all the poskim? The Gemara in Gittin 59 is quite clear that we call a kohen up for rishon to avoid the possibility of arguing!"

Just then, Rav Yechezkel realized that he had implicated one of the greatest Rebbes of the generation in wrongdoing. He suddenly felt a dread of Divine retribution; perhaps the Rebbe would take offense at his hasty words! He quickly slipped away, and after finding a different minyan to hear the reading, he returned to his father's house.

What had happened in Ziditchov haunted Rav Yechezkel, however. How could the Rebbe have contravened a clear-

cut halachah in Shulchan Aruch? He decided to ask the opinion of his father, the illustrious Divrei Chaim of Tszanz.

After hearing the entire story, Rav Chaim rendered a decision. "Go back and beg the Rebbe for forgiveness."

In his Sheiris Yaakov, Rav Yitzchok Meir Morgenstern, shlit"l, provides a possible explanation for the events that transpired in Ziditchov. "Since most of the gedolim of the region at that time, including the senior Divrei Chaim, considered themselves his junior spiritually, the Rebbe of Ziditchov was justified in standing for rishon in the place of a kohen. This is consistent with the Gemara in Megilla 22a, where we see that since the kohanim of Eretz Yisroel were submissive before Rav Huna, he too could be called instead of a kohen for rishon." ■

(Overview. Continued from page 1)

tile in front of him and it is prohibited to prostrate on a stone tile.

Different reasons are presented to explain why Rav didn't move to a place where there were no stone tiles or just recite tachanun without prostrating with arms and legs extended.

A Baraisa describes different forms of prostrating.

Levi demonstrated kidah-bowing before Rebbi and became lame.

After the Gemara cites a different cause for Levi becoming lame the Gemara explains that both factors caused him to become lame ■

The Beis Yosef<sup>4</sup> observed that women in his day refrained from doing melachah to earn money, but they sewed garments for members of their households. He wrote against this custom, asserting that all melachah should be included in the restriction. The only point he was willing to concede was that perhaps the original custom did not include melachah that was not done for profit. The Aruch HaShulchan<sup>5</sup> writes that a woman does not have to lose money to maintain the custom, and Rav Yaakov Emden<sup>6</sup> maintains that easy melachah is not included in the restriction. Biur Halacha<sup>7</sup>, however, is uncertain whether the custom follows his opinion on this matter. ■

1. רש"י ד"ה ראשי
2. רבינו ירוחם נתיב י"א ח"א נב
3. שו"ת תשב"ץ ח"ג סי' רמ"ד
4. בית יוסף אור"ח סי' תי"ז ד"ה כתב הרוקח
5. ערוך השולחן או"ח תי"ז:
6. מור וקציעה שם
7. ביאור הלכה שם סע' א' ד"ה מנהג ■