

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Rending garments

A Baraisa enumerates different events that warrant rending one's garment.

The source for rending a garment for one's father, mother and Torah teacher is identified.

The source that the rent may not be repaired is identified.

The source for rending a garment for the Nasi, the Av Beis Din and upon receiving bad news is identified.

The source and the rulings are unsuccessfully challenged.

The source for rending a garment upon hearing a "blessing" of Hashem's name is identified.

A related Baraisa is recorded.

The last ruling of the Baraisa is unsuccessfully challenged.

The source that a rent for hearing a "blessing" of Hashem's name may not be repaired is identified.

The source for rending a garment upon witnessing a burning Sefer Torah is identified.

A related teaching and incident are recorded.

The source for rending a garment when one sees the ruins of Yehudah is identified and the procedure is described.

A contradiction is noted as to whether a separate rent is necessary for seeing the place of the Beis HaMikdash and Yerushalayim or it is sufficient to rend once and then extend that rent.

The Gemara resolves the contradiction by distinguishing between one who saw the place of the Beis HaMikdash first and one who saw Yerushalayim first.

A Baraisa enumerates permitted methods of repairing the rent garments and the prohibited way to repair a rent garment.

A Baraisa discusses the placement of the rent on the garment, and another Baraisa describes what may or may not be done with the rent garment.

2) Extending the rent

A Baraisa records a dispute regarding the length of the initial rent as well as the length of the extension.

Ulla rules that the initial rent must be a tefach and the extension may be any size.

A Baraisa echoes the same rulings.

(Continued on page 2)

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated by
Mr. and Mrs. Myron Cherry
In loving memory of their sister
Rita Cherry o'b'm

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated by
Dr. & Dr. Ron Sanders
Mr. & Mrs. Binyomin Sanders
In loving memory of their mother
לע"נ מרת רחל בת ר' יוסף הכהן, ע"ה

Distinctive INSIGHT

Tearing one's garment when witnessing destruction

אמר ר' אלעזר הרואה ערי יהודה בחורבנן אומר ערי קדשך וגו' וקורע ירושלים בחורבנה אומר וכו' וקורע

The Gemara delineates a separate verse to be recited and a separate tear to be torn as one first sees the "cities of Yehuda in their state of destruction," followed by the city of Yerushalayim, and finally the Beis HaMikdash, each in its state of destruction and desolation. Why is there a separate verse and tearing for each of these sights?

Chasam Sofer explains that each of these areas represents a distinct level of kedusha. The cities of Yehuda have a status analogous to the written Torah, whereas Yerushalayim, due to the Sanhedrin which convenes there, possesses a higher level—that of the oral law, and its tradition which is passed from one generation to the next. This is from where Torah law and its application is disseminated throughout the world. Finally, the Beis HaMikdash itself is the place from where רוח הקדש is spread. The area between the keruvim is from where the voice of Hashem was heard (see Bemidbar 7:89). These places each possesses its own level of kedusha, so it is appropriate to read the specific verse and tear separately upon witnessing the utter destruction which has befallen it.

It is apparent from our Gemara that the verse and the associated proclamation are read before one tears his garment. Some explain that the statement helps to express an emotion of sadness and loss, which makes the tearing more meaningful. (See Mishnah Berura 581:#2). Bach writes that the verbal statement declares why the person is tearing his garment. Gilyonei Hashas (Megilla 18a) writes that whenever we perform a remembrance for the Beis HaMikdash, it must be done with a verbal declaration. This is why, at the Pesach Seder, as we eat the Korech sandwich, we say that we are doing so "as they did when the Mikdash was around." ■

REVIEW and Remember

1. Why did Elisha rend his garments if Eliyahu HaNavi was still alive?
2. How many rents does one make for a Sefer Torah that rips and why?
3. Why didn't Shmuel follow the lenient ruling concerning a matter related to rending a garment?
4. Why should a mourner not take a child onto his or her lap?

HALACHAH Highlight

May a child rend the garment of an adult?

ומקריעין לקטן מפני עגמת נפש

We rend the garment of a child because of grief.

The Sefer Tel Chaim¹ addresses the question of whether a child may rend the garment for an adult who is mourning. His initial approach is to analyze whether a child may act as the agent (שליח) of an adult for this mitzvah. Ketzos Hachoshen² writes that a child may not perform a bris milah because the mohel who performs the milah for the father is working as his agent. Therefore, a child who is unable to serve as an agent may not perform a bris milah. Seemingly the same principle applies for the question of a child rending a garment for an adult. In order for the rent performed by the child to be valid, he must serve as the adult's agent, which he is incapable of doing. Therefore the adult must rend his own garment.

Nesivos Hamishpat³ takes a different approach regarding the matter of a child serving as an agent. The rule that a child may not act as an agent applies only when the agency has only a legal effect, e.g. kiddushin. If, on the other hand, the agency is to perform a physical act and the act of the child will be lasting, e.g. asking a child to cut off the corners of an adult's hair, the agency of the child is recognized and valid. Therefore, according to Nesivos Hamishpat a child could serve as the agent of an adult to rend his garment. Since the agency is to perform a physical act, i.e. rend the garment, and it is lasting, even a child may serve as an agent.

Sefer Tel Chaim⁴ suggests another reason to allow a child to rend the garment of an adult which may be acceptable even for the Ketzos Hachoshen. When an adult instructs a child to rend his (i.e. the adult's) garment as his agent he is demonstrating his pain over the loss of his relative which is the primary thrust behind the mitzvah to rend a garment. Therefore, since the adult is

(Overveiw. Continued from page 1)

A Baraisa records a dispute whether it is acceptable to rend a garment once upon hearing the news that many relatives, including one's parents, passed away.

R' Yehudah ben Besaira's position that a new rent is required for a parent is explained and then Shmuel rules in accordance with that position.

Shmuel's ruling is unsuccessfully challenged.

A Baraisa records a dispute how far a rent may extend before requiring a new rent in the garment.

R' Masna and Mar Ukva disagree about when one makes a new rent for a second relative that dies and when it is sufficient to extend the existing rent.

Both opinions are unsuccessfully challenged.

A Baraisa presents halachos related to wearing a rent garment and rending a borrowed garment.

Another Baraisa teaches the law of not informing an ill person that his relative died and the requirements to rend the garment of a child or for one's in-laws.

A related incident is recorded.

3) Sitting on upright beds

A Baraisa qualifies the Mishnah's ruling regarding visitors sitting on upright beds when joining the mourner for a meal.

A related incident is recorded.

A Baraisa presents mourning guidelines for one who became a mourner while traveling for business. ■

doing his part to assure that his garment is rent perhaps it is acceptable even for a child to perform the physical act of rending the garment. ■

1. ספר טל חיים (ריינהאלד) סי' י"ט.
2. קצה"ח סי' שפ"ב סק"ב.
3. נתה"מ סי' קפ"ב סק"א.
4. ספר טל חיים הנ"ל. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

Seeing the Place of the Mikdash

"ראה את מקום המקדש מן הצופים ולחוץ..."

The Beis Yisrael, zt"l, once asked Rav Shlomo Zalman Aurebach, zt"l, a question about the source for a well-known custom.

He said, "The minhag is that at a time when we don't say tachanun, like erev Shabbos after midday, we don't tear kriyah when going to the Kosel. This is true even if one has been out of Yerushalayim for over thirty days. What is the source for this in the Poskim?"

Rav Shlomo Zalman Auerbach answered,

"Although there is no source in the Poskim, this is the custom and it has been the custom for quite a while."

When Rav Moshe Feinstein, zt"l was asked the same question, however, he replied that one must indeed tear kriyah unless one is already dressed in his Shabbos clothes and doesn't have other suitable garments to wear for Shabbos.

When Rav Shlomo Zalman was asked if those living in greater Yerushalayim outside the Old City did not have to tear kriyah if they hadn't been to the Kosel in thirty days he responded, "The custom is that they don't tear. The logic behind this is that since such people live in the same city and could easily go to the Kosel, the

fact that they haven't in over thirty days proves that they do not really feel the pain of the lack of the Beis HaMikdash. If that is the case, what would be the point of tearing kriyah?"

Once again, however, when Rav Moshe was asked about this he said that those who don't live in the Old City should tear kriyah.

Although Rav Shlomo Zalman would defend the custom not to tear, he once told someone who asked him about this, "You really ought to tear for the simple fact that you live in Yerushalayim and you don't get to the Kosel at least once a month." ■

