



OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah continues to discuss the halacha when three women share a bed and blood is found on the bed.

2) Clarifying the Mishnah

The Gemara explains the difference between our Mishnah and the previous Mishnah.

The necessity for the parable and the subsequent exchange between R' Meir and Rabanan is recorded.

R' Meir and R' Yosi cite support for R' Meir's position in two separate Baraisos and in each one Rabanan reject the proof.

Another Baraisa related to a search for tum'ah is cited.

Additional Baraisos and related incidents are recorded.

3) Lost prohibitions

A Baraisa discusses what happens if a stain gets lost in a garment.

The term "section" used by R' Shimon ben Gamliel is defined.

A Baraisa discusses what happens when sha'atnez becomes lost in a garment.

R' Yosef infers that in the future mitzvos will no longer apply.

This position is unsuccessfully challenged and a teaching of R' Yochanan is cited to support this position.

Rafram bar Pappa in the name of R' Chisda issues another ruling related to sha'atnez that becomes lost in a garment.

The source for this ruling is identified.

Another ruling about a thread woven into a garment is presented and explained.

A Baraisa presents a dispute concerning bloodstains found on garments.

The wording of the Baraisa is explained.

4) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah begins to discuss the process of removing a stain from a garment before its immersion. ■

Distinctive INSIGHT

Mocking the dead

אבל עושיה ממנו תכריכון למת

A Baraisa taught that a garment in which sha'atnez was lost should not be sold to a non-Jew, because we are afraid that he might sell the garment to another Jew who will wear the sha'atnez. This garment should also not be used as a blanket for a donkey, because eventually the presence of the sha'atnez might be forgotten and the material of the blanket might be used for clothing for a person. It is permitted, however, to use this material for shrouds for the dead. The dead have no requirement to observe mitzvos, so the prohibition of sha'atnez does not apply to such a garment, and we are also not concerned that someone else might use the fabric of the shrouds for a different garment, because items designated for the dead are prohibited from any benefit. Tosafos notes that the Gemara in Menachos (41a) teaches that we are not permitted to mock the dead, based upon the posuk in Mishlei (17:5), "One who mocks the poor insults his Maker." For this reason, a man is buried with a garment with tzitzis attached. (Our custom is to wrap the body in a tallis, but to detach one of the corners of the tzitzis). Therefore, it would seem inappropriate to use sha'atnez for shrouds for the dead. Several answers are offered by the commentators.

Tosafos cites Rashbam who says that shrouds for the dead are not providing any benefit for the body. Contact with sha'atnez without any benefit is permitted even for a living person, as we find (Yevamos 4b) that merchants who sell sha'atnez fabrics (not for clothing) may carry the samples on their shoulders.

Continued on page 2)

REVIEW and Remember

1. How does the Gemara resolve the contradiction between the Mishna on נדה ס"א and the Mishnah on ט"ו?

2. To what extent is one permitted to accept unconfirmed lashon hara

3. Why is it prohibited to sell a garment with shaatnez to a gentile?

4. Does a stain on a colored garment render a woman te-me'ah?

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
By Dr. & Mrs. Shlomo Whitehouse
in memory of his mother
מרת דבוריש בת ר' בנימין ע"ה

HALACHAH Highlight

Playing instruments at weddings in Yerushalayim

על האירוס

They decreed against the use of a bell

The Gemara relates that following the attack by Vespasian, Chazal prohibited the use of the instrument called אירוס. Rashi¹ writes that it is a bell that is used to make music at celebratory meals. Meiri² describes it as a kind of drum that is enclosed all around except for a single hole from which sound goes in and out and it was used to make music at weddings.

There is a well known Ashkenazi custom in Yerushalayim that prohibits musical instruments at weddings other than a drum. Sefer Beis Chasanim³ writes that following a cholera epidemic in 1865 the Ashkenazi rabbonim of Yerushalayim decreed in the strongest terms against the use of musical instruments at weddings. This decree was chosen because one of the great Torah scholars had a dream in which he was informed that the epidemic was the result of the fact that people did not demonstrate proper respect for the Kosel HaMa'aravi. The epidemic stopped shortly after the decree was issued and the decree was signed by numerous rabbonim.

Teshuvos Salmas Chaim⁴ writes that it was the author of the Imrei Vinah who decreed against the use of musical instruments at weddings. He also notes, however, that he heard from Maharil Diskin that one should certainly be stringent about this matter in Yerushalayim which is the place of the destruction of the Beis HaMikdash. Kuntres Liknos Chochma⁵ writes in the name of Rav Yosef Sholom Elyashiv that only singing and drums are permitted at a wedding in Yerushalayim but all other instruments

(Insight...continued from page 1)

Rabeinu Tam deflects the question by explaining that the Gemara in Menachos only considers it a mockery if a man is not buried with tzitzis, because tzitzis specifically is a mitzvah whose observance is equal to all other mitzvos (Menachos 43b). Using sha'atnez for the shrouds of the dead is not considered a mockery.

Tosafos HaRosh answers that the concept of mocking the dead is only applicable at the moment the body is being escorted to the grave. If those who are alive are wearing tzitzis and the dead is without them, this is embarrassing and offensive to the dead. In fact, the Gemara even states that tzitzis are placed upon the dead "ההיא שעתא—at that moment," referring to the time of the funeral, but the dead do not need tzitzis beyond that moment. Once the body is in the grave, the sharp contrast between the dead and those who are alive is no longer being highlighted. At that point he does not need tzitzis, and it is then that the shrouds are placed, which can contain sha'atnez. ■

are prohibited. He also maintains that it is prohibited to play music from a tape or any music-producing device. Additionally, he writes that this restriction applies to any neighborhood that is considered part of Yerushalayim, even the more distant ones. Moreover, if someone is invited to a wedding where music will be playing in violation of these restrictions he should speak to a Torah scholar whether it is even permitted for him to attend. ■

1. רש"י סוטה מ"ט: ד"ה טבלא.
2. מאירי שם מ"ז: ד"ה בפולמוס.
3. ספר בית חתנים פי"ז סעי' ו'.
4. שו"ת שלמת חיים ח"א סי' ע"ז.
5. קונטרס לקנות חכמה עמ' 13. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

Og, King of the Bashan

זה עוג

Rav Yessachar Dov of Belz, zt"l, pointed out that there are several divrei Torah of the Belzer Rebbe recorded in Sefer Toras Moshe of the Chasam Sofer, zt"l. He recounted an interesting story of how this came about.

Some misnagdim went to the Chasam Sofer and claimed that in Belz there were chassidim who were, "teaching the Torah of Og Melech HaBashan." They meant that the Torah had no taste like a salty [melach] cake [ugah] which has spoiled [bashan]. They also derided the fact that

the chassidim learned that Og actually does refer to the word cake—what a ridiculous idea! When Rav Shlomo of Belz, zt"l, heard this, he sent one of his followers who was very learned to the Chasam Sofer to defend the chassidim.

When this chassid arrived in Pressburg, the Chasam Sofer was in the middle of giving a shiur for his students. The chassid had much to contribute that demonstrated his own deep mastery of the topics discussed. When he introduced himself as a chassid of Belz after the shiur, the Chasam Sofer was gratified to hear of his origins, and was also pleased to learn that, as he had suspected, the slander was all falsehood.

The Chasam Sofer invited this talmid chacham to his home for a meal. While

there, the chassid told the Chasam Sofer a few divrei Torah in the name of his rebbe, which the Chasam Sofer jotted down for himself. At the time, he did not note the name of their originator, since he well remembered where they came from.

After he passed away, his notebook was published and these vertlach were printed without accreditation.

In response to misnagdim's claim that the chassidim were foolish for drawing a connection between the name Og and the word for cake, Rav Shalom of Belz, commented, "But Tosafos in Niddah 61 brings from our sages that Og was called Og because he discovered Avraham making cakes of matzah for Pesach!"¹ ■

1. אגורה באהלך אולמים, ע' נ"ז. ■