

Daf Digest for this month is dedicated in memory of) אשר אנטשיל ע"ה (Babby Weiss יוסף בן חיים הכהן and רבקה יענטא Weiss יוסף בן חיים הכהן

By the Weiss brothers –London, Staten Island, Yerushalayim

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Clarifying the opinions quoted in the Mishnah

A contradiction is noted between our Mishnah and a Mishnah in Berachos. From our Mishnah it would seem that R' Shimon ben Gamliel is not concerned about haughtiness whereas the Rabanan are concerned about haughtiness. However, it seems from the Mishnah in Berachos that each holds the opposite.

Two resolutions to this discrepancy are presented.

2) MISHNAH: The Mishnah records different practices concerning work on the morning of the fourteenth of Nisan. Beis Shamai and Beis Hillel dispute whether it is permissible to do work the night of the fourteenth.

3) Clarifying the Mishnah

The Gemara questions why the Mishnah begins with a discussion of minhag and concludes with an issue of issur.

R' Yochanan explains that the first ruling reflects R' Meir's opinion whereas the second ruling reflects R' Yehudah's opinion.

R' Yehudah's opinion is clarified.

4) MISHNAH: R' Meir presents guidelines for finishing work on the fourteenth and Chachamim point to three or four craftsmen who are permitted to work on erev Pesach until midday.

5) Clarifying R' Meir's position

Three possible explanations of R' Meir's opinion are presented.

The Gemara demonstrates that according to R' Meir work may be done on the morning of the fourteenth, in a place where customarily it is prohibited, if it is for a festival need and only involves completing an unfinished task.

6) Clarifying Chachamim's position

The reason for Chachamim's opinion is explained as well the point of dispute between Chachamim and R' Yosi the son of R' Yehudah.

7) MISHNAH: The Mishnah discusses the permissibility of different activities on the fourteenth.

8) Clarifying the Mishnah

The Gemara questions the necessity of the Mishnah's second ruling, permitting one to return a bird to the nest, after the Mishnah previously taught that the bird may be placed on the nest even in the first place.

Abaye explains that the second ruling refers to chol ha-moed. R' Huna and R' Ami dispute the circumstances that permit returning a bird to the nest on Chol HaMoed.

(Overview...continued on page 2)

Distinctive INSIGHT

How much is a "small" or "large" monetary loss?

מר סבר להפסד מרובה חששו ומר סבר להפסד מרובה לא חששו

Rema (Yoreh De'ah 69:2) discusses a piece of meat that was salted to be koshered, but it was not rinsed off beforehand as is required. In this case, there are two opinions what to do. The Rosh is lenient, and the opinion of **יש אומרים** is to prohibit that piece, even **בדיעבד**. We rule that the piece is allowed if the monetary loss will be great (**הפסד מרובה**).

If that piece is placed next to other pieces, that piece is prohibited to be eaten, but the other pieces are permitted. This indicates that a single piece of meat which will have to be discarded is not considered a "large loss." This is in contrast to the opinion of Nachlas Shivah (cited in **נ"ה**) who defines a "small loss" to be the value of a liver of a chicken or dove. Anything more than this is considered to be a "great loss."

שו"ת פעולת צדיק points out that our Gemara seems to substantiate the opinion of the Nachlas Shivah. Here, the loss of an entire egg is defined as a **הפסד מרובה**.

Igros Moshe (Y.D. 1:17) writes that there is no proof from our Gemara to establish the definition of what determines a loss which is "small" or "large". The Gemara in Bava Kama (117a) mentions that a mixture of regular wheat can be sold in the open market at full price. If it gets mixed together with terumah wheat, it can only be sold to kohanim, and the difference in price is nearly half, as is indicated there in the words of Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel. Yet, the Gemara calls that loss a "small loss." We see that the definition of a relative amount of loss, and whether it is "small" or "large" depends on each case, and we cannot compare one to the next. ■

HALACHAH Highlight

Religious arrogance

“חיישינן ליוהרא” וכו’, מיחזחי כיוהרא, [פי’ גאווה].

“We’re concerned for conceit”... “It appears as he is being haughty” [religious pride]

It seems from our Gemara that all agree if an activity is overtly hubris, it is forbidden. The argument in our Gemara is whether a particular situation involves arrogance or not. The subject of haughtiness needs to be explained.

There are two prohibitions. There is one concerning the relationship between man and Creator. According to the S’mag¹, the pasuk² of “Beware lest you forget Hashem your God” is a warning against pride. This is the opinion of the Chafetz Chaim³.

There is another prohibition, this one being between man and man. As explained in the Yerushalmi⁴, one who acts stringently in front of others in a matter which is technically permitted, but yet he goes beyond the letter of the law, this is considered as if he is degrading others. Similarly, the Mishna Berura⁵ writes that if one performs acts of asceticism, he should conceal them from others. [However⁶, if it is something which contains a trace of sin, one would not be allowed to perform it even if he was a guest in another’s home.] For further details see below. ■

1. הסמ"ג בהקהדמה

Gemara GEM

Repair of clothing on Chol HaMoed

אף הרצענין... שכן עולי רגלים מתקנין
מנעליהן בחולו של מועד

A shoemaker may work on erev Pesach, because pilgrims who come to Yerushalayim may have their shoes fixed on Chol HaMoed.

Tosafos notices that only the pilgrims who come to Yerushalayim are allowed to fix their shoes on Chol HaMoed. Others are not allowed, even if the

shoes might rip further if not fixed, because they can buy new ones, and fix the torn ones after Yom Tov.

Rosh (Moed Kattan, 1:#17) explains that if a rip gets bigger, this is not defined as a **דבר האבד** unless the shoe will be completely ruined. Mishna Berura (541:10) writes that even according to the Rosh, if the tear will be irreparable, it may be fixed on Chol HaMoed. But if new ones can be bought, this is preferable.

Meiri (ibid., 13a) argues with Tosafos, pointing out that not everyone has enough money to buy new shoes. ■

REVIEW and Remember

1. Explain the position of Rabanan regarding concerns of haughtiness.
2. According to the Gemara’s conclusion, what is R’ Meir’s opinion?
3. What is the point of dispute regarding manufacturing shoes on erev Pesach?
4. What is the dispute between R’ Huna and R’ Ami?

2. בדברים פ"ח פסוק י"א [וע"ע בפירוש המצודות במימכה פ"ו פ"ח עה"פ הוצנע לכת עם אליהך
3. בפתחה לספר חפץ חיים בלאוין ל"ת ח'
4. הירושלמי בברכות פ"ב ה"ט, וכדפירש שם הפ"מ בד"ה בלחוד. ומעין המעשה שם כ"ה גם בבבלי בב"ק דף פ' ע"ב, ועע"ש בדף נ"ט במעשה דאלעזר זעירא וע"ע בירושלמי בפ"ק דחגיגה והובא בתשב"ץ ובשו"ע אר"ח תקס"ה ס"ו, שהמתענה הומפרסם עצמו לאחרים להשתבח שהוא מתענה הוא נענש עלע כך עכ"ל. וע"ש במ"ב שהתיר כדי שילמו דממנו. וכן עי' במ"ב בסוף סימן קנ"ד בשם הרשב"א וכן עי' ברמ"א [ט"ז] ונקה"כ ביור"ד סימן רמ"ט סי"ג. וע"ע ברמב"ם בהלכות תשובה פ"ז ה"ג שצריך לחזור בתשובה מרדיפת כבוד
5. המ"ב בסימן ק"ע ס"ק ט"ז
6. במ"ב שם ■

(Overview...continued from page 1)

9) Cleaning under an animal

A Beraisa presents guidelines for cleaning under an animal.

A contradiction in the Beraisa is noted. Abaye and Rava suggest different resolutions to the contradiction.

Rava tested his students by pointing to an apparent contradiction between our Mishnah and another regarding taking and retrieving items from craftsmen.

Two resolutions are presented, but the Gemara refutes the second resolution.

10) MISHNAH: The Mishnah teaches that the residents of Yericho had six questionable practices, three of which the sages protested against and three they did not protest. ■

