

This month's Daf Digest is dedicated  
לעילוי נשמת צבי בן יחזקאל יוסף גרין, מחסידי דעעש  
From the Grin family, Sao Paulo, Brazil

## OVERVIEW of the Daf

### 1) Liability as a zaken mamre (cont.)

The Gemara concludes its discussion of the criteria mentioned by R' Elazar in the name of R' Oshaya regarding the nature of the ruling that could make one liable as a zaken mamre.

2) **MISHNAH:** Details related to the execution of the zaken mamre are presented as well as a dispute whether he is executed immediately or they would wait until Yom Tov.

### 3) When to execute the zaken mamre

A Beraisa elaborates on the dispute between R' Akiva and R' Yehudah when to execute the zaken mamre.

Another Beraisa enumerates other people whose executions would be publicly announced.

4) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah enumerates and explains transgressions punished with strangulation.

### 5) Death penalty associated with prophecy

A Beraisa notes that there are three cases in which a prophet is killed by Beis Din and three cases where he is killed by the hands of Heaven.

R' Yehudah in the name of Rav cites the source for these rulings.

A Scriptural example of one who prophesies that which he did not hear, is cited and analyzed.

Tangentially, the Gemara mentions the principle that two prophets do not use the exact same words.

An example of one who prophesies what was not said to him is presented and analyzed.

(Continued on page 2)

## REVIEW and Remember

1. When was the zaken mamre executed?  
.....
2. Which categories of false prophets are executed by Beis Din?  
.....
3. Why did Hashem use the word נא when instructing Avrohom to sacrifice Yitzchok?  
.....
4. What are the two issues related to subverters disputed by Rabanan and R' SHimon?  
.....

## Distinctive INSIGHT

### The events leading up to the Akeida

ויהי אחר הדברים האלה והאלקים נסה את אברהם

The Torah (Bereshis 22:1) juxtaposes the Akeida with an event which preceded it. "And it was after these things that God tested Avraham, and He said to him, 'Avraham'; and he said, 'Here I am.'" Our Gemara (Sanhedrin 89b) is puzzled by what things preceded and led up to the test of the Akeida. Rav Levi explains that there was a discussion between Yitzchak and Yishmael. Yishmael claimed that he was truly greater than Yitzchak as he had undergone his bris at 13, while Yitzchak was only eight days old when he entered the covenant of the bris. Yitzchak responded that Yishmael's claim had no basis as Yishmael had entered into his covenant with God using only one part of his body, whereas Yitzchok declared that he would be willing to offer his entire being for Hashem. As a result of this statement, Yitzchok was indeed challenged to offer his life on the akeida.

This Gemara is very puzzling. First, why is it so important for us to know the detailed discussion between Yitzchak and Yishmael, as seemingly it has no impact upon us. Secondly, both of these men were already in or approaching middle age and their behavior patterns were clearly established. Therefore, how could Yishmael have had the audacity to claim that he was greater, and why did Yitzchak not simply respond by pointing out the difference in their personal behavior?

Rabbi Tzvi Haskell notes that much has recently been written about how, at the very end of Galus EDOM, Yishmael will once again become a major player for at least a short time. With this in mind we understand that Yitzchak's struggle with Yishmael is our struggle. We also understand that Yishmael does not measure his religiosity or value by his behavior, but only by his willingness to suffer for his cause. It was in this regard that he claimed that he was greater than Yitzchak. To this, Yitzchak must respond on Yishmael's terms - that the descendants of Yitzchak tower over Yishmael not only in terms of being greater in their personal behavior, but also even using the criteria established by Yishmael and according to his priorities, the Jews are more worthy.

The demand upon us is clear. Let us all pray that all the enhanced self-sacrifices that we all do throughout the year serve as a merit so that there no longer be any need for Yiddishe korbanos of flesh and blood. ■

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated  
By Adam Sheps for a Refuah Shelaima for  
דניאל יצחק בן שרה

# HALACHAH Highlight

## Adding to the mitzvah of tefillin

ואי עביד חמשה בתי גרוע ועומד הוא

And if he makes five compartments the tefillin lack validity from the out-

set  
**R**osh<sup>1</sup> writes that one who is G-d fearing will wear Rashi and Rabbeinu Tam tefillin simultaneously. The act of wearing two pairs of tefillin does not violate the prohibition against adding to the Torah since that prohibition is violated when one adds a fifth compartment to his tefillin and not when he wears a second pair of tefillin. Ma'adnei Yom Tov<sup>2</sup> explains that wearing a second pair of tefillin does not violate the prohibition against adding to the Torah since the two pairs of tefillin stand independent of one another as opposed to a fifth compartment that is an addition to the tefillin itself.

Taz<sup>3</sup> challenges this ruling from the Gemara in Eruvin (96a). The Gemara there rules that one may not go outside wearing two pairs of tefillin on Shabbos since it violates the prohibition against adding to a mitzvah. He answers that Biblically one does not violate the prohibition against adding to the Torah since each tefillin stands by itself but there is a Rabbinic injunction and that is the reason one may not wear two pairs of tefillin outside on Shabbos. When one wears Rashi and Rabbeinu Tam tefillin one does not even violate the Rabbinic injunction since one has in mind not to fulfill the mitzvah with the tefillin that is not correct according to halacha.

Magen Avrohom<sup>4</sup> writes that the reason it is permitted to wear Rashi and Rabbeinu Tam tefillin is that inevitably one of them is invalid which by definition precludes one from violating the prohibition against adding to the Torah. It is only if one were to wear two pairs of valid tefillin that the prohibition against add-

(Overview...continued from page 1)

Examples are given of one who prophesies in the name of an idol, one who suppresses his prophecy, one who disregards the words of a prophet, one who transgresses his own words and one who disregards the words of a prophet.

### 6) Akeidas Yitzchok

The Gemara expounds some of the verses related to Akeidas Yitzchok.

R' Levi offers a different interpretation of the word אחר.

### 7) False prophets and subverters of a city

A Beraisa presents two disputes, one regarding the method of execution of a prophet who subverts a city and the second related to the method of execution of someone else who subverts a city.

The basis of the dispute regarding the execution for a prophet who subverts a city is presented.

The basis of the dispute regarding the execution for someone else who subverts a city is presented. ■

ing to the Torah would be violated. This principle that the prohibition against adding to the Torah is only violated when using a valid mitzvah object seems to refute Rosh's comment that one who adds a fifth compartment violates the prohibition against adding to the Torah. Magen Avrohom answers that there are two categories of the prohibition of adding to the Torah. One category is when one does the mitzvah in a greater quantity than mandated and the second is when one attaches something invalid to a mitzvah item. A fifth compartment to tefillin is an example of the second category. ■

1. רא"ש ה' תפילין ס"י ה'.
2. מעדני יו"ט שם אות כ'.
3. ט"ז או"ח ס"י ל"ד סק"ב.
4. מג"א שם סק"ג. ■

# STORIES Off the Daf

## At whose hands?

”מיתתו בידי שמים...”

**W**hen the chassidim of Petrashen asked the Imrei Chaim of Vizhnitz, zt”l, to come for a visit to their town, the rebbe agreed to do so. This visit afforded such honor to the city that dozens of people rode the trains to Klausenberg to join the rebbe's entourage for the final leg of the journey. Hundreds of men, women, and children came out to greet the rebbe's train when he finally arrived in the town.

The Vizhnitzer Rebbe's first move was to visit the rav of the town. Only when he

finished this visit did he consent to go to his host. The rav commented about the visit, “From the rebbe's conversation I found that he is not only an important rebbe but also a gadol baTorah.”

The next day was erev Shabbos and the rebbe—a renowned darshan—was asked to speak in the main shul of the town. His remark when asked to speak was very telling. “You know when Rav Yechezkel of Shinovah, zt”l, was asked to speak in public he would always refuse. When asked to explain why, he would say, ‘In Sanhedrin 89 we find that one who says a false prophecy is killed in earthly courts. But one who received a bona fide prophecy that should be told to others and withholds the prophecy is punished by death from heaven.

“In light of this Gemara I am in trouble whatever I do. If I merit true Torah from heaven and do not tell this over, there are very heavy consequences. But what if what I wish to say is not Toras emes? In that case, I will be in the category of those who deserve capital punishment from human hands. Since I cannot be sure which type of Torah I will give over, I must chose between these two options. I prefer to refrain from saying over even at the risk of withholding genuine Torah. Like Dovid Hamelech famously said in the verse, “נפלה נא ביד ה' וביד אדם אל אפולה”, I, too, prefer to fall into the hands of Hashem, not man.’”■

1. עולמו של אבא, ע' תכ"א ■