

## OVERVIEW of the Daf

### 1. A teacher reading by lamplight (cont.)

The Gemara earlier established that it was permitted for a teacher to prepare the beginning of each passage, yet this is a contradicted by a Baraisa. The Gemara answers that the Baraisa may also mean that one may not prepare any more than the beginning of each passage, or that children are different and they won't touch the lamp because of their fear of the teacher.

### 2. The restriction of a zav eating with a zava

R' Shimon ben Elazar points that the ruling of the Mishnah demonstrates the great care the Jewish people demonstrated regarding issues of taharah.

The Gemara questions, based upon our Mishnah, whether it is permitted for a man and his wife, who is a niddah, to share a bed if both of them are fully clothed.

The final conclusion is that such a practice is forbidden. R' Pedas, however, would disagree because he maintains that only cohabitation is prohibited and to extend the Rabbinic restriction to prohibit even sharing a bed when both are wearing clothing is not possible.

A number of incidents related to this issue are related.

**3. MISHNAH:** The Mishnah makes reference to a number of halachos that were discussed in the attic of Chananyah ben Chizkiya ben Garon. At the time of that discussion a vote was taken and since Beis Shamai outnumbered Beis Hillel eighteen enactments were decreed according to Beis Shamai on that day.

### 4. Clarifying the Mishnah

Abaye asks R' Yosef whether the Mishnah should read, "ואלו תני" referring to the halachos stated in the previous Mishnah or should the Mishnah read "אלו תני" referring to the halachos in the following Mishnah. The Gemara demonstrates from a Baraisa that the correct reading is "ואלו תני".

### 5. Chananyah ben Chizkiya

The Gemara notes two great accomplishments of Chananyah ben Chizkiya. The first was writing Megilas Taanis and the second was answering the difficulties found in Sefer Yechezkel.

### 6. The eighteen enactments

The Gemara begins to count the eighteen enactments by quoting a Mishnah in Zavin that lists ten issues related to tumah. ■

## Distinctive INSIGHT

### Bound in Torah

תנא דבי אליהו מעשה בתלמיד אחד וכו'

The Gemara tells the story of a Torah scholar who died young. This man's wife came to the Beis HaMidrash carrying his tefillin, and she began to complain about his shortened life. This student was very diligent, and no one was able to respond to this woman's bemoaning, finally Eliyahu discovered and exposed the tragic flaw which this young man and his wife possessed.

It is noteworthy that this woman specifically brought her late husband's tefillin with her, as if it indicated more of a reason why he did not deserve to die. Maharsha explains that she brought the tefillin to increase the anguish of the other students who would see her. **ספר גליוני הש"ס** of R' Yaakov Engel explains that tefillin specifically represents the connection which we have to Torah study. Her argument was sharper, as she demonstrated that her husband learned Torah and was bound up with Torah as his life pursuit.

R' Baruch Shimon Shneurson, the former Rosh Yeshiva of Tchebin, suggests another insight. We say that "Torah is our life and the length of our days." In fact, the more one believes and lives this concept of Torah being his life, to that degree he can expect that it will then be the length of his days. There is no comparison between one person who learns Torah occasionally and casually, and one who is totally devoted to its study day and night. The mitzvah of tefillin is that we bind it upon our arm. One who learns Torah with full commitment is also considered to be bound up with it. Therefore, this woman took her husband's tefillin as she circulated around the shuls and the Batei Midrash to demonstrate that her husband did not simply learn Torah, but he was bound up with the Torah, just as the tefillin is tied around one's arm. This accentuated her complaint that her husband should not have died young. ■

## REVIEW and Remember

1. Is one permitted to eat meat with milchigs on the table?  
\_\_\_\_\_
2. How did Ulla's behavior contradict his teaching?  
\_\_\_\_\_
3. Why did the young Talmid Chacham die?  
\_\_\_\_\_
4. Why do we not add new dates to Megilas Taanis?  
\_\_\_\_\_

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated

By Mr. and Mrs. Michael Schultz in memory of their brother

ר' חיים לייב בן ר' יצחק ע"ה

Mr. Harvey Schultz O.B.M.

# HALACHAH Highlight

## Halachic ramifications of the Gemara's discussion regarding physical sensitivity after death

אמר רבן שמעון בן גמליאל: אף אנו מחבבין את הצרות, אבל מה נעשה שאם באנו לכתוב אין אנו מספיקין ... דבר אחר אין בשר המת מרגיש באיזמל. איני? והאמר רב יצחק: קשה רימה למת כמחט בבשר החי, שנאמר (איוב כד, כב) אך בשרו עליו יכאב ונפשו עליו תאבל. אימא: אין בשר המת שבחי מרגיש באיזמל.

*Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel said: We as well cherish difficulties. The reason that we don't transcribe our salvations is because we could not manage it. Another reason why the salvations are not written is because the dead do not feel the cutting of the sharp blade. Is it really so that the dead don't feel? For Rav Yitzchak said that worms are more painful to the dead than a needle is to the flesh of the living. The Gemara responds that the previous statement should be read as: the dead flesh does not feel the cutting of the sharp blade.*

Many commentators<sup>1</sup> explain that the pain of the worm to the departed is not physical pain, because the dead have no physical sensations; rather it is a spiritual pain that affects the soul of the departed upon seeing the disgrace of the body.

The Rashba in a responsum<sup>2</sup> writes that it is permitted to pour lime on the body of a deceased person in order to hasten the decomposition and facilitate transfer to the family burial site; since this is neither disgracing, nor does the body feel pain. Rav David ibn Zimra<sup>3</sup>, the Radvaz, was questioned about the Rashba's responsum based upon our Gemara where the conclusion of the Gemara appears to sustain the view that the dead do in fact feel the pain of the blade. The Radvaz responded that the Rashba opined that

the initial opinion of the Gemara is the correct one, namely that the dead do not feel the blade at all, and the question from Rav Yitzchak's statement is relative only to worms, since they are seen as a Heavenly punishment which the deceased does feel. However, other types of pain are not felt by the deceased. The Radvaz adds that the Gemara could have answered with this very response but chose a better one.

The Chasam Sofer<sup>4</sup> answers this question based upon the above mentioned concept that the pain is not felt by the body, but rather by the soul. He explains that the Rashba addresses two points: a) the physical pain of the accelerated decomposition and b) the suffering of the soul upon seeing the body's decomposition. The Rashba contends that the body itself has no sensation of physical pain at all, and therefore the lime will not induce any physical suffering. The Gemara's contention that there is suffering after death was the soul's suffering upon seeing the disgrace of the decomposing body. In the case that the Rashba was asked, there was no humiliation to the soul with the accelerated decomposition, since that would allow for the fulfillment of the deceased person's will to be buried in the family plot. ■

1. עי' ספר חסידים (סי' תתשסג), תוס' יו"ט (אבות פ"ב משנה ז). ועי' דברי המהר"ל, רבו של התוס' יו"ט בס' גור אריה כאן. ודו"ק. ועי' בשו"ת מנחת אלעזר ח"ד (סי' כח) שהביא ראיה מגמרא דידן לאסור נתוחי מתים שהרי המת מרגיש בחתיכת האיזמל. ע"ש.
2. שו"ת הרשב"א ח"א (סי' שסט וסי' תתטז). והובא בבדק הבית (יו"ד סי' שסג) וברמ"א (שם סי' ב).
3. שו"ת הרדב"ז ח"א (סי' תפד). וכן עמד בשאלה זו מדנפשיה בשו"ת שבות יעקב ח"ב (סי' צז). ע"ש.
4. שו"ת חתם סופר ח"ו (סי' לז ד"ה א' שציוה). ועי' לרבי מנשה בן ישראל בס' נשמת חיים (מאמר ב פכ"ד ד"ה אמנה הרשב"א). והשווה לדברי הגר"ע יוסף שליט"א בס' מאור ישראל כאן. ■

## Gemara GEM

### Guarding oneself from sin

לך אמרי נזירא סחור סחור לכרמא לא תקרב

When distancing oneself from sin, it is not simply enough to say that one should avoid sinning itself. Rather, precautions and safeguards must be set up. This is illustrated in terms of a warning which is given to a nazir who is alerted to "Go away!" and to "Go around!" a

vineyard. What is this added aspect of warning which the Gemara is teaching by comparing the precaution not to sin to the extra distance which a nazir is told to maintain in order not to sin?

The Rebbe from Satmar explains that some people are willing to allow themselves to conduct their daily business in a manner which comes close to sin, as are confident that they will be able to withstand any temptation to go the next step. The lesson of this Gemara is that a person should not consider himself totally in control of a situation.

Therefore, in reference to any situation, we should be reminded that there is a person known as a nazir, who is committed to abstaining from even permitted actions as he strives to obtain higher levels of kedusha. Yet, even he is cautioned and advised to keep clear of an area where there are grapes. Therefore, for the average person who is not living in a state of heightened alert, it is certainly necessary to not sin, and to not even introduce himself into situations which are close to sin. ■

