



OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Daniel and Gavriel (cont.)

The Gemara continues to relate the events related to Gavriel being thrown out of the Heavenly Court and how Daniel managed to have him reinstated.

2) The five afflictions (cont.)

An alternative source is submitted which indicates that abstaining from washing is an affliction.

This source is rejected and an alternative is accepted.

On the third attempt the Gemara is able to demonstrate that abstaining from wearing shoes constitutes affliction.

A source is identified that demonstrates that abstaining from marital relations is an affliction.

The source is unsuccessfully challenged.

3) Washing

A series of Baraisos is cited which elaborates upon the prohibition against washing and different circumstances where it is permitted.

One of the Baraisos mentioned that it is even permitted on Yom Kippur to pass through water that is up until one's neck. This statement is challenged from teachings derived from a verse in Yechezkel that describes the water that will flow in the future from the place of the Beis HaMikdash.

The challenge is refuted.

4) The stream that will emerge from the Kodesh HaKodoshim

The Gemara digresses further to discuss the water that

(Continued on page 2)

Distinctive INSIGHT

Crossing a river on Yom Kippur

עובר עד מים בצוארו ואינו חושש

The Baraisa allows one to pass through a river on Yom Kippur in order to greet his father or Rebbe, even if he will be submerged in water up to his neck. This is not a violation of the prohibition of washing, because this is not his intent. The Rishonim wonder about this halachah, because aside from the issue of washing on Yom Kippur, which can be alleviated, there is a separate prohibition of washing clothes, which is prohibited on Shabbos and Yom Tov due to the melachah of laundering. This Gemara (Zevachim 94b) defines this melachah as occurring as soon as a garment is soaked in water (שרייתו זהו כיבוסו). Why, then, is passing in a river allowed?

Tosafos Yeshanim explains that the rule of "soaking a garment in water is its laundering" only applies to a garment which has filth on it. However, a garment which is soiled due to normal wearing is not considered laundered simply by becoming wet. Alternatively, Tosafos Yeshanim cites רבינו תם who says that this rule only applies for fabrics which launder easily, such as linen. However, garments which need added "elbow grease" to become clean, such as wool, are not technically "laundered" just by being put into water.

Beis Yosef (O.C. 302) cites ריב"א who says that "soaking is laundering" is only applicable when the intent of the person in placing the garment in the water is in order to brighten and whiten the fabric. Avnei Nezer (#159) explains that if the person is just passing through a river, the fact that the soil may become loosened is only incidental (גרמא), which lacks the essential aspect of being a מחשבת מלאכה, and is therefore permitted on Shabbos. If the person has intent for this soaking to cleanse the garment, his intent has the effect of upgrading the laundering, to the extent that the act is not only גרמא, but it is a full מלאכה. ■

REVIEW and Remember

- Which angel oversees the Jewish People?

- How do we know that abstaining from wearing shoes is a form of affliction?

- Under what conditions is it permitted to wash on Yom Kippur?

- When is it prohibited to walk through water that is waist high?

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
לע"נ הרב אביגדור בן הרב שאול אלחנן ע"ה
Rabbi Victor Amster o.b.m.
On the occasion of his 31th yahrzeit
By his children Mr. and Mrs. Jeremy Amster

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
by Mr. and Mrs. Dovid Tessler
In memory of their family that was
נהרג על קידוש השם
יהא זכרם ברוך

HALACHAH Highlight

Reporting bad news

ועוד דעבדת לית לך אין משיבין על הקלקלה

Furthermore, [now that] you have done [this], do you not subscribe to the principal that one should not return with bad news?

The Gemara records a criticism directed at Gavriel for reporting bad news. This concept is recorded in Shulchan Aruch in the context of the laws of mourning. Shulchan Aruch¹ rules that one is not obligated to tell a friend that a relative of theirs passed away, even if it is the friend's mother or father². Furthermore, it is permitted to invite that friend to a wedding or other celebration since, at present, he is ignorant of the fact that his relative passed away. The reason, explains Shulchan Aruch, is that it is foolish to report bad news.

Poskim³ ask why it is permitted to invite a person to a wedding who should be mourning – does it not involve a violation of *מכשול*—placing a stumbling block before the blind?

Sefer Chassidim⁴ writes that the obligation to mourn only begins when a person is faced with the news that a relative passed away. One who is ignorant of this fact bears no obligation to mourn and therefore does violate halachah by attending celebrations. If the mourner, himself, does not violate halachah by attending a simchah those who invite him cannot be in violation of *לפני עור*.

Teshuvos Beis Yehudah writes⁵, based on our Gemara,

STORIES Off the Daf

The stream from the Beis HaMikdash

מעין היוצא מבית קדשי הקדשים בתחילה דומה לקרני חגבים...מכאן ואילך היה מתגבר ועולה

Rav Yechezkel Abramsky, zt"l, explained that the stream that emerged from the kodesh kodoshim represents the inverse relationship that exists between spirituality and physicality. The closer one is to holiness, the less one's needs are for material comforts. But as one moves further away, the tide that pulls a person toward physical luxuries gains momentum. We see this from the meanderings of the stream as it left the Beis HaMidkash. What began as a trickle only as wide as the antennae of a grass-

hopper grew wider and stronger as it moved further and further away from the epicenter of spirituality.

Once, Rav Eliezer Yehudah Finkel, zt"l, was approached by his daughter. "Father, the grocer is offering a side-board that is pretty and of high quality for just seventy zlotys. Can we buy it?"

Rav Eliezer Yehudah replied in shocked dismay, "Do you need a side-board? Did your mother have such a thing?"

When Rav Yosef Dovid Epstein, zt"l, shared this story, he expressed some puzzlement. "I didn't understand the Rosh Yeshivah's argument at first; what difference should it make if her mother had it or not? I later realized learned that the concept of mesorah, of striving to hand down the authentic Torah tradition, also

(Overview...Continued from page 1)

will flow from the Beis HaMikdash and explores the verse's statement that no one will be able to pass through the water.

A description is given of the way this stream will widen as it progresses further and further from the Kodesh HaKodoshim. ■

that reporting bad news is a full-fledged prohibition of equal weight to the prohibition against a mourner violating his mourning. Therefore, we apply the principle⁶, "We do not tell a person to sin in order to benefit a friend by preventing him from sin." Meaning, why should the person who knows of the death report the bad news, thus violating a prohibition, in order to save his friend from violating his mourning? The only alternative is to say nothing, although the person will unknowingly participate in activities that, had he known better, would violate halachah. ■

1. שו"ע יו"ד סי' ת"ב סע' י"ב כתב, "מי שמת לו מת ולא נודע לו, אינו חובה שיאמרו לו, ואפילו באביו ואמו. ועל זה נאמר: מוציא דבה הוא כסיל (משלי י, יח) ומותר להזמין לסעודת אירוסין ונישואין וכל שמחה, כיון שאינו יודע"
2. ע"ש ברמ"א שכתב וז"ל, "ומכל מקום בבנים זכרים נהגו להודיע כדי שיאמרו קדיש, אבל בבנות, אין מנהג כלל להודיעם"
3. תשובת מהר"ש הלוי חי"ד סי' כ' המובא בגליון המהרש"א לשו"ע שם וכן בשו"ת בית יהודה ח"א יו"ד סי' י"ז
4. ספר חסידים סי' תת"ג וז"ל, "א' שמע שמת קרוב של אשתו... אמרו לו לא היית צריך [להגיד לה] כי אין אבילות נוהגת קודם שמועה" ע"ש בברית עולם ומקור חסד שהביאו עוד פוסקים ע"ז ואכמ"ל
5. שו"ת בית יהודה הנ"ל
6. ע' גמ' שבת ד'. דאיתא שם, "וכי אומרים לו לאדם חטא כדי שיזכה חברך?" ■

applies to one's standard of living. Although there are changes in reality from one generation to the next, such as the availability of electricity, one should nevertheless make an effort to alter one's standard of living as little as possible from that of the earlier generations."

The Alter of Novhardok, zt"l, said that failing to do so could be compared to traveling east by train while walking through the cars in a westerly direction. If the train is moving swiftly to the east, what headway can one's steps possibly make against the "current" of the train?

He would conclude, "When you are hurtling headlong into gashmiyus, how can your efforts to achieve a high quality spiritual life have any real impact? It's like trying to move in two opposite directions at the same time!" ■