

## OVERVIEW of the Daf

### 1) Righteous people (cont.)

The Gemara makes an inference from the incident in which Rabbi accepted the testimony of someone who related something that was novel.

Different versions of expressing that we do not reject such testimony are presented.

The sources for the different ways this thought could be expressed are identified

### 2) Beis Shan

Yehudah the son of R' Shimon ben Pazi unsuccessfully challenges the conclusion of the previous discussion that Beis Shan is not a part of Eretz Yisroel.

R' Yirmiyah and R' Zeira discuss whether there was basis for Rabbi to exempt Beis Shan from terumos and ma'asros.

### 3) Righteous people (cont.)

The Gemara recounts the incident that led R' Zeira to assume that God would not allow a righteous person to mistakenly eat something that is prohibited.

R' Yosef makes an observation about R' Pinchas Yair who is the focus of this incident.

The necessity to separate terumos and ma'asros for produce that one will feed his animal is clarified.

At the end of the incident Rabbi commented that righteous people are greater in their lifetime than they are in death.

R' Pappa and Abaye discuss whether the proof that righteous people are greater in their lifetime than they are in death is a valid proof.

R' Yehoshua ben Levi explains why mules are called ימים.

This explanation is unsuccessfully challenged.

Tangentially, R' Chanina declares that even sorcery cannot affect a person unless God decreed a punishment for that person.

A related incident involving R' Chanina is cited.

R' Chanina also teaches that a person does not even stub his toe if it was not decreed from above.

R' Elazar and Rava further discuss a stubbed toe.

A final statement regarding Pinchas ben Yair is presented. ■

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated  
Rabbi and Mrs. Eli Meystel  
in honor of the Bar-Mitzvah  
of their son, Simcha

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated  
Mr. and Mrs. Yoel Reifer  
in honor of the Bar-Mitzvah  
of their son, Benzy

## Distinctive INSIGHT

*Leaving room for later generations to make their mark*

מקום הניחו לו אבותיו להתגדר בו

As a result of testimony by R' Yehoshua b. Zeiruz, Rebbe ruled that fruits and vegetables which grow in Beis Shan were exempt from terumah and ma'aser gifts. Rebbe's extended family members rose up against his ruling, and they wondered how he could release the obligation for tithing from items grown in Beis Shan, an area which his ancestors had deemed to be obligated in these halachos. Rebbe responded and said that this was an area of halacha which his ancestors had left for Rebbe to rule and to thereby be credited with this decision. Rebbe illustrated that a similar scenario is recorded in Tanach, where we are told that King Chizkiyahu ground up the copper snake made by Moshe Rabeinu to alleviate a devastating plague that threatened the nation. Later, this copper image was abused by the people, as they began to offer incense to it for idolatrous purposes. This is why Chizkiyahu had it destroyed. The Gemara notes that it is wondrous to think that this image which was being used for idolatrous purposes was not destroyed much earlier. Why would Assa and Yehoshafat, both righteous kings, not have destroyed this statue earlier? Rather, it must be that they left it intact in order for Chizkiyahu to take care of the matter.

Rashi explains that Chizkiyahu's ancestors left him this very important job to do, because if there were no momentous tasks for him to do, his name would not be famous and respected. Rabeinu Gershom explains that his ancestors left him this job in order for him to be remembered by it.

Maharsha asks, that if this was the intent of his ancestors, why would the righteous kings who preceded Chizkiyahu tolerate a symbol used for idolatry just in order to allow Chizkiyahu to come and be the one to destroy it and be cred-

*Continued on page 2)*

## REVIEW and Remember

1. How could Beis Shan be outside of Eretz Yisroel if a pasuk states that it is part of Eretz Yisroel?
2. In what quality was R' Pinchas ben Yair greater than Moshe Rabbeinu and the rest of his generation?
3. What caused Rabbi's face to shine with joy?
4. According to R' Chanina, what is the meaning of the phrase אין עוד מלבדו?

# HALACHAH Highlight

## The prohibition against causing animals to suffer

עקרנא להו ... קטלנא להו

Should I maim them? ... Should I kill them?

Teshuvus Avodas Hagershuni<sup>1</sup> wrote that the prohibition against causing animals to suffer (צער בעלי חיים) does not apply when one is killing the animal. Proof to this is found in our Gemara in the incident involving R' Pinchas ben Yair. When R' Pinchas ben Yair saw the white donkeys in Rebbi's household he refused to enter. As they negotiated Rebbi offered to maim the animals so that they would no longer be able to kick and R' Pinchas ben Yair responded that such a course of action is not an option since it is prohibited to cause animals to suffer. Rebbi then offered to kill the animals and R' Pinchas ben Yair rejected this suggestion as well since it would involve wasting a valuable object (בל תשחית). The fact that R' Pinchas ben Yair did not invoke a concern for the suffering of the animals when Rebbi suggested that he would kill the animals indicates that the prohibition against causing an animal to suffer is not violated when one kills an animal.

Teshuvus Noda B'yehudah<sup>2</sup> was asked by someone who had a large piece of property that included forests with all sorts of animals whether it was permitted to go hunting. Does such a sport violate the prohibitions against causing animals to suffer or בל תשחית? Noda B'yehudah responded that there is no reason to elaborate on the matter since Terumas HaDeshen<sup>3</sup> has already addressed the matter and made it clear that anything that serves a person's needs does not violate the prohibition against causing an animal to suffer. Furthermore, the

(Insight...continued from page 1)

ited with this accomplishment? Toras Chaim also asks why the kings would have deliberately left a symbol of idolatry for their children to destroy, when there was no guarantee that their sons would be righteous.

Maharsha and Toras Chaim explain that this copper snake was not intentionally left for later generations. After their monumental efforts to rid Eretz Yisroel of idolatry, some remnants of idolatry lingered. It thereafter became apparent that this copper snake of Moshe was destined to be an accomplishment which Chizkiayhu was to take care of.

Lev Aryeh explains that because the copper snake of Moshe Rabeinu was not made to be for idolatry, these earlier righteous kings tried to prevent the people from worshipping it as an idol. They did have some success, and they determined that it should not be destroyed, and that their children would have to make decisions as time passed regarding how to handle it. King Chizkiyahu realized that the situation had deteriorated, so he had it destroyed. ■

prohibition against causing an animal to suffer is violated only when one does something to an animal that causes it pain and leaves it alive suffering in pain but killing an animal does not violate the prohibition. He also cites our Gemara as proof that killing an animal does not violate the prohibition of צער בעלי חיים. Sdei Chemed<sup>4</sup>, however, cites authorities who maintain that killing animals for no purpose does violate the prohibition against causing animals to suffer. ■

1. שו"ת עבודת הגרשוני סי' י"ג.
2. שו"ת נודע ביהודה מהדו"ת יו"ד סי' י'.
3. שו"ת תרומת הדשן פסקים וכתבים סי' ק"ה.
4. שדי חמד מערכת צ' כלל ב'. ■

# STORIES Off the Daf

## On the Way to a Mitzvah

"והוא דקאזיל בדבר מצוה..."

Rav Shlomo of Bovov, ז"ל, once presided at an engagement on Motzei Shabbos. After he read the betrothal agreement, he broke the plate as is customary. Somehow, however, he cut his finger in the very act of breaking the plate. He did not lose his equanimity for a moment and even looked extremely joyful as he shared an idea with the celebrants.

"We find in Sotah 7 that forty days before an embryo is formed a heavenly

voice declares, 'The daughter of so-and-so is destined for so-and-so.' Similarly, in Chulin 7 we find that one does not cut his finger unless a heavenly voice announced this from on high. Both this match and my cut were the subject of a heavenly voice!"<sup>1</sup>

Perhaps we can understand the rebbe's joy in light of the following story. A certain talmid chacham approached the Steipler, ז"ל, and asked that he daven for his son whose foot was swollen. He had received an injury – while on the way to perform a mitzvah – which had become worse and inflicted much pain.

The Steipler's reply surprised him. "If your son got wounded while on the

way to do a mitzvah I am jealous of him. God should help him recover! But you should know that it is a huge merit to be wounded on the way to or while doing a mitzvah. We find in this in Chulin 7. There we see that splitting one's toe by doing a mitzvah effects atonement like an olah. The Chofetz Chaim, ז"ל, would say that if one received a wound on his entire foot, this is a greater merit. This is clear since even a second wound on the big toe is easier to bear than a wound on the entire foot upon which one stands. Your son's merit is even greater than one who brings a korban!"<sup>2</sup> ■

1. בית צדיקים—באבוב, ע"י פ"ז
2. אורחות רבינו, ח"א, ע"רמ"ג ■