

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Gid hanasheh (cont.)

R' Ashi and Ravina offer alternative explanations of the Mishnah that was cited in an unsuccessful attempt to clarify R' Yehudah's position concerning the uncertainty of whether it is the Torah or logic that dictates that it is the gid hanasheh of the right thigh that is prohibited.

Another unsuccessful attempt to clarify R' Yehudah's position is cited.

A Beraisa is cited that proves that R' Yehudah is certain that it is the gid hanasheh from the right side that is prohibited.

R' Yehudah's position is further clarified.

Rava suggests a source for R' Yehudah's position and the response of Rabanan to that source.

R' Yehoshua ben Levi suggests an alternative source for R' Yehudah.

Tangentially the Gemara presents two versions of how the angel presented himself to Yaakov Avinu.

The response of Rabanan to this is recorded.

Additional expositions related to gid hanasheh are presented.

An exposition related to Yaakov Avinu's fight with the angel is recorded.

R' Yitzchok infers from a related pasuk that a Torah scholar should not go outside at night.

Other Amoraim cite different sources for this ruling.

2) Yaakov Avinu's dream

The Gemara begins to exposit the pesukim that lead up and describe Yaakov Avinu's dream of the Angels going up and down a ladder.

3) Yaakov Avinu's fight with the angel

The Gemara returns to its analysis of the pesukim that relate to Yaakov Avinu's fight with the angel.

4) The angel's praise of God

The Gemara challenges R' Chananel in the name of Rav's description of how different groups of angels praise God forcing a revision of R' Chananel in the name of Rav's statement.

The description of the manner in which angels praise Hashem as recorded in the Beraisa is challenged. ■

Distinctive INSIGHT

The confrontation with the Angel of Eisav

ויאבק איש עמו עד עלות השחר

The Gemara discusses several aspects of the encounter between Yaakov Avinu and the Angel of Eisav. As a result of this battle, we have the mitzvah not to eat from the gid hanasheh, described in Bereshis (32:33): "Therefore Bnei Yisrael are not to eat the sciatic nerve."

It is interesting to note that many miracles of salvation which our people encountered are commemorated by positive action. The Exodus is celebrated with Pesach, matzah, and marror. Our wanderings in the desert are noted with the mitzvah of Sukkah. Purim and Chanukah are holidays which are marked with the reading of the Megilla and with the lighting of candles respectively. Why, then, is this victory over the forces of Eisav remembered by a prohibition against eating the sciatic nerve - gid hanasheh?

In his Darash Moshe, Rav Moshe Feinstein, zt"l, explains that there is no doubt that to withstand the trials and tribulations of living in the immoral society that surrounds us is a commendable accomplishment. However, ideally, we would rather not be faced with these tests, so that we may live our lives with a clear focus on the lofty levels to which we aspire. Thus we pray each morning "Yehi ratzon...she'lo navo liyedei nisayon" - "May it be Your will...that we should not be brought to be tested." The encounter with the angel of Eisav represents the cultural influences of society to which we are exposed during our trek through the Diaspora. We are consistently confronted by these value systems which are contrary to Torah, and we struggle to preserve our holy status even as it is under assault. Therefore, in order to commemorate this battle, we distance ourselves from the gid hanasheh, as if to beseech God, "If You give us this test, we will accept the challenge with love and we will take the proactive role we need to overcome the tempest."

However, we would rather not encounter the Angel of Eisav at all, so that we could, instead, concentrate all our efforts toward our growth and bonding with Avinu Malkeinu. ■

*Today's Daf Digest is dedicated by Dr. and Mrs. Merrill Zahtz
In loving memory of their father*

ר' חיים אלטער בן ר' יחזקאל, ע"ה

*Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
לעילוי נשמת דבורה בת יוסף מאניס*

By the Rimel family, Neve Tzuf, Israel

HALACHA Highlight

Is it prohibited to allow property to become destroyed as a result of inaction

מכאן לצדיקים שחביב עליהם ממונם יותר מגופם

This indicates that for the righteous their money is dearer to them than their bodies

Rambam¹ writes that it is prohibited to cut down a fruit tree and it is also prohibited to restrain the canal of water that is directed towards a tree in order that it should dry up. Chazon Ish² explains that what Rambam means with his second phrase is that it is prohibited to redirect a stream of water away from the tree so that it should dry up. The reason this is prohibited is that one is performing an act that causes the destruction of the tree. On the other hand, if a tree required one to physically carry water to the tree it would be permitted to refrain from bringing water to the tree since in this case the tree will dry up as a result of his inaction – שב ואל תעשה. Nevertheless, he writes that one should not refrain from watering a fruit tree since our Gemara teaches that righteous people find their money dear to them since it did not come to them by theft. It was for that reason that Ya'akov Avinu went back to retrieve the forgotten jars. Obviously had he not gone back to retrieve the jars he would not have violated the prohibition since they would have been destroyed though his inaction. It was only due to his piety that he felt compelled to retrieve his jars.

REVIEW and Remember

1. Why is one not punished with lashes for leaving the Korban Pesach until morning ?

2. How did the angel appear to Yaakov Avinu ?

3. How wide was the ladder in Yaakov's dream ?

4. How do the different groups of angels sing God's praise ?

Teshuvos Shevet Halevi³ writes that the custom is that when it is necessary for someone to cut down a tree out of some necessity he refrains from watering the tree so that it dries up. Since this is done by inaction it does not violate the prohibition of **בל תשחית**. Once the tree has dried up it is permitted to cut it down. Along the same lines Rav Moshe Feinstein⁴ ruled that once someone threw something away, even if he violated the prohibition of **בל תשחית** in the process one is not obligated to attempt to prevent it from being destroyed. The prohibition is to actively destroy things but there is no prohibition to allow things to become destroyed. ■

¹ רמב"ם פ"ו מהל' מלכים ה"ח.
² חזו"א על שרמב"ם שם.
³ שו"ת שבט הלוי ח"ו סי' קי"ב אות ב' סק"ד.
⁴ שו"ת אג"מ יו"ד ח"ב סי' קע"ד ענף ג'. ■

STORIES off the Daf

To the Right

"המהלך לימין רבו הרי זה בור..."

The Satmar Rav, zt"l, was known for piety, his vast knowledge and his lightning-quick answers to any question posed to him in all areas of Torah. His replies were exceedingly brilliant, yet the Satmar Rav was very humble and loved to honor others while fleeing from honor himself.

When the Satmar Rav once paid the Ahavas Yisrael of Vizhnitz, zt"l, a visit, the latter motioned for the rav to sit down in the seat on his right side. The Satmar Rav did so and then immediately gave over a teaching which showed his humility and his erudition all at once.

"Although our sages tell us in Yoma and in Chullin that a student lacks basic manners if he stands to the right when accompanying his teacher, this is irrelevant to the present case. It is not for nothing that the Gemara discusses specifically the case of one who is walking. It does not say one who 'sits' with his teacher—a much more usual situation—since there is nothing disgraceful about sitting to the right of one's teacher."

The Imrei Chaim, zt"l—who was also present—wished to convey to the illustrious visitor that he might have been given the seat to the right of the Vizhnitzer Rebbe because of his personal stature and greatness. "If the Satmar Rav is not the student, there would be no question even if he sat to the right. In any case, surely a Jew must always be mehalech, must advance in spiritual matters. Maybe

this is why it says mehalech: to teach that whatever the student is doing he is moving forward..."

The Satmar Rav immediately answered deftly, "Although there are many halachos for how a student should treat his teacher, during learning the custom is not to be particular about this. The gemara singles out mehalech because there is a substantial difference between going and sitting or the like. Yosef adjures his brothers, **אל תרגזו בדרך**. Rashi explains that warned them to refrain from learning halachah in depth. Presumably while on the road there should be no halachic discourse. This is why specifically a student who goes to the right of his teacher while walking is considered empty. But during learning there is no disgrace in this."¹ ■

¹ קדוש ישראל, ח"ב ■

