

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Blood of a wound (cont.)

R' Nachman's explanation of the phrase "blood of a wound" is unsuccessfully challenged.

A related incident is cited.

2) Black

Rabba bar R' Huna explains the meaning of the term חרת.

A Beraisa is cited in support of this interpretation.

A Statement in the Beraisa is unsuccessfully challenged.

The Gemara proves that the Mishnah's reference is to dried ink rather than liquid ink.

Different Amoraim give examples of items that are as black as the black referenced in the Mishnah.

3) Examining colors

R' Yehudah in the name of Shmuel gives guidelines for examining colors on the bedikah cloth.

R' Yitzchok bar Avudimi gives different guidelines.

R' Yirmiyah of Difti asserts that there is no disagreement between these guidelines but R' Ashi rejects this assertion and contends that there is a disagreement.

4) Deeper or weaker shades

Ulla asserts that deeper shades of the colors enumerated are teime'im and weaker shades are tahorim.

This position is unsuccessfully challenged.

R' Ami bar Abba offers another opinion regarding weaker shades.

This position is unsuccessfully challenged.

A second version of R' Ami bar Abba's position is recorded.

Bar Kappara maintains a third position about this matter followed by a related incident.

5) Crocus plant

The Beraisa teaches that the Mishnah refers to a moist crocus plant rather than one that is withered.

Four different Beraisos identify different places on the plant to compare to blood.

Abaye reconciles the Beraisos.

The rabbis clarified another relevant point related to the crocus plant.

6) Earth colors

One Beraisa presents different opinions how to produce earth colors.

Another related Beraisa is cited.

The Gemara searches for clarity regarding the last point of the Beraisa but the matter is left unresolved.

Additional teachings and related incidents are presented.

7) Examining blood

The Gemara recounts the attitude of different Amoraim about training to examine blood.

Additional related incidents are recorded.

(Overview...continued on page 2)

Distinctive INSIGHT

Wearing white clothes when others are wearing black

אל תקברוני לא בכלים שחורים ולא בכלים לבנים. שחורים שמא אזכה וכו', לבנים שמא לא אזכה ואהיה כחתן בין האבלים

In its discussion clarifying different shades and hues of the color black, the Gemara informs us that the uniforms of the bathhouse attendants in a distant land was a black color which would be tamei. This is challenged from a statement of R' Yannai, which is then resolved.

R' Yannai told his children not to bury him in black or white shrouds, but rather ones that were reddish, similar to the uniforms of the bathhouse attendants. Rashi explains R' Yannai's instructions to his children. "Do not bury me in black shrouds, because I hope to merit to be in Gan Eden, where the tzaddikim wear white. I do not want to appear as a mourner among grooms (it would be embarrassing to appear as one who is evil among the righteous). However, do not bury me in white shrouds, because I might not merit to be in Gan Eden, and I will appear as a groom among mourners, which is similarly inappropriate. Rather, bury me in reddish shrouds, which is an intermediate color." Aruch LaNer explains that red is symbolic of the process of teshuva, as the verse (Yeshayahu 1:18) relates that one's sins which are described as being red will change to white with the teshuva process.

Tur (Y.D. 352) cites a Beraisa where R' Nosson says that the clothes in which a person is buried will be the ones which he will be wearing at the time of the resurrection of the dead. Furthermore, in the Gemara in Kesubos (111b) R' Chiya teaches that the righteous will rise from their graves fully clothed. He notes that a wheat seed is planted by itself without any covering, but it grows and rises from the ground fully enveloped and covered with sprigs and sprays. Tur explains that it is based upon the statement of R' Nosson that R' Yannai instructed his sons to bury him in red shrouds, not ones that were black or white. Tur concludes that our custom is to bury the dead in white shrouds. This is also the ruling of Shulchan Aruch (ibid., 352:2).

The statement of R' Yannai suggests that a groom should not wear white when he is among mourners, who are all wearing black. In the community of the Panim Me'iros people had the custom of wearing black on Shabbos. He was asked whether one could wear white clothes on Shabbos, which is recommended based upon Kabbalah, although many people wore black. He answered that perhaps there is no advantage to wearing white in his days, because we find that R' Yannai notes that a groom, who has reason to celebrate, does not feel comfortable or happy wearing white if no one else around him is dressed similarly. Perhaps the kabbalists themselves only spoke about a culture where people were not all wearing black. He concludes that under such circumstances, one should dress modestly, at least in public, and wear white in his own home if he wishes. ■

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated by
 the Wilk, Greenwald & Krasner families in loving memory of our father

ר' אברהם אשר זעליג בן ר' משה יוסף, ע"ה

HALACHA Highlight

Issuing a ruling after a ruling was already issued

חכם שטימא אין חברו רשאי לטהר
If a Torah scholar declared something tamei his colleague may not declare it tahor

The Gemara mentions the principle recorded in the Beraisa that once a Torah scholar declares something tamei his colleague may not declare it tahor. There is a debate amongst the Rishonim concerning the rationale for this restriction and whether בדיעבד the second ruling takes effect. According to Rashi¹ the reason the second Torah scholar may not issue a ruling is that it is disrespectful to the first Torah scholar. Ran² adds that when the second Torah scholar issues a lenient ruling it appears as though there are two Torahs. According to these reasons if the second Torah scholar issued a ruling it is a valid ruling. Ra'avad³ disagrees that the issue is the honor of the first Torah scholar; rather once the first Torah scholar issued his ruling that the object is tamei he actually made that object tamei. Once it is tamei another Torah scholar cannot declare that same object tahor and the second ruling is not a valid ruling altogether.

Aruch HaShulchan⁴ wonders why this ruling is not cited by Rambam or Shulchan Aruch. He suggested that nowadays that sefarim are readily available the halacha is no longer applicable. The restriction applied when the argument related to different perspectives without either scholar having proof to his perspective. Nowadays, all of our rulings can be traced back to the Gemara or one of the earlier Poskim and it is very rare that someone would issue a

REVIEW and Remember

1. Why did R' Yannai not want to be buried in black or white shrouds ?

2. How does one make "earth water" ?

3. How did Rava impress Ifra Hurmiz ?

4. What light should be used to examine bedikah cloths ?

ruling that is based on rationale without a source to support that position, therefore the restriction does not apply.

Teshuvos Mishnah Halachos⁵ was asked about the common practice to ask the same question to numerous Torah scholars. Seemingly, this practice is in violation of this restriction. He answered by noting that Rema⁶ already ruled that it is permitted for someone to ask the same question to numerous Torah scholars as long as one informs the second Torah scholar that the question was already posed to another Torah scholar and how he ruled. The prohibition is for the second Torah scholar to issue a ruling against the first Torah scholar but the restriction was never on the one asking the question. ■

¹ רש"י ד"ה מעיקרא.
² ר"ן ע"ז ג. בדפי הר"י ד"ה הנשאל.
³ פירוש הראב"ד לע"ז ז. ד"ה ת"ר.
⁴ ערוה"ש יו"ד סי' רמ"ב סעי' ס"ג.
⁵ שו"ת משנה הלכות ח"ח סי' קל"ח.
⁶ רמ"א יו"ד סי' רמ"ב סעי' ל"א. ■

STORIES off the Daf

"God's Secrets Are for Those Who Fear Him"

"מרעא דארעא דישראל..."

When the Badatz wished to appoint the Satmar Rav, zt"l, to be the Gaon Av Beis Din of Yerushalayim, they sent Rav Yosef Sheinberger, zt"l, to present him with a special letter of appointment. When the Satmar Rav noticed that the letter used the language of מרעא דארעא דישראל, he smiled and said jokingly, "Here I am in Brooklyn, and they call me מרעא דארעא דישראל?"

Rav Sheinberger respectfully pointed out that there was a precedent to use this title for a great rav outside of Eretz Yisrael. "When the student of the illustrious Vilna

Gaon, the author of Taklin Chaditin, zt"l, wrote a letter from Eretz Yisrael to the Chasam Sofer, he also refers to him as מרעא דארעא דישראל."

The Satmar Rav immediately responded with awe, "Nu, the holy Chasam Sofer... who can compare to him? Who is his equal? סוד ה' ליראינו. The holy Chasam Sofer!"

Rav Sheinberger felt that applying the verse סוד ה' ליראינו must have some relevance, but could not figure out what it might be.

When he recounted this strange story to Rav Dovid Jungreis, zt"l, the rav explained the connection. "You know we find this expression used three times in shas to allude to Rabbi Elazar. In Niddah we find why specifically Rabbi Elazar merited this title. The gemara explains there that he had special discernment alluded to in the verse, סוד ה' ליראינו. He could tell something or

someone's character merely by his scent, as we find in Sanhedrin regarding Moshiach. We see that this expression is only applicable to one who, like Moshiach, has such discernment, he can 'sniff out' holiness and its opposite."¹ ■

¹ עולמות שחרבו, ע"י נ"א ■

(Overview...continued from page 1)

The Gemara inquires whether a woman is believed to say that she showed blood of a similar color to a Torah scholar and he declared it tahor.

Two unsuccessful attempts to resolve this matter are recorded and the matter is left unresolved.

An incident involving Rebbi is presented and explained.

The Gemara relates that different Amoraim would use different types of light to examine bloodstains. ■

