

This month's Daf Digest is dedicated
לעילוי נשמת צבי בן יחזקאל יוסף גרין, מחסידי דעעש
From the Grin family, Sao Paulo, Brazil

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Subversive prophet

R' Chisda defines the dispute regarding the subversive prophet.

R' Hamnuna challenges this definition.

Although the challenge could be resolved R' Hamnuna nevertheless offers his own understanding of the point of dispute regarding the subversive prophet.

A Beraisa is cited that seems to contradict both explanations.

Abaye follows R' Chisda's position and explains the Beraisa in accordance with his position.

Rava follows R' Hamnuna's position and explains the Beraisa in accordance with his position.

R' Avahu in the name of R' Yochanan teaches that a prophet may instruct a temporary transgression of the Torah with the exception of idolatry.

A Beraisa is cited that supports this ruling.

Another Beraisa cites R' Akiva who disagrees whether a false prophet could make the sun stand still.

2) Zomemim of the daughter of a kohen

The source of the Mishnah's ruling that zomemim of the daughter of a kohen falsely accused of an adulterous affair are executed with strangulation is presented.

הדרן עלך אלו הן הנחנקין

3) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah teaches that all Jews have a share in the World-to-Come and then lists categories of people and certain individuals who do not have a share in the World-

(Continued on page 2)

REVIEW and Remember

1. How does the Beraisa seem to refute both R' Chisda and R' Hamnuna?

2. What people do not have a share in the World-to-Come?

3. Which type of kohen should not be given terumah?

4. How do we know that the dead will be resurrected in their clothes?

Distinctive INSIGHT

Obeying a prophet in a הוראת שעה

אמר רבי אבהו א"ר יוחנן בכל אם יאמר לך נביא עבור כל דברי תורה שמע לו וכו'

R' Abahu in the name of R' Yochanan teaches that if a person who has an established reputation as a true prophet comes and tells us that we must now violate any commandment in the Torah, we must listen to him. Earlier (89b), Rashi extends this to a situation of someone who has no status as a prophet, but he comes now and presents a credible sign or wonder to prove his veracity. This is true in regard to violating any mitzvah in the Torah, provided that he says that this ruling is only temporary, as an emergency measure (הוראת שעה). This halacha also does not apply if the prophet instructs us to worship idolatry, even as an emergency measure, even if the prophet performs a fantastic sign such as causing the sun to stand still in the middle of the sky.

In his Responsa (2:#652), רדב"ז addresses the question of whether the message of this Gemara applies in extreme cases. Can it be true that if an established prophet would come and tell us to kill a particular person, or even an entire city, would we listen to him and murder this person or persons, as a temporary measure?

רדב"ז responds by saying that originally, he also felt that the law of listening to a prophet might not apply in regard to harming other people. Perhaps, he says, the halacha of listening to a prophet to violate a law of the Torah only applies to mitzvos between man and God. For example, we would listen to the prophet to eat non-kosher, or to violate the Shabbos.

Nevertheless, רדב"ז concludes that this halacha, indeed, applies even where a prophet instructs us to act against a Torah law such as murder. The Gemara clearly states that the only exception to this rule is where the prophet instructs us to worship idolatry, and the reason is that the wonders the prophet performs to convince us of his authenticity might be used in the case of idolatry to sway us to permanently follow the idolatry. In other areas of halacha, where this reason does not apply, we would obey the prophet as a temporary measure to do anything he tells us.

The rationale for this extreme measure is that it is Hashem who gave us the Torah and Who commanded us not to murder. He is also the one who gave us the mitzvah of obeying a prophet who guides us in times of need. Therefore, if the need arises, and Hashem sends us a prophet with a timely message, we would be required to follow his instructions, even if he would tell us to destroy an entire city and its inhabitants. ■

HALACHAH Highlight

Mitzvos following resurrection

אלא מלמד שעתיד לחיות וישראל נותנין לו תרומה

Rather it teaches that he will be resurrected in the future and the people of Yisroel will give him terumah

The Gemara Niddah (61b) writes that it is acceptable to make burial shrouds (תכריכין) out of sha'atnez since in the future mitzvos will no longer be applicable. Tosafos¹ proves from this that even after a person is resurrected he is not obligated to perform mitzvos. This is evident from the fact that R' Meir proves that the dead will be resurrected wearing clothing. How could we bury the dead wearing sha'atnez if they will rise wearing those same garments? It must be that even after their resurrection they will not be bound by mitzvos. Ritva² challenges this assertion from the Gemara below (92a). The Gemara there relates that Yechezkel resurrected people and that they wore tefillin. According to Tosafos they should not have been wearing tefillin since they had died and people who are resurrected are not obligated to observe mitzvos.

Ritva suggests two answers to this challenge. The first answer is that the principle that people who are resurrected are exempt from mitzvos is limited to those people who will be resurrected in the end of days. The men who were resurrected by Yechezkel did not experience a full resurrection since they died after having children. In his second answer he suggests that the men resurrected by Yechezkel were indeed exempt from tefillin but they donned tefillin voluntarily. This is similar to the fact that our forefathers fulfilled the mitzvos of the Torah even before the Torah was given.

Rashba³ has a different understanding of the Gemara

to-Come.

(Overview...continued from page 1)

4) Resurrection

A Beraisa explains why one who denied resurrection forfeits his share of the World-to-Come.

A source in the Torah that alludes to the resurrection of the dead is presented.

D'vei R' Yishmael interprets the cited pasuk differently and accordingly it is not a source for resurrection.

Tangentially, the Gemara discusses the rule that terumah may only be given to a kohen who is a chaver.

A Beraisa cites the exposition of R' Simai that serves as the source for resurrection.

The Beraisa proceeds to present five discussions, three of which are on this daf, about the principle of resurrection. ■

Niddah's statement that "in the future – לעתיד לבא" mitzvos will not be observed. He asserts that the intent is that while a person is dead he is not obligated to observe mitzvos. For that reason it is acceptable to bury someone in shrouds made of sha'atnez. When that person is resurrected and his obligation to observe the mitzvos is restored he will have to remove the sha'atnez garment. Aruch Laner⁴ cites authorities who cite our Gemara as proof to Rashba's contention. The Gemara relates that in the future Aharon will be given terumah. The fact that he will be given terumah is a clear indication that mitzvos will be observed in the future. ■

¹ תוס' נדה ס"א: ד"ה אמר ר' יוסף.

² ריטב"א שם.

³ רשב"א שם.

⁴ ערוך לנר לקמן צ"ב. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

A portion in the World to Come

"כל ישראל יש להם חלק לעולם הבא..."

Rav Elchonon Wasserman, zt"l, would recount a compelling teaching from the Chofetz Chaim, zt"l regarding a seeming contradiction on today's daf: "The mishnah assures us that every Jew has a portion to the world to come. Yet immediately after this it lists exceptions. If there are exceptions, why does the mishnah make a blanket statement that implies that everyone has a portion unconditionally?"

"The answer can be understood by

way of a parable. Once there was a poor man who went from door to door collecting food and soliciting donations from kindly donors. A certain wealthy man had pity on him. He gave him a generous donation and a good meal. After this he brought the poor man into his pantry and filled the poor man's sack with the best food that could be had. The poor man blessed his benefactor and left his home filled with joy especially since his sack was filled with food and his pockets were filled with coins.

"Unfortunately, the sack was old and had many small tears and there were holes in his pockets. Although these were not readily noticeable, they quickly expanded enough for the bountiful gifts to

fall out of the sack one by one and his entire journey was littered with coins and valuable foodstuff which he needed, but had no way to contain.

"The same is true regarding one's portion in the world to come. Every neshama's spiritual pockets and pouches will be filled with spiritual illumination. But one who reads works of heresy makes one kind of rip while epikursus cause a different type of tear. Lending money to a fellow Jew for forbidden interest makes yet another hole as does embarrassing talmidei chachomim... Unless a person does a heartfelt teshuvah, he will have no way of enjoying his portion in the world to come."¹ ■

■ מאיר עיני ישראל, ח"ד, ע' 382