

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Generation of the flood (cont.)

The Gemara finishes the additional incident related to dirt.

2) Generation of dispersion

The Gemara discusses what the generation of dispersion did to lose their share in the World-to-Come.

A Beraisa cites another opinion regarding the sin of the generation of dispersion.

R' Yochanan explained what happened to the tower they were building.

Rav reports that the air where the tower once stood causes forgetfulness.

3) The People of Sedom

A Beraisa proves that the people of Sedom do not have a portion in the World-to-Come.

R' Yehudah offers an alternative explanation of the same pasuk as well as another verse.

A Beraisa elaborates on the sins of Sedom.

Another Beraisa identifies the cause of the Sedomites' haughtiness.

Two expositions of Rava related to Sedomites are presented.

Verses from Iyov are explained as descriptions of the wickedness of the Sedomites.

A related story is presented. The Gemara elaborates on some of the unjust laws of Sedom.

(Continued on page 2)

REVIEW and Remember

1. What was the sin of the generation of dispersion?

2. How did the Sedomites find the hidden wealth of travelers?

3. Why did the Sedomite judges want to charge Eliezer for receiving a beating?

4. With which groups did Yaakov not want to be associated?

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
By Mr. & Mrs. Ira Arthur Clair and family in memory of
מרת אסתר רייזל בת ר' אפרים פישל, ע"ה
Mrs. Esther Clair O.B.M.

Distinctive INSIGHT

The message of salt and honey

הויה ההיא רביתא דהות קא מפקא ריפתא לעניא בחצבא, איגלאי מלתא שפיוה דובשא ואוקמוה על איגר שורא וכו'

The verse regarding the sins of Sodom states that "God said: 'Because the outcry of Sodom and Amora has become great, and because their sin has been very grave.'"

Rashi cites our Gemara which states that the cry was that of a certain girl who had been killed by the people of Sodom and Amora because they discovered that she had given some food to a poor person. It had been a torturous death. They covered her with honey, which attracted swarms of bees, which stung her until she died. Obviously, in choosing this type of death, the people were sending a specific message. Just what was that message?

Let us also consider that Lot's wife turned into a pillar of salt. Rashi says that this punishment was measure for measure for her refusing to give even a pinch of salt to guests. Thus we have incidents in Sodom involving both honey and salt.

There is another place in the Torah where honey and salt are mentioned together. In reference to an offering, the Torah says that every offering requires salt. However, the Torah states that no offering can have leaven or honey. How does this relate to our question?

Rabbi Moshe Schechter explains that honey represents the delicacies and extras of life - the indulgences. Salt, on the other hand, represents simplicity, the opposite of indulgence. "A pinch of salt" tells us that a person can suffice with the minimum - the basic necessities of life. We dip our bread in salt to demonstrate that when it comes to physical activities such as eating, we try to remember the lesson of salt. On the altar, which is Hashem's table, the message of salt goes with everything. The message of indulgence, however, is banned from the altar.

The commentaries explain that the lifestyle of Sodom was one of total emphasis on materialistic gains and over-indulgences. They lived with the message of honey and disdained the message of salt. That is why Lot's wife refused to give salt to the poor, and why the people of Sodom chose to use honey to kill the girl who gave to the poor, since giving to the poor is unacceptable in a society that places all its emphasis on material gain. They covered her with honey to demonstrate that here we live with the message of honey, but in the end, Hashem punished Sodom with Sulphur and salt - (see Devarim 29:22) as if to say that what Sodom lacked was the message of salt. ■

HALACHAH Highlight

Stealing less than a perutah numerous times

אתי כל חד וחד שקיל חדא

Each one would come and take a single [brick]

The Gemara relates that one of the sins of the Sedomites was that when a person had a row of bricks citizens would come and take a single brick for themselves. Over time the owner was left without any bricks but each one claimed that he took only one brick. Maharsha¹ explains that each brick was worth less than a perutah and that is how they rationalized this form of theft. This type of behavior is a springboard for a debate about stealing less than a perutah. Although stealing less than a perutah is prohibited, when the amount is so insignificant there is no obligation on the thief to return the stolen money or object. What is the halacha if someone stole less than a perutah numerous times so that the total amount stolen is more than a perutah? Is the thief obligated to return the stolen property or not?

Minchas Chinuch² suggests that the answer to this question depends upon why it is unnecessary to return less than a perutah. Is the reason because half a perutah is only "חצי שיעור—half a measure" and one is only obligated to return a "full measure," or is the reason that people forgive such a small amount of money (מחילה)? Magid Mishnah³ writes explicitly that stealing less than a perutah is considered חצי שיעור. Since it is only a חצי שיעור there is no obligation to return it even though it was prohibited to steal it in the first place as with any prohibition that חצי שיעור is prohibited. The Gemara earlier (57a, 59a) seems to indicate that the reason less than a perutah does not have to be returned is that such a small amount is forgiven.

STORIES Off the Daf

The Eishes Chayil

ואי מר רביה אנת תלמידיה

The Tchebiner Rav, ז"ל, recounted that when Rav Yizchok of Vorke, ז"ל, passed away, some of his chassidim became followers of his son, Rav Yaakov Dovid of Amshinov, ז"ל. But most of the chassidim decided to follow Rav Mendeleh of Vorke, ז"ל, since he was more down-to-earth and was more involved with the common folk.

But on the day when Rav Mendeleh became rebbe he changed drastically. "In Sanhedrin 109 we find that Ohn Ben Peles' wife saved him from Korach. She did this by frankly saying, 'What difference

does this dispute make to you? No matter who becomes rav, you will still remain the student.' Although the Gemara attributes great chochmah to his wife, we may certainly ask what wisdom was necessary to make such a simple point?

"The answer is that Korach claimed that the entire nation is holy and that there should be no leader at all. But she was intelligent enough to see through this ruse since she understood that there would always be someone people must nullify themselves to and receive from."

From that day, Rav Mendeleh changed his ways, speaking very little even to those who were close to him.¹

Rav Yehudah Rabinowitz, ז"ל, a student of the Tchebiner Rav, compared Ohn's wife to the wife of Korach. "Ohn's

wife saved him by uncovering her hair when Korach arrived. Korach's wife, by contrast, talked him into making a machlokes in the first place. It is possible that some allow the hair of a woman to remain uncovered on her wedding day to symbolize that she should be like Ohn's wife and steer her husband away from machlokes. We can also explain similarly why we send the new chosson a tallis. This symbolizes to him that he should never allow himself to be drawn into a machlokes like Korach who foolishly listened to his wife. He should never be like Korach who made an argument by claiming that a tallis that is all techeiles is not obligated in tzitzis."² ■

1. שר התורה ע' 665

2. כרם חמד, ח"א, ע' ר"א ■

(Overview...continued from page 1)

Examples of the corruption of Sedom's judicial system are presented.

A number of stories of when Eliezer the slave of Avrohom visited Sedom are recounted.

4) The spies and Korach's followers

The sections of the Mishnah discussing the spies and Korach's followers are recorded.

A Beraisa is cited that supports R' Eliezer's position that the followers of Korach do have a portion in the World-to-Come.

The Gemara expounds on the first verse of the Korach story.

The story of Ohn ben Peles is retold. ■

Accordingly, continues Minchas Chinuch, it could be said that the question of returning many thefts that total more than a perutah is subject to this debate⁴. According to Magid Mishnah the exemption from returning less than a perutah was that it was חצי שיעור but once he has stolen numerous times and the amount equals more than a perutah the measurement has been reached and he is obligated to return the money. According to the Gemara's explanation each time he stole the owner exempted him from returning such an insignificant amount. As such, we do not combine all the thefts together since by the time the subsequent theft occurs the owner has already exempted the thief from returning the earlier theft. ■

1. מהרש"א לסוגיין

2. מנחת חינוך מצוה ק"ל אות ד'

3. מגיד משנה פ"א מהל' גניבה ה"ב

4. וכן נראה מלשון ספר חינוך מצוה ק"ל ■