



OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) A town that became subverted on its own

The Gemara inquires whether a town that became subverted on its own is punished as a subverted city.

An unsuccessful attempt to resolve this inquiry is presented.

2) Subverted city

The Gemara inquires what is done with idolaters before it could be determined whether the majority of residents are idolaters.

R' Yehudah makes a suggestion.

Ulla challenges this explanation and offers an alternative answer.

R' Yochanan and Reish Lakish disagree about the procedure to follow before it is determined that the majority of the residents are idolaters.

Reish Lakish's position is challenged and consequently revised.

3) Travelers

A Beraisa discusses what happens when travelers were present when a city was determined to be a subverted city.

The ruling of the Beraisa is challenged.

Rava offers a solution to the challenge.

A Beraisa is cited that supports this distinction.

4) Destroying property

A Beraisa discusses what happens to property that is physically out of the city, and the property of righteous people in the city.

R' Chisda clarifies a halacha in the Beraisa.

R' Chisda rules that deposits of a subverted city are permitted.

This ruling is clarified.

The fate of property that is jointly owned with a resident from outside of the subverted city is discussed.

R' Chisda inquires whether slaughtering an animal from a subverted city keeps it from becoming neveilah.

The question remains unresolved.

R' Yosef inquires whether the hair of righteous women is prohibited.

After clarifying the inquiry the Gemara leaves the matter unresolved.

(Continued on page 2)

REVIEW and Remember

1. What is the procedure for determining whether a majority of the residents of a city are idolaters?
2. What is the difference between an animal that is jointly owned and dough that is jointly owned?
3. What is the point of dispute between R' Yochanan and Reish Lakish concerning the verse *וזבח רשעים תועבה*?
4. How does R' Chisda explain the dispute whether challah is separated from maser sheni dough?

Distinctive INSIGHT

What is done with the hair of the righteous?

אי דמחובר בגופה כגופה דמיא, לא צריכא דתלי בסיבטא

The Gemara discusses the halachos regarding various items found in an *עיר הנדחת*, a city which has gone astray.

Rav Yosef asks about the hair of the righteous women in the city, and whether it must be collected and destroyed by fire with the rest of the property of the city. Initially, the Gemara notes that Rav Yosef's question is directed only regarding the hair of righteous women, but not regarding the hair of the sinners, which apparently must be burned. Yet, the rule to destroy objects found in the city only applies to items which can be readily collected and immediately burned (*תקבץ ושרפת*), as opposed to hair, which must be cut before it is collected and then burned. How are we to understand the question of Rav Yosef when no one's hair is included in this halacha?

Rava therefore explains that this question was in regard to a wig. The Gemara points out that if the wig is secured to the head of the woman, it is *כגופה*, as part of her body. Rashi explains that while it is being worn, the wig has the status of the woman's clothing, which is certainly not collected and burned. Rather, the question is regarding a wig which is not being worn at that moment, and it is hanging on a hook in her home. On the one hand, it should be burned, as is the clothing of the righteous which is not being worn. Or, because the wig is normally taken and put onto the body, perhaps it is considered as it is part of her wardrobe even at a moment it is not actually on her head. The Gemara concludes without resolving this issue - *תיקו*.

Minchas Chinuch (Mitzvah 464, #26) notes that Rashi explains that the wig on the woman's head is part of her clothing, rather than translating the Gemara literally, by saying that the wig is part of the woman's body (*כגופה*). He recognizes, though, that Rashi's comment is correct, in that even the clothing of the righteous is not burned. Sefer Divrei Mordechai explains that Rashi is addressing the problem of how a wig can be considered as part of the woman's body. And even if we say that it is part of her body, we find the opinion of Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel (15a) who holds that hair that is ready to be cut is considered as if it was already detached from the body (*שיער העומד ליגוז כגוזו*) (דמי). How can a wig be part of the body, while long hair ready to be cut is considered as if it is already detached? Rashi therefore explains that even without being part of her body, the wig is at least a part of her wardrobe, and it is therefore not to be burned.

יד רמה explains the Gemara's analysis a bit differently. If the wig is attached with an adhesive, it is certainly part of her body. The question is where the wig is attached to her head with a pin or by a hook. Is this part of her body or not? According to *יד רמה*, if the wig is not being worn at all, and it is hanging in her closet, it certainly must be burned with the property of the city.



HALACHAH Highlight

Determining residency

הא למיהוי מבני מתא הא למיהוי מיתבי מתא

This is to be a citizen of the city [and] this is to be an inhabitant of the city

The Gemara discusses a visitor to a subverted city who was seduced into worshipping idolatry with the citizens. The Gemara rules that if he was there for thirty days he is considered an inhabitant of the town, meaning he is beheaded and his property is destroyed. In contrast, when it comes to determine citizenship for tzedaka it is only after living in a new location for twelve months that someone is considered a citizen. Chasam Sofer¹ uses the Gemara's discussion to ask a question about a Gemara in Megilla. The Gemara Megilla (19a) derives from the pasuk (Esther 9:19), "Those who dwell in open cities," that even if someone is in an open city for a day he is categorized as an open-city person and will read the Megilla on the fourteenth of Adar. From our Gemara it would seem that without an exposition we would say that a person's residency for Megilla reading would be determined by where he lived for the past twelve months. The exposition would then indicate that residency is determined by the last thirty days. How then did Chazal know to interpret the pasuk as teaching that residency for Megilla reading is determined by where a person is for that day?

Chasam Sofer explains that there are three different categories of residency. The first category is בני העיר – a citizen. It takes twelve months for someone to qualify as a citizen. Once one is a citizen of a city he is considered attached to that city so that even when he visits elsewhere he is still considered a citizen of his home town. The second category is יושבי העיר – inhabitant of a city. After thirty days one is considered an inhabitant. This status indicates a relationship with the city and its residents and this status remains with a person even if he leaves the city for a short period of time. The last category is יושבי בעיר – residing in a city. Even if one is in a city for one night he is residing "in" the city since the phrase is an indication of where one is currently located. A careful reading of the pesukim then dic-

5) City square

A Beraisa presents a dispute whether a city that did not have a square could be made into a subverted city.

6) Consecrated objects

A Beraisa elaborates on what is to be done with consecrated objects from a subverted city.

One of the rulings in the Beraisa is challenged.

R' Yochanan and Reish Lakish offer different resolutions.

Reish Lakish's assertion that the Mishnah follows R' Shimon is challenged.

The challenge is accepted and Reish Lakish offers another resolution.

This resolution is unsuccessfully challenged.

Reish Lakish's explanation is unsuccessfully challenged.

R' Shimon's position in the Beraisa is clarified by Ravina.

It is noted that Ravina's explanation is at odds with Shmuel.

7) Terumah

R' Chisda asserts that the Mishnah's ruling that terumah should be left to rot is limited to terumah that is in the hands of a Yisroel.

R' Yosef successfully challenges this explanation and offers a revised qualification to the Mishnah.

8) Maaser Sheni

A dispute whether maaser sheni dough requires challah is presented.

R' Chisda limits the scope of the dispute.

R' Yosef challenges this explanation of the dispute. ■

tates how to expound the correct meaning. In the discussion of the subverted city the Torah uses the phrase יושבי העיר – inhabitant of the city – and thus Chazal ruled that thirty days' residency is required. In the Megilla the phrase that is used if יושבים בעיר – residing in an open city – and thus Chazal ruled that if one resides in the city for the night he is obligated to read together with the citizens of that open city. ■

1. שו"ת חת"ס או"ח סי' קצ"ד. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

Ten things were said of Yerushalayim...

"עשרה דברים נאמרו בירושלים..."

On today's daf we find that due to the great holiness of Yerushalayim it could not become an עיר הנדחת. This is one of a list of ten things that distinguished Yerushalayim over other cities in Eretz Yisrael.

Rav Nosson Gestetner, zt"l, recounted, "My ancestor, Rav Yisrael of Shklov, zt"l, was a student of the Vilna Gaon. He authored the Pe'as HaShulchan, which discusses the halachos relevant to those living in Eretz Yisrael, and Tiklin Chaditin, on Meseches

Shekalim. In addition, he prepared the Be'ur HaGra on the first half of Shulchan Aruch for publication as well as the Gaon's commentary on Shekalim.

"He moved to Eretz Yisrael and settled in Tzfas with virtually all Jews during that time. Tragically, there was an earthquake that killed many people and wreaked terrible damage. Rav Yisrael was one of the survivors and he wrote a long letter describing the catastrophe to the Chasam Sofer, zt"l.

"The Chasam Sofer was so shaken by this calamity that he gathered everyone together and eulogized the many casualties, 'This was the result of people moving into Tzfas and ignoring holy Yerushalayim! Har HaMoriah is in Yerushalayim. On this

mountain, Yitzchak was offered for a sacrifice and Yaakov slept and had the dream of the angels ascending and descending a ladder to heaven. The Beis Hamikdash was there, and we still have the Kosel, from which the Shechinah never moved from the time of the destruction.

"Around one hundred years ago, people began to move to Eretz Yisrael en masse. They reasoned that since the Rashbi is interred in Meron and the Arizal in Tzfas, it was preferable to move to Tzfas or Meron, but this was an error. Even today, Hashem's name is in Yerushalayim and there is a mitzvah to ascend for the three festivals even for those who do not live in this most holy city!" ■

1. שיחות מלוח מלכה, ח"ג, ע"ר רכ"ג. ■