

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Ma'aser confession (cont.)

The Gemara challenges the explanation why Yochanan Kohen Gadol abolished the recitation of the ma'aser confession.

Reish Lakish resolves the challenge.

The implication of this resolution is challenged and the Gemara concludes that Yochanan Kohen Gadol instituted two enactments.

2) Clarifying the Mishnah

The Gemara explains the term המעוררי.

Two different explanations of the term נוקפים are explained.

Two more details from the Mishnah are explained.

3) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah continues to enumerate different events that triggered the end of an era for a particular matter.

4) Clarifying the Mishnah

R' Huna the son of R' Yehoshua explains how we know that the verse prohibiting music was said in reference to the abolishment of Sanhedrin.

5) The prohibition against music

Rav and Rava emphasize the prohibition against listening to music.

The Gemara digresses to further discuss the verse in Tzefania.

R' Huna identifies circumstances when the music prohibition does not apply.

A related incident is recorded.

R' Yosef teaches that some music is worse than others.

R' Yochanan discusses the consequence for listening to music in violation of the prohibition.

6) Identifying the נביאים ראשונים

R' Huna asserts that the נביאים ראשונים refers to Dovid Hamelech, Shmuel Hanavi and Shlomo Hamelech.

R' Nachman further elaborates on the status of the urim v'tumim during the time of Dovid Hamelech.

Rabah bar Shmuel unsuccessfully challenges R' Huna's explanation.

After successfully challenging R' Huna's explanation R' Nachman bar Yitzchok asserts that the term is to exclude Chagai, Zecharyah and Malachi who are the later prophets.

A related Baraisa is cited.

7) The Shamir

A Baraisa presents a disagreement regarding the use of the shamir.

R' Nechemyah identifies the use of the shamir according to his position that it was not used for the Beis Hamikdash.

Another Baraisa describes the shamir.

8) Items that ceased to exist after the destruction of the Beis

(Overview...Continued on page 2)

Gemara GEM

The losses attributed to the destruction of the Beis Hamikdash

משחרב מקדש ראשון בטלה שירא פרנדא וזכוכית לבנה

Sefer Keren Orah writes that the many examples of loss which are associated with the destruction of the first Beis Hamikdash are our sages' way of illustrating the great and awesome harm which occurred to the world with the loss of the Beis Hamikdash.

When the Beis Hamikdash was functional, it served as the source of honor for Hashem. This charge provided a unique spiritual illumination to the world, as it cast an aura of holiness upon all physical entities. As a result, all mundane aspects of life were elevated and understood in terms of their true purpose and mission in creation. This purified life itself, until even the physical aspects of the world glowed with the light of Torah and its mitzvos.

When evil acts are perpetrated, the soul is sullied. However, even if one succeeds in avoiding sinful actions, if a mitzvah is done imperfectly, without full intent and focus, the soul suffers. The prophet (see Zecharia 3:4) describes a damaged soul as "wearing soiled garments," as the clothing of the soul is mitzvos and good deeds.

When the Beis Hamikdash was extant, it's spiritual impact helped people to perform mitzvos to perfection. With the destruction of the Beis Hamikdash, a darkness enshrouded the world, and the physical acts associated with mitzvos became more coarse and less refined. The reference to the loss of white glass and fine silk indicates that the clarity and brightness of the glow of Torah which was visible through crystal was darkened, and the clean and fresh clothing of perfect mitzvah observance has become defiled and soiled. ■

REVIEW and Remember

1. What was the origin of the דמאי enactment?

2. When is music permitted?

3. What was abolished subsequent to the destruction of the Beis HaMikdash?

4. What is the Gemara's example of one who has little faith?

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
By the Okner family in memory of their grandmother
מרת שרה בת ר' בערל, ע"ה
Mrs. Sarah Matthew

HALACHAH Highlight

Singing zemiros with one's sister

זמרי נשי ועני גברי כאש בנעורת

Women singing and men responding is like fire in flax

The Gemara Berachos (24a) teaches that a woman's voice is an ervah and the Gemara explains that it refers specifically to the recitation of Krias Shema. In other words, when a man is reciting Krias Shema or any other holy matter (דברים) he may not listen to the voice of a woman who is singing. Poskim debate whether this restriction applies even for one's mother, daughter or sister. Chazon Ish¹ was of the opinion that the restriction applies to one's relatives whereas other authorities² disagree and assert that just as there is no prohibition against gazing (הסתכלות) at one's relatives so too there is no restriction against listening to them sing.

This gives rise to an interesting question of whether it is permitted for a man to sing holy matters (zemiros or Eshes Chayil) together with one of his relatives. Rav Shlomo Zalman Auerbach³ ruled that it is permitted according to the letter of the law for a man to sing Shabbos Zemiros with his female relatives (i.e. his mother, wife who is not a nidah, daughter and sister even if she is married) even if the song contains pesukim. The rationale is that they are recited as part of a song and praise of Hashem rather than as a holy matter or to study the pesukim, therefore, it is not considered as if he is reciting a holy matter while a woman is singing. He includes in this lenient ruling even the singing of Eshes Chayil. Many other Poskim agree that singing zemiros with one's female relatives is

(Continued from page 1)

Hamikdash

R' Ami identifies certain items that ceased to exist following the destruction of the first Beis Hamikdash.

A Baraisa supports R' Ami's assertion.

9) Identifying נופת צופים

Three explanation of the term נופת צופים are presented.

A Mishnah is cited that discusses זיפים honey.

R' Yochanan and Reish Lakish dispute the meaning of the term זיפים.

A second dispute regarding the term זיפים is recorded.

10) People of faith

R' Yitzchok elaborates on the meaning of "people of faith."

Rava offers another interpretation of the verse mentioned in R' Yitzchok's statement. ■

permitted.

Rav Yaakov Reisher⁴, the Shvus Yaakov, discusses the recitation of Hallel at the seder. He notes that Tosafos writes that women are obligated to recite hallel at the seder. Therefore, it is permitted for a woman to lead the recitation of Hallel, in other words a woman can lead others even in the recitation of הודו and אנה ה'. He adds, however, that since nowadays the custom is for people to sing Hallel it is prohibited for a woman to lead the sections of הודו and אנה ה' since that would be included in the Gemara's comment that women singing and men responding is like fire in flax. ■

1. מובא שיטתו בפסקי תשובות סי' ע"ה אות י"ג
2. פסקי תשובות שם
3. הליכות שלמה הל' תפלה פ"כ אות י"א
4. חק יעקב סי' תע"ט סק"ו ■

STORIES Off the Daf

"What will I eat tomorrow?"

כל מי שיש לו פת בסלו ואומר מה אוכל למחר אינו אלא מקטני אמנה

It is hard to imagine the destitution of Warsaw between the two World Wars. A debilitating shortage of food and the most basic amenities of life is something which virtually no one needs to deal with today outside of the third world. In Warsaw, people literally starved. A person who could afford to bring home enough bread for his family was considered very fortunate indeed. Understandably, most people would eat only the minimum of

any food purchased so as to make their meager stores last as long as possible. Virtually no one knew where their next crust of bread would come from, literally.

Interestingly, the Brisker Rav, zt"l, would eat his fill and wouldn't limit himself to save food from one day to the next. He constantly worked on bitachon and felt that leaving over was not appropriate for him. After all, in Sotah 48 Rabbi Eliezer Hagadol proclaims that anyone who has bread in his basket yet asks, "What will we eat tomorrow?" has little faith.

In sharp contradistinction to the Brisker Rav completely eating his fill, his

son, Rav Yosef Dov, zt"l, ate virtually nothing. The Brisker Rav could not chew the hard crusts of the breads. His son would eat only those and nothing else.

The Brisker Rav scolded him. "The only reason why we don't have enough food for you too, is that you insist on eating only the crusts and not your full share of the bread. If you ate as much bread as you need, we would have enough for both of us."

Rav Yosef Dov continued his practice of only eating the crusts however. Years later he explained, "I didn't want to be a ba'al bitachon on my father's cheshbon!" ■

