

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) One's wife's sister (cont.)

The Gemara asks for the source that the prohibition against marrying one's wife's sister applies to maternal and paternal sisters.

The conclusion is that the prohibition against marrying one's wife's sister is derived from the prohibition against marrying one's brother's wife that applies to maternal and paternal brothers.

The source that the prohibition against marrying one's brother's wife applies to maternal and paternal brothers is identified.

The source that yibum is not done with the wife of a maternal brother is identified.

2) Extra kares references

Two explanations are presented to explain why the Torah specifies the kares punishment regarding the prohibition of marrying one's sister.

The necessity for mentioning kares concerning the prohibition against marrying one's father's brother's wife is explained.

3) העראה

The Gemara identifies the source that העראה is prohibited for regular prohibited sexual relations, prohibited relations that apply to kohanim, and positive commands.

The source that העראה works to acquire a yevama or a wife is identified.

4) שכבת זרע

Rava explains why the phrase שכבת זרע appears in the context of the designated maidservant, a married woman, and a sotah.

5) העראה

Shmuel identifies what constitutes העראה.

(Overview...Continued on page 2)

REVIEW and Remember

- Does the prohibition against one's brother's wife apply to a maternal brother?

- Why is the term ערירים written concerning the prohibition against marrying one's father's brother's wife?

- Why does the phrase שכבת זרע appear three times in the Torah?

- How did R' Dimi respond when he was told that Rabbah bar bar Chana quoted R' Yochanan differently?

Distinctive INSIGHT

The condition of being ערירי

רבה רמי: כתיב ערירים יהיו, וכתיב ערירים ימותו. הא כיצד? יש לו בנים קוברו, אין לו בנים הולך ערירי. ואצטרך למיכתב וכו'

Rabba cites two contrasting verses and explains how they are to be reconciled. The verse of ערירים יהיו tells us that the sinners who engage in incest will become childless. This teaches that the children they had until the point they sinned will die during their lifetime. The inference of the verse is that they will lose the children they had until this time, and the fate of losing children will apply to the children who are alive now. However, the verse does not emphasize that they will die childless, thus we are left with the conclusion that any children they might have after this point could very well survive. The verse which states ערירים ימותו teaches that the sinful couple will die childless. This means that if they have no children until this point, they will not have children, and if they did have children at this point, these children will predecease them. We could, however, be left with the impression that any current children already born might not be affected. This is why the verses complement each other, and together they provide a full understanding of the extent of the repercussions of this sinful behavior. The parents who commit incest will die childless, both in reference to the children they have already, as well as any children who might be born after the sin. This is the lesson of the Gemara, and is how it is explained by Rashi here on the daf.

In his commentary to Chumash, Rashi (to Yayikra 20:20) explains the implication of the verses in the opposite manner as we have just presented. There, he says that ערירים ימותו would have taught that children born before the sin will die during the life of the parents (i.e., the word ימותו refers to the children, not to the parents). And the verse ערירים יהיו indicates that if they had no children until this point, the sinful adults will never have children.

In his commentary to Rashi's Commentary on Chumash, R' Eliyahu Mizrahi notes that the approach of Rashi there is in contrast to his explanation to the Gemara. Nevertheless, the point of our Gemara is that the two verses work in tandem to form a true explanation of the punishment of being ערירי/childless. The only difference between the nuances is how to conduct the analysis. The conclusion is the same, regardless. ■

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
 By Mr. Martin Samber and family
 In loving memory of their father, grandfather and great grandfather
 ר' אברהם בן ר' משה ע"ה

This week's Daf Digest is dedicated
 By Mr. & Mrs. Dennis Ruben in memory of
 הילדה רבקה דינה ע"ה בת ר' דוד שיחי'

HALACHAH Highlight

Is a widow considered related to her deceased husband?

הואיל לאחר מיתה נמי איקרי שארו

Since even after [her husband's] death she is called his relative

There is a dispute whether a widow is considered related to her husband following the death of her husband. Tosafos¹ here writes that a widow is no longer considered related to her husband after his death, but Tosafos in Bava Basra² cites another Gemara that indicates that a widow is considered related after her husband's death. Rav Moshe Feinstein³ suggests that this dispute can be utilized to understand an interesting explanation of Rav Shabsai Hakohen, the Shach.

Shulchan Aruch⁴ rules that a woman has the authority to prevent the burial of her husband until she is paid her kesubah. This ruling is difficult because elsewhere Rema⁵ rules that a creditor has the authority to prevent the burial of his debtor until he is paid his debt unless the debtor is related to the deceased. Why then, does a wife have the authority to prevent her husband's burial until her kesubah is paid if she is a relative? Shach⁶ suggests two resolutions to this difficulty. The first resolution is that the second ruling of Rema applies only to those who are blood relatives but those who are merely related by marriage are not included in that rule. A second resolution is to distinguish between a case where there are charitable funds available to bury the deceased and a case when charitable funds are not available.

Rav Moshe Feinstein writes that the two different explanations of Shach can be understood in light of the dispute concern-

(Overview...Continued from page 1)
Support from a ruling of Rabbah bar bar Chanah in the name of R' Yochanan is cited.

R' Yochanan's ruling is unsuccessfully challenged.

R' Dimi in the name of R' Yochanan cites an alternative opinion regarding what constitutes העראה.

Ravin's report in the name of R' Yochanan matches that of R' Dimi's.

The Gemara notes that Ravin disputes Rabbah bar bar Chanah but does not necessarily disagree with Shmuel.

R' Shmuel bar Yehudah cites another definition of העראה and גמר ביאה from R' Yochanan that differs with Shmuel. ■

ing the relationship between husband and wife following the husband's death. According to the approach that maintains that upon the husband's death the family relationship between husband and wife ceases one can assert that there is a difference between blood relatives and those who are related by marriage, as Shach suggests in his first answer. On the other hand, if the family relationship continues after the husband's the death another resolution is required and that is the second resolution of Shach to distinguish between places where charitable funds may or may not be available. ■

1. תוס' ד"ה לאחר מיתה
2. תוס' ב"ב קיד: ד"ה מה
3. שו"ת אג"מ וי"ד ח"ב סי' קנ"א
4. שו"ע אה"ע סי' קי"ח סע' י"ח
5. רמ"א חו"מ סי' קז סע' ב'
6. ש"ך שם סק"ו ■

STORIES Off the Daf

The consequences of sin

אין לו בניס מת ערירי

On today's daf we find that some sins can cause a person to die without children, ר"ל. Such is the severity of such acts!

The Torah tells us (Bamidbar 32:22) "you shall be clear before God and before Yisrael." The Yerushalmi (Shekalim 3:2) teaches that a person is obligated to take care to appear justified and righteous in the eyes of all creatures as much as he must be careful to fulfill his obligations to Hashem.

The Chasam Sofer wrote that he was always very concerned about these two commandments. These two obligations, to fulfill one's duties before Hashem and to maintain an impressive reputation and

impeccable appearance in front of His nation Yisrael, are as yokes upon our necks. However, it is easier to fulfill the first obligation, the one to Hashem, than to fulfill the obligation to the people, who carry in their hearts foreign thoughts and ideas.

Additionally, the punishment connected with the second obligation is infinitely harsher than that for one who does not fulfill his obligation to Hashem. We find this concept in the Gemara, where it states that one who desecrates Hashem's name has no atonement at all. An example of desecrating Hashem's name would be if a "rabbi" buys meat without paying for it immediately. Even if one is not in a position as a role model in the community, where people are seeking and expecting from him impeccable and straight conduct, such an act is desecrating Hashem's name, in spite of the fact that the person did not actually do anything wrong, and the nega-

tive impression which his conduct gave is in error and their judgment is hasty.

Chasam Sofer's even wrote, "And I thought several times whether it is possible for one to ever fulfill this verse properly." Perhaps this is what Shlomo HaMelech was referring to when he said (Kohelles 7:20), "There is no righteous man in the land who will do good and will not sin."

Moshe Rabbeinu warned the tribes of Reuven and Gad, when he said, "And you will be clear from Hashem and from Yisrael." Yet despite the fact that they did everything to fulfill their obligations by going at the front of the camp to conquer the land, in the end, the matter was not in their hands. And perhaps that is why they were the first of all the tribes to be exiled, since they could not satisfy the requirements of the people. (See I Divrei Ha-Yamim 5:26) ■

