

24 Menachem Av 5774
August 20, 2014



Moed Katan Daf 9

Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamah of

Tzvi Gershon Ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for his neshamah and may his soul find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

The Gemora seeks to find a Scriptural source that one should not intermingle one joyous occasion with another. The Gemora cites a verse in Melachim I [8:65]: *At that time, Shlomo instituted the celebration, and all Israel was with him, a huge congregation, from the approach to Chamas until the Brook of Egypt, before Hashem our G-d, for seven days and seven more days, fourteen days.* They celebrated the completion and dedication of the Beis Hamikdosh for seven days before Sukkos and then they celebrated the festival of Sukkos for seven days. The Gemora posits: If we would be permitted to intermingle one joyous occasion with another, they should have waited and combined the seven day celebration for the dedication of the Beis Hamikdosh together with the seven days of Sukkos. By the fact that they didn't combine the two, it can be proven that we cannot intermingle two joyous occasions.

The Gemora rejects the proof: Perhaps we can intermingle two joyous occasions, but we cannot intentionally delay the celebration once the Beis Hamikdosh was complete.

The Gemora answers: Shlomo could have left out a small portion of the building and finish it immediately prior to Sukkos. By the fact that he didn't leave over any part, this indicates that we cannot intermingle two joyous occasions.

The Gemora persists in its questioning: They would not have left over any part of the building of the Beis Hamikdosh because it would be a disgrace to leave the Beis Hamikdosh incomplete and besides, everyone would realize that it was just a ploy to result in the dedication occurring on Sukkos.

The Gemora responds: They could have left over the over the building of the Kalyah Orev. (*The Beis Hamikdosh roof was one amah wide at its tip. They covered that amah with iron plates that had spikes there to prevent ravens from resting on the roof. The Aruch states that it is a scarecrow.*)

The Gemora rejects this by saying that the Kalyah Orev was regarded as a necessity for the building of the Beis Hamikdosh and therefore it could not be left out.

In conclusion: We do not have conclusive proof from Shlomo that it is forbidden to intermingle one joyous occasion with another because Shlomo concluded the building of the Beis Hamikdosh earlier and could not postpone the dedication until Sukkos.

The Gemora concludes that the source that two joyous occasions cannot be intermingled with each other is from the extra words in the verse. It is

written: “fourteen days,” why was it necessary to write “seven days and seven more days?” It is to teach us that two joyous occasions cannot be intermingled with each other. (9a)

Rabbi Parnach said in the name of Rabbi Yochanan: The Jewish people did not observe the fast of Yom Kippur that year, but they ate on that day as part of the celebration of the inauguration of the Beis Hamikdosh.

The Gemora mentions that the Jewish people were worried that they may have acted wrongly by eating on Yom Kippur and would deserve extermination. Hashem was pleased with their decision, as He demonstrated at the end of the celebrations by sending forth a Heavenly voice to proclaim that they were all destined to eternal life in the World to Come.

They derived the allowance to eat on Yom Kippur from the Torah's description of the inauguration of the Tabernacle in the Wilderness. When the Tabernacle was dedicated, the Nesi'im (*leaders of the tribes*) brought sacrifices as part of the celebration, even on Shabbos. The Jewish people derived from there that when the Beis Hamikdosh is dedicated, the celebration overrides the obligation to fast on Yom Kippur.

The Gemora asks: Why were they worried?

The Gemora answers: There is a distinction between the dedication of the Tabernacle and the dedication of the Beis Hamikdosh. The sacrifices could override Shabbos because it was necessary for Hashem (*the*

korbanos), but the eating by the dedication of the Beis Hamikdosh was for the ordinary people.

The Gemora asks: Why was it necessary by the dedication of the Beis Hamikdosh to eat and drink; wouldn't it be sufficient with offering sacrifices?

The Gemora answers: There is no joy without eating and drinking. (9a)

The Gemora cites Scriptural sources demonstrating that the sacrifices offered by the dedication of the Tabernacle overrode Shabbos and that the dedication of the Beis Hamikdosh overrode Yom Kippur. (9a)

The Gemora seeks the source which indicates that Hashem forgave the Jewish people for eating on Yom Kippur. Tachlifa taught a braisa: It is written in Melachim I[8:66]: *And they went to their tents joyful and glad of heart*. This teaches us that the people returned to their homes to find their wives in a state of marital purity, and that they rejoiced in the radiance of the Divine presence, and that each wife became pregnant and gave birth to a boy, and a Heavenly Voice went out and said to them: You are all prepared for a life in the World to Come. (9a)

Rav Yehudah in the name of Rav explains the part of the verse dealing with Dovid: Dovid had a relationship with Bathsheva, the wife of Uriah Hachiti, who was on the battlefield. Although Hashem told Dovid that his sin was forgiven, Dovid desired a sign in his lifetime that would clearly demonstrate that he had repented. Hashem responded that the sign would occur only after Dovid

died, in the lifetime of Dovid's son Shlomo. When Shlomo sought to bring the Aron (Ark) inside the Holy of Holies, the gates of the Holy of Holies would not open. He recited twenty-four songs of prayer, but he was not answered. He then recited the verse: until Shlomo invoked the merits of his father Dovid. Upon witnessing this phenomenon, the enemies of Dovid were humiliated, and the Jewish People knew that Hashem had forgiven Dovid. (9a)

Rabbi Yonason ben Amsai and Rabbi Yehudah ben Gerim learned the portion related to vows in the Beis Medrash of Rabban Shimon bar Yochai. In the evening, he granted them permission to leave. They stayed overnight and returned again in the morning to receive permission. Rabban Shimon bar Yochai asked them: Didn't you receive permission last night? They responded: You have taught us that a student who receives permission to leave in the evening, but ends up staying overnight, must receive permission again the following morning. (The Gemora cites a Scriptural source for this.)

Rabban Shimon bar Yochai told his son: These people are men of stature; go to them so they will give you a blessing. When he arrived, they were discussing the following halachah (which was derived based on a contradiction in two verses): When there are two mitzvos in front of a person, one can weigh the mitzvos and perform the greater one, providing that the smaller mitzvah can be performed by others; however, one must perform the smaller mitzvah if it cannot be performed by others.

Similarly, they stated that a mitzvah that can be performed by others does not compare to Torah

study, and one who is studying Torah should allow others to perform the mitzvah; however, one must interrupt his learning and perform a mitzvah that cannot be performed by others.

Rabban Shimon bar Yochai's son asked them for a blessing. They said to him: "May it be the will of Hashem that you sow your field but not harvest. You should take out but not bring in. Let your house be destroyed, and your inn be occupied. May your table be turned over, and may you not see a new year."

When he returned to his father, he reported that he was disappointed with what seemed to be a series of curses rather than blessings. Rabban Shimon bar Yochai, however, understood the true intent of the cryptic words. "Sowing the field and not harvesting" refers to having children who will survive and not die in his lifetime. "To take in and not bring out" means that his sons should bring daughters-in-law into his house, and that they should never have to leave, which would be the case if, Heaven forbid, his sons might die. They also wished that he marry off his daughters and never have to bring them back to his own home. In context, they wished that his grave (house) remain empty and that he succeed in building his portion in the World to Come (the inn). Finally, they prayed that his table be surrounded with children, and that he enjoy a long life with his wife, and she should not die, never having to experience another "first-year" of marriage. (9a -9b)

The Mishna had stated: And a woman may make her adornments during Chol Hamoed.

The Gemora cites a braisa: These are the women's adornments. She paints her eyes, parts her hair, and puts rouge on her face; some say she may use a razor for her "lower face."

Rav Chisda's wife was adorning herself in front of her daughter-in-law (on Chol Hamoed). Rav Huna bar Chinena sat before Rav Chisda, and as he sat there he said that the permission mentioned in the Mishna applied only to a young woman, but not to an elderly woman. Rav Chisda said to him: By God! Even to your mother, and even to your mother's mother, and even if she would be standing by her grave, as the saying goes: At sixty as at six; the sound of the bells (of a wedding) make them run. (9b)

Rabbi Yehudah was quoted in the Mishna as saying: She may not plaster her face (*with lime*) because it is a defacement to her (*even though, it will improve her appearance when the lime is removed; presently it causes her grief*).

Rabbi Yehudah is cited in a braisa: She may not plaster her face (*with lime*) because it is a defacement to her. He does admit that she may plaster her face with lime that can be peeled during Chol Hamoed because although presently (*while it's on*), it causes her grief, it will result in joy later on (*after it's removed*).

The Gemora asks: Does Rabbi Yehudah really maintain that something which presently causes grief is permitted because it will result in joy later on? We have learned in a Mishna (Avodah Zorah 2a): It is permitted to accept repayment of a loan from an idolater on his holiday (*certain transactions are*

forbidden with idolaters during their holiday season out of concern that they will thank their idol for their good fate) because it (*the repayment*) causes him grief. The Chachamim disagreed because they will be happy after time (*since they are not obligated to pay any longer*). It emerges that Rabbi Yehudah does not hold that something which presently causes grief is permitted because it will result in joy later on, so how can he rule that a woman is permitted to use the lime?

Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak answers: Chol Hamoed is different since there are many activities that are permitted even though they presently cause grief; nevertheless they are allowed because they will result in joy.

Ravina answers: Rabbi Yehudah maintains that an idolater never rejoices after repaying a loan (*since he is always seeking ways to keep the money illegally*). (9b)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

DELAYING THE PERFORMANCE OF A MITZVAH (SIYUM DURING THE NINE DAYS)

The Gemora seeks to find a Scriptural source that one should not intermingle one joyous occasion with another. The Gemora cites a verse in Melachim I [8:65]: *At that time, Shlomo instituted the celebration, and all Israel was with him, a huge congregation, from the approach to Chamas until the Brook of Egypt, before Hashem our G-d, for seven*



days and seven more days, fourteen days. They celebrated the completion and dedication of the Beis Hamikdosh for seven days before Sukkos and then they celebrated the festival of Sukkos for seven days. The Gemora posits: If we would be permitted to intermingle one joyous occasion with another, they should have waited and combined the seven day celebration for the dedication of the Beis Hamikdosh together with the seven days of Sukkos. By the fact that they didn't combine the two, it can be proven that we cannot intermingle two joyous occasions.

The Gemora rejects the proof: Perhaps we can intermingle two joyous occasions, but we cannot intentionally delay the celebration once the Beis Hamikdosh was complete.

The Gemora answers: Shlomo could have left out a small portion of the building and finish it immediately prior to Sukkos. By the fact that he didn't leave over any part, this indicates that we cannot intermingle two joyous occasions.

The Avnei Neizer (O"C 459:9) asks: How could they have delayed the building of the Beis Hamikdosh? Isn't there a principle that one cannot push off the performance of a mitzvah?

He answers by citing the Chacham Tzvi (106), who maintains that it is permitted to delay the performance of a mitzvah when the mitzvah can be performed with a greater degree of sanctity later, and since here, the mitzvah of completing the Beis Hamikdosh on Sukkos would be of greater sanctity and it would enhance the mitzvah, there would be no concern for the procrastination of the mitzvah.

The Shach (Y"D 246:27) rules that when one is close to finishing a Mesechta, he may leave a little left at the conclusion of the Mesechta in order to make the siyum on a day that is fit to have a siyum feast. It is brought in some seforim that the source for this halacha is our Gemora, which stated that they could have left over a small portion of the building of the Beis Hamikdosh in order to celebrate the dedication on Sukkos. (They didn't do this by the Beis Hamikdosh because we cannot intermingle two joyous occasions or because it would be disgraceful to leave over a portion of the Beis Hamikdosh.)

The Elya Rabbah (551:27) states: While it is permitted to eat meat during the Nine Days at a siyum feast, one should not hurry or delay the finishing of a Mesechta in order to conclude it during the Nine Days.

The question is asked: Why not? Our Gemora prohibits this only by the building of the Beis Hamikdosh; it can be inferred that this would be permitted by all other mitzvos.

Rabbi Ezriel Hildesheimer (O"C 90) answers: Regarding the building of the Beis Hamikdosh, if we can intermingle two joyous occasions, there would be no prohibition at all to dedicate the Beis Hamikdosh on Sukkos. However, to hurry or delay the finishing of a Mesechta in order to conclude it during the Nine Days and make a siyum then would be inconsistent with the custom of not eating meat during the Nine Days. It is on account of this that the Elya Rabbah rules that this is forbidden to do.



EATING ON YOM KIPPUR

by Rabbi Yoseph Dov Karr

The Gemora says that the Jewish people did not observe the fast of Yom Kippur that year, but they ate on that day as part of the celebration of the Chanukas ha'Mikdash. The Gemora says that they derived the allowance to eat on Yom Kippur from the Torah's description of the Chanukas ha'Mishkan in the Midbar. When the Mishkan was dedicated, the Nesi'im brought Korbanos as part of the celebration, even on Shabbos. The Jewish people derived from there that when the Mikdash is dedicated, the celebration overrides the obligation to fast on Yom Kippur. Hashem was pleased with their decision, as He demonstrated at the end of the celebrations by sending forth a Bas Kol to proclaim that they were all destined to eternal life in Olam ha'Ba.

The Gemora mentions that before they heard the Bas Kol, the Jewish people were worried that they may have acted wrongly by eating on Yom Kippur and would be liable for the severe punishment of Kares.

Why were the people concerned that they would be liable for punishment? Even if their ruling was incorrect, at worst their act was an inadvertent transgression, an act of Shogeg, for which there is no punishment of Kares. Moreover, the people certainly followed the ruling of Beis Din in this matter, and thus there was no reason for them to be held accountable. Even if the ruling was wrong, the people would be liable only to bring a Par he'Elem

Davar (the Korban offered when the entire nation acts upon an erroneous ruling of Beis Din which permits an act that is actually forbidden with a punishment of Kares). Why were they afraid that they would be punished with Kares?

Perhaps the answer may be dependent upon whether or not the permission of eat on Yom Kipper was D'chuya or Hutra. Apparently it was D'chuya and therefore they were concerned that even though it was mutar to eat there was still a partial sin and needed to be forgiven and they were worried perhaps they made a mistake. The Bas Kol came and told them not to worry, as Hashem decided it was the right thing to do and was completely Hutra.

DAILY MASHAL

Stories from the Daf

By: Daf Digest

Someone once asked Rav Moshe Feinstein, zt"l, "Can one fulfill the mitzvah of bikur cholim by telephone? This would still enable a person to fulfill the main reason for the mitzvah, to inspire one to pray for the sick person, even if the rest of the benefits of the mitzvah would not be achieved. I think the Shulchan Aruch itself provides a proof when it states that one can discharge his obligation to visit a person too sick to speak by visiting the outer chamber and asking after his welfare."

Rav Moshe responded, "But how can you see how the patient is doing and help him over the telephone? Sometimes a visitor needs to straighten up the

sickroom or help in some other way. He continued, “Your proof is no proof at all! In the case where the patient is forbidden to speak, the act of asking others how he is constitutes a visit because entering the sickroom can actually cause the patient harm. But if the patient can receive visitors, one must make the effort to visit personally. How else will the patient feel cared for? Also, one prays with more intensity after making an actual visit. It could also be that one’s prayers in the sickroom are received more readily because the Shechinah is above the patient’s bed. “Although you are wrong to say that the main ‘reason’ for the mitzvah is to inspire the visitor to pray, this aspect of the mitzvah is distinguished in one respect.

We find in our Gemora that Rav Yonasan ben Amsai and Rav Yehuda ben Geirim were analyzing verses when the son of Rabbi Shimon bar Yochai approached them for a blessing. The Gemara explains there that if there is a mitzvah that needs to be done and it can be performed by someone else, one should not interrupt his learning. If there is no one else to do it, however, one should interrupt one’s learning. In the case of bikur cholim, even if all the needs of the sick person will be taken care of by others one should still visit; the more people who pray for the patient, the better! And if one really cannot visit—he should at least pick up the phone and call!”