



Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamot of

Moshe Raphael ben Yehoshua (Morris Stadtmauer) o”h**Tzvi Gershon ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h**

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for their neshamot and may their souls find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

The Mishnah had stated: If someone related to the Kohen Gadol dies.

Our Rabbis taught in a Baraisa: Neither shall he (the Kohen Gadol) go out of the Sanctuary: [this means,] he shall not go out with them, but he may go after them. How so? — When they [the other mourners] disappear, he may reveal himself [to the public]; and when they appear [in a street], he must be hidden [in another]. (19a1)

The Mishnah had stated: And he may go with them as far as the entrance gate of the city. [R' Yehudah said... because it is written . . .]. Surely Rabbi Yehudah's argument is correct? — Rabbi Meir will tell you: in that case, he must not [leave the Temple] even for his house! Therefore, this must be the meaning of: Neither shall he go out of the Sanctuary: He must not depart from [i.e., profane] his holy status, and in this case, since he has something to remind him [of his status] he will not come into contact [with the dead]. And Rabbi Yehudah? — Owing to his bitter grief, he might be tempted to overlook that, and thus come into contact [with the dead]. (19a1)

The Mishnah had stated: when the Kohen Gadol comforts mourners.

Our Rabbis taught in a Baraisa: When he passes along the row to comfort others, the Segan (assistant Kohen Gadol) and the former Kohen Gadol stand on his right; while the Rosh Beis Av, the mourners and all the people are on his left. And when he stands in the row to be comforted by others, the Segan is stationed on his right and the Rosh Beis Av and all the public on his left.

The Gemara notes: But the former Kohen Gadol is not present on this latter occasion. Why? — He [the Kohen Gadol] might feel depressed by the thought, “He rejoices at my misfortune.”

From this Baraisa, says Rav Pappa, we can infer three things: [i] that the Segan [here] and the Memuneh [in the Mishnah] are identical; [ii] that the mourners stand, while the people pass by; [iii] that the mourners are placed to the left of the comforters.

Other Rabbis taught in a Baraisa: Formerly the mourners used to stand still while the people passed by. But there were two families in Jerusalem who contended with one another, each maintaining, “We shall pass first.” So the Rabbis established the rule that the public should remain standing and the mourners pass by.

Rami bar Abba said: Rabbi Yosi restored the earlier custom in Tzipori that the mourners should stand still and the public pass by. He also said: Rabbi Yosi enacted in the same town that a woman should not walk in the street followed by her child, owing to an incident that once happened. [Once immoral men kidnapped a child which was following its mother, and she was searching for it; she was lured into a house and they assaulted her there.]

Further, Rami bar Abba said: Rabbi Yosi also enacted in that town that women, while in the outhouse, should talk to one another for the sake of privacy [from the intrusion of men].

Rabbi Menashya bar Oos said: I inquired of Rabbi Yoshiyah the Great, in the grave-yard of Hutzal, and he told me that a row

[for condolence] must consist of not less than ten people, excluding the mourners, and that it was immaterial whether the mourners stood still and the public passed by, or the mourners passed by and the public remained standing. (19a1 – 19a3)

The Mishnah had stated: When a Kohen Gadol is comforted.

The students asked: When he consoled others, what did he say to them? — Come and hear! And he said [to them], “Be comforted.”

The Gemara clarifies: On what occasion [did he actually say this]? Shall we say it was when others comforted him? But how could he say, “Be comforted”? He would suggest ill-omen to them! — It must therefore be taken that when he comforted others, he said: “Be comforted.” Draw your own conclusion! (19a3)

The Mishnah had stated: The king may neither judge etc.

Rav Yosef said: This refers only to the Kings of Israel, but the Kings of the House of David may judge and be judged, as it is written: O House of David, thus said the Lord, execute justice in the morning. For if they may not be judged, how could they judge: is it not written: Search within yourself, and search others, which Rish Lakish interpreted to mean: Correct yourself first and then correct others?

The Gemara asks: But why this prohibition of the kings of Israel?

The Gemara answers: Because of an incident which happened with a slave of King Yannai, who killed a man. Shimon ben Shetach said to the Sages: Set your eyes boldly upon him and let us judge him. So they sent the King word, saying: Your slave has killed a man. Thereupon he sent him to them [to be tried]. But they again sent him a message: You too must come here, for the Torah says: If warning has been given to its owners, [teaching], that the owner of the ox must come and stand by his ox. The king accordingly came and sat down. Then Shimon

ben Shetach said: Stand on your feet, King Yannai, and let the witnesses testify against you; yet it is not before us that you stand, but before Him who spoke and the world came into being, as it is written: Then both the men between whom the controversy is, shall stand etc. He answered: I shall not act in accordance with what you say, but in accordance with what your colleagues say. [Shimon] then turned first to the right and then to the left, but they all, [for fear of the King], looked down at the ground. Then Shimon ben Shetach said to them: Are you wrapped in thoughts? Let the Master of thoughts [God] come and call you to account! Instantly, Gavriel came and smote them to the ground, and they died. It was there and then enacted: A King [not of the House of David] may neither judge nor be judged; testify, nor be testified against. (19a3 – 19b1)

The Mishnah had stated: He may not perform chalitzah nor may it be performed etc. [Rabbi Yehudah said etc.]

The Gemara asks: But is this really so? Didn't Rav Ashi say, that even according to the view that if a Nasi foregoes his honor his renunciation is accepted, yet if a King foregoes his honor, it is not accepted; for it is Written: You shall not in any wise set him over you, intimating, that his authority should remain over you?

The Gemara answers: A mitzvah is a different matter. (19b1)

The Mishnah had stated: Nor may anyone marry [his widow. Rabbi Yehudah said . . .]

It has been taught in a Baraisa: They [the Rabbis] said to Rabbi Yehudah: He [David] married women of the house of the King who were permissible to him, namely, Merav and Michal.

Rabbi Yosi was asked by his disciples: How could David marry two sisters while they were both living? He answered: He married Michal after the death of Merav. Rabbi Yehoshua ben Korchah said: His marriage to Merav was contracted in error, as it is said: Deliver me my wife Michal whom I betrothed to me for a hundred foreskins of the Philistines. How does this



prove it? — Rav Pappa answered: Because he said, “My wife Michal,” but not, “My wife Merav.”

The Gemara seeks to clarify: Now, what was the error in his marriage [with Merav]? [It was this:] It is written: And it shall be that the man who kills him, the king will enrich him with great riches and will give him his daughter. Now he [David] went and slew him, whereupon Shaul said to him: I owe you a debt, and if one betroths a woman by a debt, she is not betrothed. Accordingly, he gave her to Adriel, as it is written: But it came to pass at the time when Merav, Shaul's daughter should have been given to David, that she was given to Adriel the Meholathite to wife. Then Shaul said to David: If you still wish me to give you Michal to wife, go and bring me [another] hundred foreskins of the Philistines. He went and brought them to him. Then he said: You have now two claims on me, [the repayment of] a loan and a perutah. Now, Shaul held that when a loan and a perutah are offered [as kiddushin], he [the would-be husband] thinks mainly of the loan; but in David's view, when there is a loan and a perutah, the mind is set on the perutah. Or if you like, I will say, all agree that where a loan and a perutah [are offered], the mind is set on the perutah. Shaul, however, thought that [the hundred foreskins] had no value, while David held that they had value at least as food for dogs and cats.

The Gemara asks: How does Rabbi Yosi interpret the verse, Deliver me my wife Michal?

The Gemara answers: He explains it by another view of his. For it has been taught in a Baraisa: Rabbi Yosi used to interpret the following confused passage thus: It is written: But the king took the two sons of Ritzpah the daughter of Ayah whom she bore unto Shaul, Armoni and Mephiboshes, and the five sons of Michal, the daughter of Shaul, whom she bore to Adriel the son of Barzillai, the Meholathite etc. But was Michal really given to Adriel; was she not given to Palti the son of Layish, as it is written: Now Shaul had given Michal, David's wife, to Palti the son of Layish . . .? But Scripture compares the marriage of Merav to Adriel to that of Michal to

Palti, to teach that just as the marriage of Michal to Palti was unlawful, so was that of Merav to Adriel.

The Gemara asks: Now as to Rabbi Yehoshua ben Korchah, surely it is written: And the five sons of Michal the daughter of Shaul whom she bore to Adriel.

Rabbi Yehoshua ben Korcha would answer you: Was it then Michal who bore them? Surely it was rather Merav who bore them! But Merav bore and Michal brought them up; therefore they were called by her name. This teaches you that whoever brings up an orphan in his home, Scripture ascribes it to him as though he had begotten him. (19b1 – 19b3)

(Mnemonic: Chanina — he called, Yochanan — and his wife, Elazar — and Redemption; and Shmuel among his Disciples.)

Rabbi Chanina says this is derived from the following: And the women her neighbors, gave it a name, saying: There is a son born to Naomi. Was it then Naomi who bore him? Surely it was Rus who bore him! But Rus bore and Naomi brought him up; hence he was called after her [Naomi's] name.

Rabbi Yochanan says it is derived from the following: And his wife Ha-Yehudiah bore Yered the father of Gedor [and Chever the father of Socho, and Yekusiel the father of Zanoah] and these are the sons of Bisia the daughter of Pharaoh, whom Mered took. Now, Mered was Calev; and why was he called Mered? — Because he opposed the counsel of the other spies. But was he [Moshe] indeed born of Bisia and not rather of Yocheved? — But Yocheved bore and Bisia reared him; therefore he was called after her.

Rabbi Elazar says: It is inferred from the following: You have with your arm redeemed your people, the sons of Yaakov and Yosef, Selah. Did then Yosef beget them; surely it was rather Yaakov? — But Yaakov begot and Yosef sustained them; therefore they are called by his name.

Rabbi Shmuel bar Nachmani said in Rabbi Yonasan's name: He who teaches the son of his neighbor the Torah, Scripture



ascribes it to him as if he had begotten him, as it says: Now, these are the generations of Aaron and Moshe; while further on it is written: These are the names of the sons of Aaron: thus teaching you that Aaron begot and Moshe taught them; hence they are called by his name.

Therefore thus said the Lord unto the house of Yaakov, who redeemed Avraham. But where do we find that Yaakov redeemed Avraham? — Rav Yehudah answered: It means that he redeemed him from the pains of rearing children; hence the passage, Yaakov shall not now be ashamed, neither shall his face now wax pale. He shall not now be ashamed — of his father, neither shall his face now become pale — because of his grandfather.

[The second husband of David's undivorced wife] is variously called Palti and Paltiel! — Rabbi Yochanan said: His name was really Palti, but why was he called Paltiel? Because God saved him from transgression. What did he do [to be delivered from sin]? He planted a sword between her [Michal] and himself, and said: Whoever [first] attempts this thing, shall be pierced with this sword. But is it not stated: And her husband [Palti] went with her? — This means that he was to her like a husband. But is it not written, He went weeping? — This was for losing the good deed [of self-restraint]. Hence [he followed her] to Babhurim, implying that they both had remained like unmarried youths and not tasted the pleasure of marital relations.

Rabbi Yochanan said: Yosef's strong [temptation] was but a petty trial to Boaz; and that of Boaz was small in comparison with that of Palti son of Layish. 'Yosef's strong temptation was but a petty trial to Boaz,' as it is written: And it came to pass at midnight and the man was startled: 'va-yillafes.' What is the meaning of va-yillafes? — Rav said: His flesh became [as hard] as turnip heads. And that of Boaz was small in comparison with that of Palti son of Layish,' as has been stated above. (19b3 – 20a1)

DAILY MASHAL

By: Kollel Iyun Hadaf of Yerushalayim – www.dafyomi.co.il

The **MAHARSHA** suggests that the pains mentioned here are the pains which Yakov had to endure in order to have his children. He had to run away from Esav, be stripped of all of his possessions, and work for the conniving Lavan for twenty years in order to have his family which would eventually become the Shevatim. Moreover, he was pursued and his life threatened upon returning from Lavan's house, and he faced the threat of war with the men of Esav. All of these things Yakov endured in order to have the Shevatim.

The **IR DAVID** adds an important point. He asks, why would one have thought that Yakov should be embarrassed? He answers that since Yakov's forebears established the Tefilos of Shacharis and Minchah which are obligatory, while the Tefilah that Yakov established, Ma'ariv, is only voluntary (Berachos 26b), Yakov's contribution to the future of the Jewish people was less important than that of his forebears. Consequently, there was reason for Yakov to be embarrassed, if not for the fact that he was the one who raised the Shevatim.

The Midrash (Bereishis Rabah 63:2, Vayikra Rabah 36:4) gives a different explanation for how Yakov saved Avraham. The Midrash explains that Avraham was saved from the fiery furnace of Nimrod only in the merit of his future descendant, Yakov.

What is the intention of the Midrash? The accepted approach is that although Avraham was much greater than Yakov, Hash-m would have let him die and create a Kidush Hash-m if not for the fact that the Shevatim would issue forth from his descendant, Yakov, from whom a holy nation would be born. Therefore, Hash-m miraculously ensured that Avraham was left unscathed by the fire.