



Today's Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

Sanhedrin Daf Mem Ches

- **Q: Rava** had said that the act of designation is not considered to be significant. The Gemara asks, a Mishna says that if a woman's kerchief is tamei medras (a tumah that can be put on something that is fit to be sat upon) and she designates the kerchief to be used as a cover for a Sefer Torah, it loses its tumas medras (because it is no longer fit to be sat upon). We see that the act of designation is significant!? **A:** The Mishna means that she gave it over and wrapped it around the Torah. It is only then that it would lose its tumas medras.
 - **Q:** If she wrapped it around the Torah, why would she have to also give it over (i.e. designate it)? **A: Rava** requires that both things be done. We find that **R' Chisda** holds this way regarding a bag used for tefillin as well – if it is designated for use for tefillin *and* actually used for tefillin, it may no longer be used as a coin purse.
 - **Abaye** would hold that if the bag was designated for tefillin it could not be used as a change purse. If it was used for tefillin, it would only be assur to use as a change purse if it had also been designated for tefillin.
 - **Q:** We have learned that if a structure is built over a burial plot for a person who is still living (he will be buried there when he dies), it remains mutar to benefit from. If even a single row of stones was added for a meis (who has already died, but has not yet been buried) it becomes assur to benefit from. We see that designation is significant!? **A:** The case is where the meis was already in the plot, so there was more than simple designation.
 - **Q:** If that is true, why does it only become assur when a row of stones is added? Even if nothing was added it should become assur!? **A:** The chiddush is that even if the meis is then removed from that grave, the structure remains assur to benefit from.
 - **Rafram bar Pappa in the name of R' Chisda** said, if he can recognize the stones that were added for the meis, he can just remove those stones and the rest of the structure is mutar to benefit from.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, that if one dug a grave for his father and ended up burying his father elsewhere, the son may never be buried there himself. We see that designation is significant!? **A:** It is assur to the son out of respect for his father, not because it was designated for a meis. In fact, the end of the Braisa suggests this as well.
 - **Q:** Maybe we can bring a proof to **Rava** from a Braisa. The Braisa says, a new grave is mutar to benefit from, but if even a neifel is put in it, it becomes assur to benefit from. This suggests that it becomes assur only when the neifel is actually put into it, and designation is not significant!? **A:** The Braisa would hold it is assur even with only designation. The reason it speaks of putting the neifel in, is to contrast with the view of **R' Shimon ben Gamliel**, who holds that a neifel would not make it assur at all.
 - **Q:** A Mishna says that if a collection was made to raise money for someone's burial and there is surplus money, it is given to his heirs to use as they wish. Now, if designation is significant, the money should be assur to benefit from!? **A:** The case is that the collection was made while the person was still alive, and that is why it does not become assur.
 - **Q:** A Braisa that expounds on this Mishna says that the money was collected for a meis!? **A:** The Braisa cannot serve as proof for **Rava**, because the Braisa goes on to say that **R' Meir** says the surplus money should not be touched until Eliyahu comes, and **R' Nossan** says it should be used to build a headstone or to sprinkle wine in front of the coffin. From this part of the Braisa we see that designation *is* significant! Rather, **Abaye** will explain that all agree that

designation is significant, but that the **T”K** holds that only the part needed for the meis is considered to be “designated” for the meis, whereas **R’ Meir** is uncertain, and **R’ Nosson** holds that even the surplus is “designated” for the meis. **Rava** will explain that all agree that designation is not significant, but that the **T”K** holds the meis is embarrassed that a collection had to be made for him, and therefore is mochel and allows the money to be used by his heirs, **R’ Meir** is unsure whether he is mochel, and **R’ Nosson** holds that he is for sure not mochel.

- **Q:** A Braisa says, that if parents throw clothing on their son who has died (thereby making them assur) it is a mitzvah for people to try and save the clothing. Now, if designation is significant, how could they possibly save the clothing!? **A:** Since they are throwing the clothing out of the pain that they are in, it is not considered to be a true designation for a meis.
 - **Q:** If that is so, why does **R’ Shimon ben Gamliel** say that if the clothing actually touch the bed on which the meis is on, they become assur? **A:** He is referring to the bed that is buried with the meis, not the bed that the meis was lying on. The reason it becomes assur is because that clothing can easily become confused with the tachrichin of the meis.
- **Q:** A Braisa says, if a bag was made for the purpose of putting tefillin in it, it is assur to put money in it. If it was not made for the purpose of tefillin, but tefillin were put in it, it is mutar to put money in it. We see that designation is significant!? **A:** The Braisa should be understood as saying, if it was designated for tefillin *and* he put tefillin in it, it is assur to put money in it. Explained this way, the Braisa would be following the view of **R’ Chisda**.
- **Q:** A Braisa says, if someone told a craftsman to make a case for a Sefer Torah or for tefillin, if it was never used for the Sefer Torah or tefillin it may be used for mundane items. We see that designation is not significant!? **A:** Although this Braisa is a proof to **Rava**, we find that this matter is actually a machlokes among Tanna’im. A Braisa says that **R’ Shimon ben Gamliel** holds that the leather used for tefillin must be tanned with the intent for tefillin. We see that he holds that designation is significant.
- **Q:** **Ravina** asked **Rava**, could it be that there are people who don’t have tachrichin when they die and the tachrinin are first made for them after death? **A:** **Rava** said, this would happen with the people of Harpania (who were so poor that they would collect for a dead person’s tachrichin only after he died).
- **Mareimar** paskened that the halacha follows **Abaye**, and the **Rabanan** said the halacha follows **Rava**. The Gemara paskens that the halacha follows **Rava**.
- A Braisa says, if a person is killed by the Jewish king (for rebelling or some other reason) his possessions go to the king. If a person is killed by Beis Din his possessions go to his heirs. **R’ Yehuda** says, that even those killed by the king have their possessions go to their heirs. The **Rabanan** said to **R’ Yehuda**, the pasuk says that King Achav took the possession of Navos after he killed him! **R’ Yehuda** answered, that King Achav was his cousin and was therefore his heir. The **Rabanan** asked, Navos had many sons, so how could Achav have inherited as an heir!? **R’ Yehuda** said, Achav killed Navos and his sons. The **Rabanan** say his sons were not killed.
 - **Q:** The pasuk says that the false witnesses said that Navos cursed Hashem and the king. Now, according to **Rabanan** the reason they said “and the king” was so that his possessions should go to Achav, but according to **R’ Yehuda**, why did they need to add “and the king”? **A:** According to the **Rabanan**, why did they need to say that he cursed Hashem? It must be they said that to incite anger among the people. For this same reason **R’ Yehuda** would say that they added “and the king”.
 - **Q:** The pasuk says that Yoav ran to the Mizbe’ach and told Shlomo’s messengers that he will not go with them to be killed by the king and would rather die there at the Mizbe’ach (i.e. by Beis Din). This makes sense according to the **Rabanan**, because he wanted to be killed by Beis Din so that his possessions should go to his heirs. However, according to **R’ Yehuda**, why did he care how he would be put to death? **A:** He said that to try and delay his killing, not with any intent regarding his possessions.
 - The pasuk tells of an exchange between Binayahu and Yoav. Yoav told him to tell Shlomo that if Shlomo has him killed, Shlomo will have to accept upon

himself the curses that Dovid cursed Yoav, and if he didn't want those curses he should not kill him. Shlomo told Binayahu to go ahead and kill Yoav anyway. **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** said, all the curses that Dovid put on Yoav ended up being fulfilled in the offspring of Dovid. We find that his descendant Rechavam was a zav, that his descendant Uziyahu was a metzora, his descendant Asa needed a cane to walk because of a painful ailment that he had, his descendant Yoshiyahu was killed by the sword, and his descendant Yechanya didn't even have bread to eat (these were all the curses that Dovid said would happen to the descendants of Yoav).

- **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** said, this is what people mean when they say "be from the cursed, but not from the ones who curse".