

THE BAIS HAVAAD

# HALACHA JOURNAL

Family, Business, and Jewish Life through the Prism of Halacha

A PUBLICATION OF THE  
BAIS HAVAAD HALACHA CENTER  
105 River Ave. #301, Lakewood NJ 08701  
1.888.485.VAAD (8223)  
www.baishavaad.org  
info@baishavaad.org  
Lakewood • Midwest • Brooklyn • South Florida

לע"נ הרב יוסף ישראל  
ב"ר משה גרוסמן זצ"ל

Dedicated in loving memory of  
HaRav Yosef Grossman zt"l

VOLUME 5783 • ISSUE XL • PARSHAS VA'ES'CHANAN-SHABBOS NACHAMU



## PART II—FAILURE TO APPEAR: IS A MISSING PERSON EVENTUALLY PRESUMED DEAD?

Adapted from the writings of Dayan Yitzhak Grossman

In last week's article we cited the position of the Trumas Hadeshen that although the absence of any news of a missing man does not allow his wife to remarry *ab initio* (*lechat'chilah*), it does allow her to remain married if she already remarried upon the ruling of a reputable authority, though he ruled in error. In this article, we discuss the perspectives of subsequent authorities on this idea.

R' Dovid ibn Zimra (the Radvaz) strongly rejects this leniency, arguing that the entire discussion in the Gemara and *Rishonim* of a presumption of death based on the lack of news of a missing husband is limited to someone who fell into an "endless" body of water and probably drowned, i.e., where there is strong evidence of death independent of the lack of news. But where the lack of news is the only basis for an assumption of death, this is not sufficient even to allow a wife who has already remarried to remain married. He also asserts that the absence of news is of dubious significance, because there are a

variety of possible alternative explanations for this: The husband may have become disfigured, and out of humiliation fled to a place where no one knows him; he may have fled to avoid creditors; or he may have been kidnapped. He points out that such a possibility was already raised in the Gemara itself:

There was a certain man that at the end of his wedding, a fire broke out in his marriage residence. His wife escaped and said to people, "See my burning husband! See my burning husband!" They came and saw a burned man lying there and a hand lying at a distance. R' Chiya bar Avin... (did not accept her testimony, and he) would say that the burned body lying there does not prove the husband is dead, for I can say that it is the body of another man who came to rescue the occupants and the fire devoured him, and his hand caught fire and was severed. And the husband developed

(continued on page 2)

The Bais Hava'ad  
on the  
Parsha



Bring the Parsha to Life!

### PARSHAS VA'ES'CHANAN

#### RISK MANAGEMENT

Excerpted and adapted from a shiur by Rav Eliezer Gewirtzman

But you should take great care for your souls, for you did not see any likeness on the day Hashem spoke to you at Choreiv from the midst of the fire.

Dvarim 4:15

This *pasuk* is commonly understood as a mitzvah *de'Oreisa* to protect our lives and avoid danger. This is based on the Gemara (Brachos 32b) in which a chasid did not interrupt his *Shmoneh Esrei* to respond to a general's greeting and was told by the general that he violated this mitzvah and the earlier "*hishamer lecha ushmor nafshecha me'od*" (Dvarim 4:9). The *chasid* answered that he would not stop davening to the King of Kings to greet a human king, but the Gemara indicates that these *psukim* do indeed refer to protecting one's health.

The Maharsha and the Ramban (Dvarim 4:15) note that the *psukim*, in context, address not forgetting the Torah (4:9) and not worshiping *avodah zarah* (4:15). The Maharsha therefore says that when the Gemara says they refer to health, it's only an *asmachta*.

The Rambam (*Rotzeiach* 11:4) writes that *hishamer lecha* is a mitzvah *asei* to avoid danger, and one who fails to do so violates this *asei* and the *lo sa'aseh* of "*velo sasim damim beveisecha*." The Minchas Chinuch questions

(continued on page 2)

Q&A from the  
BAIS HAVAAD  
HALACHA HOTLINE  
1.888.485.VAAD(8223)  
ask@baishavaad.org

### Wear and Tear

Q Should I do *kriah* when davening at the *Kosel*?

A One who sees Yerushalayim<sup>1</sup> or the *mekom haMikdash* in their destruction must perform *kriah* (Shulchan Aruch O.C. 561:2), making a one-*tefach* tear in one garment, e.g., a shirt. If he sees Yerushalayim and then the *mekom haMikdash*, he makes a tear for each, the second at least three finger-widths from the first. But if he tore for the *mekom haMikdash* and only then saw Yerushalayim,

(continued on page 2)

<sup>1</sup> This refers to parts of Yerushalayim that existed at the time of the Bais Hamikdash, e.g., *Sha'ar Yafu* and parts of the Old City. Seeing the golden mosque dome is considered seeing the *mekom haMikdash* rather than Yerushalayim.

(continued from page 1)

a blemish, and because of his embarrassment, he ran far away.<sup>1</sup>

The Radvaz thus has two major points of disagreement with the Trumas Hadeshen: He challenges his general doctrine that circumstantial evidence (*umdena*) is sufficient basis to allow a woman who has remarried to stay married (in the absence of particular circumstances discussed in the Gemara, such as falling into an endless body of water), and he disputes the significance of the particular *umdena* of the absence of news of the husband.<sup>2</sup>

As mentioned in the last article, the Rama accepts at least the general principle that proofs and circumstantial evidence (*ra'ayos ve'umdenos*) are sufficient to allow a woman who remarried to remain married, and various later *Acharonim* also accept and defend this principle.<sup>3</sup> Some go even further and invoke the absence of news of the husband as a basis for allowing the wife to remarry *ab initio*, at least in the presence of certain other circumstances and conditions,<sup>4</sup> or as grounds for considering the prohibition against the wife remarrying as only *deRabanan*, resulting in greater latitude for reliance upon other arguments for leniency.<sup>5</sup>

This latter point was notably espoused by the Chasam Sofer in several *teshuvos* in which he explains that his time was different from earlier eras, because due to the presence of well-established postal systems and newspapers, information travels much more effectively and swiftly than it used to, and if the missing man were alive, he would surely have contacted his family. Thus, although we may absolutely not ("*challilah*") rely directly upon this consideration to permit a woman to remarry—even in combination with other considerations—it is nonetheless grounds for considering the prohibition of her remarriage to be only *deRabanan*, with the concomitant greater latitude for leniency. (In support of the view that twelve months is enough, he notes that according to secular law, anyone who does not respond to a summons published in a newspaper is considered to have passed from memory ("*avad zichro*"), from which we may derive that twelve months is sufficient time for anyone to inform us by mail of his status, no matter how far away he may be.)<sup>6</sup>

But in another pair of *teshuvos* he writes that although he initially found this argument persuasive—even to the extent of possibly allowing

the wife to remarry *lechat'chilah*—he changed his mind upon encountering the case of a man who reappeared after not having been heard from for several years, "and I said, 'Blessed is He who chose them and their teachings,' for the words of the Chachamim will never be nullified."<sup>7</sup> Some argue that the dates of the various *teshuvos* indicate that the lenient ones represent the Chasam Sofer's final position (and that the earlier, stringent *teshuvos* were written, as indicated therein, as a retort to the heretics who challenged the wisdom of Chazal).<sup>8</sup> But if this is the case, the Chasam Sofer's failure in his later *teshuvos* to even acknowledge his earlier vigorous rejection of this leniency (even if that rejection was only intended as a retort to the heretics) is somewhat puzzling.<sup>9</sup>

R' Shalom Mordechai Schwadron (the Maharsham) discusses the idea of the Trumas Hadeshen and the Chasam Sofer in a couple of his *teshuvos*; in one, he suggests that even the Radvaz might accept the lenient view in the conditions prevalent in the Maharsham's time and place (the latter half of the nineteenth century in Eastern Europe), because the region was at peace, the roads were safe, and post offices and telegraph wires were ubiquitous.<sup>10</sup> But in a subsequent *teshuvah* he notes the Chasam Sofer's own rejection of the lenient position, and he implies that it is therefore difficult to rely upon the lenient *teshuvos*.<sup>11</sup>

In a pair of *teshuvos*, R' Moshe Feinstein (discussing men incarcerated in German death camps and men on an airplane that crashed into the sea) invokes the absence of any news of a husband as grounds (in combination with other considerations) to permit his wife to remarry. He cites the leniency of the Trumas Hadeshen and the Chasam Sofer (in his lenient *teshuvos*; he does not mention the stringent ones), and asserts this is a fortiori true in our time, when information travels even more swiftly and effectively than it did in the Chasam Sofer's era, and certainly more than it did in the Trumas Hadeshen's, due to the increase in the number of post offices and the existence of the telegraph and telephone, by which information from throughout the world is available quickly.<sup>12</sup>

R' Eliezer b. Shmuel of Verona (often referred to as R' Eliezer of Verdun) maintained that although the Gemara rules unequivocally that a man who fell into an endless body of water cannot be presumed dead, this only means that he cannot be presumed dead immediately, but after the

(continued from page 1)

it is sufficient to just add a bit to the first tear.

If within thirty days he sees these sites again, he need not repeat *kriah*. There is a minhag that many follow that residents of Yerushalayim don't do *kriah* on either site, even after a thirty-day absence.



DAYAN YEHOASHUA GRUNWALD

On the way to the *Kosel* you will see Yerushalayim and most likely also the *mekom haMikdash*. Act according to the above based on what you see and in what sequence.

*Kriah* must be done while standing. Even *bedieved*, if performed while sitting it is invalid and must be repeated. If you go to the *Kosel* by car and can't stop for *kriah* on the way, and by your arrival you already saw both Yerushalayim and the *mekom haMikdash*, tear once for both.

It is cited in the name of the Steipler Gaon that tearing twice is only *lechat'chilah*, and *bedieved*, if one waited to tear until he saw both sites, he has not violated the basic halacha (Orchos Rabeinu Vol. 2 p. 150). It seems that based on this, most people only do one *kriah*, because they often aren't able to tear *kriah* on the way.

Many *poskim* (including the Chazon Ish and Rav Elyashiv) hold that one is exempt from *kriah* on Erev Shabbos after *chatzos*, lest the sadness carry over into Shabbos. (On *motza'ei* Shabbos or Rosh Chodesh, the obligation applies.) And most *poskim* disapprove of the workaround of going to these sites wearing a borrowed shirt.

passage of a considerable amount of time without any news of the missing man, he may indeed be presumed dead.<sup>13</sup> This opinion is conceptually quite similar to that of the Trumas Hadeshen et al., and the Trumas Hadeshen cites it in support of his position, but the Radvaz points out that R' Eliezer's colleagues did not accept his view. A detailed discussion of R' Eliezer's position (and the degree to which it is accepted by later authorities) is beyond the scope of this article.

<sup>1</sup> Yevamos 115a.

<sup>2</sup> Shu"t Radvaz cheilek 1 siman 526.

<sup>3</sup> Mar'os Hatzvo'os to Rama ibid. os 58; Shu"t Ein Yitzchok cheilek 1 E.H. siman 29 anaf 6. Cf. Pis'chei Teshuvah E.H. siman 17 s.k. 77; Shu"t Yabia Omer cheilek 7 siman 14 os 7.

<sup>4</sup> Shu"t Ein Yitzchok cheilek 2 (E.H.) siman 1 anaf 4.

<sup>5</sup> Shu"t Tzitz Eliezer cheilek 15 siman 59 os 1.

<sup>6</sup> Shu"t Chasam Sofer E.H. cheilek 1 siman 48 s.v. Uve'emmiss; siman 58 from s.v. Ve'amram bechol zos; and siman 65 s.v. Uvis'shuvah acheres. Cf. Pis'chei Teshuvah ibid. s.k. 138.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid. cheilek 2 end of siman 131 from s.v. Vehaderech hasheini; end of siman 138 from s.v. Vehinei bedidi hava uvda.

<sup>8</sup> Shu"t Kol Mevaser end of siman 84 os 6.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Shu"t Toras Chesed (Lublin) cheilek 2 E.H. end of siman 7 os 7 s.v. Ve'od yeish letzareif; Yabia Omer ibid.

<sup>10</sup> Shu"t Maharsham cheilek 1 end of siman 6 s.v. Ve'ulam bateshuvah hana".

<sup>11</sup> Ibid. cheilek 3 siman 252 os 8.

<sup>12</sup> Shu"t Igros Moshe E.H. cheilek 1 siman 43 s.v. Ve'od yeish letzareif shtas Trumas Hadeshen; siman 48 s.v. Al kol panim.

<sup>13</sup> Cited by Mordechai, end of Yevamos.

(continued from page 1)



the Rambam's interpretation in light of the fact that the *psukim* refer to other matters. He answers (in Kometz Hamincha) that Chazal had a mesorah that these

*psukim* were to be understood this way, as evident from the Gemara (Shvuos 36) that cites *hishamer lecha* as the source that one may not curse himself, on account of the danger.

The Shulchan Aruch (427:8,10) says that a person must mind his health,

and he receives *makas mardus* if he doesn't, which implies that the *issur* is *deRabanan*. But the Sma and the Levush say such a person violates the *issur de'Oreisa* of *hishamer lecha*.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Some *poskim* say one violates the *issur de'Oreisa* only if the risk is great.

ALLURE HEALTHCARE SERVICES  
Mr. and Mrs. Michael Nudell

BHHJ SPONSORS  
Mr. Binyamin Eisenberg

To become a corporate sponsor of the BHHJ or disseminate in memory/zechus of a loved one, email info@baishavaad.org

Elevate your Inbox.

Scan here to receive the weekly email version of the Halacha Journal or sign up at [www.baishavaad.org/subscribe](http://www.baishavaad.org/subscribe)

