



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

Megilla Daf Ches

MISHNA

- There is no difference between one who is prohibited to benefit at all from another based on a vow, and someone who is only prohibited to benefit from another in a food related way based on a vow, except that this latter person may walk on the other's property, and may use his keilim that are not used to prepare food.

GEMARA

- The Mishna seems to say that both these people would be assur to use keilim that are used in food preparation.

DRISAS HAREGEL

- **Q:** People don't care if a person walks through their property, so why should that be considered as benefiting from the other person? **A: Rava** said, this follows **R' Eliezer**, who says that this would be considered a benefit.

MISHNA

- There is no difference between "nedarim" korbanos and "nedavos" korbanos except that one is personally responsible for a neder korbon (if it gets lost he must bring another), and is not personally responsible for a nedavah korbon.

GEMARA

- The Mishna seems to suggest that regarding the issur of "baal te'achar" (delaying to bring one's korbon), they are the same.
- A Mishna says, a neder is where one says "I place an obligation on myself to bring a korbon". A nedavah is where one says, "This animal should be a korbon". If a neder korbon dies, is stolen, or is lost, it must be replaced. A nedavah need not be replaced.
 - We learn this from a Braisa. A pasuk says "v'nirtza lo l'chaper alav". **R' Shimon** says, only when it is "alav" (an obligation on him), does he become personally responsible. **R' Yitzchak bar Avdimi** explained, it is as if he says "I am accepting responsibility for this".

MISHNA

- There is no difference between a zav who saw 2 discharges to a zav who saw 3, except that the latter must bring a korbon.

GEMARA

- The Mishna seems to say that they are the same with regard to making anything that they sit on or lay on tamei as an "av hatumah", and the requirement to count 7 clean days.
 - **Q:** How do we know this? **A:** A Braisa says, **R' Simai** says, the Torah calls one who saw 2 discharges "tamei", and one who saw 3 discharges "tamei". The difference must be regarding the obligation to bring a korbon.
 - **Q:** Maybe when he sees only 2 he is tamei and need not bring a korbon, and when he sees 3 he must bring a korbon but does not become tamei? **A:** If he saw 3, he first saw 2, and therefore must be tamei.

- **Q:** Maybe seeing 2 requires a korbon, and seeing 3 adds the tamei status!? **A:** The pasuk says that the Kohen brings the korbon for the zav as a kaparah “from” the discharges. The word “from” teaches that only some zavim bring this korbon, not all. Therefore, it must be that only once he sees 3 discharges is he obligated to bring a korbon, whereas one who sees 2 is only tamei.
- **Q:** If we darshen the word “from”, what will we darshen with the word “from his discharges” written in another pasuk? **A:** A Braisa says it teaches that a zav who saw 2 discharges must count 7 clean days.
 - **Q:** If he makes the places that he sits and lays on tamei as an av hatumah, clearly he must count 7 clean days!? **A:** We find that a woman sometimes makes the places that she sits and lays on tamei as an av hatumah and still need not count 7 clean days. Therefore, we need the pasuk to teach regarding a zav.
 - **Q: R’ Pappa** asked, how can it be that one “from” is used to exclude a zav who saw 2 discharges (from bringing a korbon), whereas the other “from” is used to include such a zav (for counting 7 clean days)!? **A: Abaye** answered, if the pasuk meant to exclude the zav in this second case, it should not have made mention at all, and we would automatically assume that he was excluded. Therefore, “from” must mean to include the zav.

MISHNA

- There is no difference between a metzora who has been locked up (to see if he has definite tzaraas) and one who has confirmed tzaraas, except regarding letting his hair grow and ripping his clothing (which only apply to the latter).
- There is no difference between a metzora who becomes tahor without having been confirmed and one who has become tahor after being confirmed with tzaraas, except that the latter must shave all his hair and bring birds for his purification procedure.

GEMARA

- The Mishna seems to say that the two are equivalent with regard to being sent out of the machaneh, and with regard to their tamei status.
- **Q:** How do we know that a metzora who was locked up and not yet confirmed need not let his hair grow and rip his clothing? **A: R’ Shmuel bar Yitzchak** taught in front of **R’ Huna**, the pasuk regarding such a metzora says “vitaher”, which is past tense, to teach that such a metzora is tahor from certain things from the get-go. These things are the requirement of letting his hair grow and ripping his clothing.
 - **Q: Rava** asked, regarding a zav the pasuk uses the same word and we learn that it teaches that he doesn’t create retroactive tumah. Maybe regarding a metzora we should say that it teaches that same thing, and does not free him from the other requirements!? **A: Rava** said, we can learn this from the pasuk of “v’hatzaru’a **asher bo** hanegah”. This teaches that it is only a metzora who has confirmed tzaraas that has the requirements mentioned in the pasuk (letting his hair grow and ripping his clothing).
 - **Q: Abaye** asked, the requirement that he be sent out of the machaneh also uses the verbiage of “asher...bo”, and yet we know that it applies even to a metzora who does not yet have confirmed tzaraas!? **A: Rava** answered, the pasuk regarding sending him out says “kol yimei”, which we darshen to include a metzora who does not have confirmed tzaraas.
 - **Q: Rava** seems to say that a metzora without confirmed tzaraas is always included in all requirements unless specifically excluded (e.g. like with the pasuk of “asher bo”). If so, why is he excluded from the requirements of shaving his hair and bringing birds for a procedure!? **A: Abaye** said, the pasuk regarding these requirements begins by saying that the Kohen goes to the metzora and

finds that the tzaraas has healed. That must only be talking about a metzora with confirmed tzaraas.

MISHNA

- There is no difference between the Sefarim of Tanach, and tefillin and mezuzos, except that Tanach may be written in any language, whereas tefillin and mezuzos must be written in Ashuris. **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** said, even Tanach may only be written in Greek (other than Ashuris).

GEMARA

- The Mishna seems to say that they are all equivalent in the requirement to be sewn with sinews, and that they both make the hands of one who touches them tamei.