



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

Chagigah Daf Yud

MISHNA

- The halachos of releasing one from nedarim “fly in the air”, in that there is no real source for these halachos in the pesukim. The halachos of Shabbos, of Chagigah, and of me'ilah, are like mountains hanging by a hair, in that there are many halachos and very little source from pesukim. Monetary laws, the halachos of Avodah, the halachos of tumah and taharah, and the halachos of arayos have a lot of sources in the pesukim. They are the fundamentals of the Torah.

GEMARA

- A Braisa says, **R' Eliezer** says, the halachos of releasing nedarim do have support in the pesukim, based on the words “ki yafli” which are written twice in the pesukim. One teaches that one may enter into a vow, and the other teaches that one may exit a vow as well. **R' Yehoshua** says the support is based on the pasuk in which Hashem says “I have sworn in My anger”. This suggests that after the anger subsides, one may be released from his vow. **R' Yitzchak** says it is based on the pasuk of “kol nediv libo”, which teaches that a promise must only be kept as long as one is willing. **Chananya, the nephew of R' Yehoshua** says, it is based on the pasuk that says “I have sworn and I have kept the promise...” This suggests that even after swearing, there are times when one need not keep that promise.
 - **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said, I have a better source than all these others. The pasuk says “One may not profane his word”. This teaches that although he may not profane his word, others may do so for him (by releasing him from the vow).
 - **Rava** said, all these sources can be refuted except for that of **Shmuel**. The words of **R' Eliezer** are used for another drasha (that the vow of nezirus must be stated clearly). The words of **R' Yehoshua** may mean that even though the promise was made in anger, it may not be taken back. The words of **R' Yitzchak** may be meant to exclude the view of **Shmuel**, who says that one is only obligated to a vow once he has expressed it orally. The words of **Chananya** are used by **R' Gidal in the name of Rav** to darshen that one may make a vow to perform a mitzvah. However, the source of **Shmuel** cannot be refuted. **Rava** said, this is as people say that one sharp pepper is better than a full basket of melon.

HILCHOS SHABBOS

- **Q:** There are so many pesukim written with the halachos of Shabbos! Why are they considered to be hanging by a hair? **A:** The Mishna is referring to cases like **R' Abba**, where one digs a hole, but only because he needed the dirt, not the hole. In that case he is patur. That is the case that has no source in the Torah.
 - **Q:** That would mean that we are saying that the Mishna only follows **R' Shimon** (who says that a melacha done for other than its primary purpose is patur)? **A:** The Mishna may even follow **R' Yehuda**. He would agree that where someone does such a melacha (not for its primary purpose) and the result is a destructive one (e.g. he is left with a hole in his field) that he would be patur. This would be the Halacha referred to in the Mishna.
 - **Q:** What is meant by the Mishna that the halachos are like “mountains hanging by a hair”? **A:** It is referring to the concept that only a “mileches machsheves” (a calculated melacha) is assur on Shabbos, and yet this concept is never explicitly stated in the Torah.

CHAGIGOS

- **Q:** The concept of Chagigah is stated in the Torah!? **A:** What is meant is like **R' Pappa** said, that the pesukim as written may simply mean that people should celebrate ("V'chagosem oso chag LaShem"), and not that a korbon needs to be brought.
 - **Q:** We find that Moshe told Paroh that Hashem wanted the Yidden to go out and "V'yachogu li baMidbar", and that clearly referred to korbanos, as Moshe even told Paroh that he would have to give the Yidden animals to take along with them!? **A:** It may be that Moshe was telling Paroh that food will be needed for the celebration that will take place, but not that korbanos will be brought.
 - **Q:** The pasuk says "v'lo yalin cheilev chagi ahd boker" – the fats of the chagigah should not be left to morning. Clearly this refers to a korbon (a party does not have fats)!? **A:** It may be that the Torah is saying that the fats of voluntary korbanos brought during the chag (the celebration) may not be left until morning.
 - **Q:** Is that to suggest that fats of korbanos of the rest of the year may be left until morning? A pasuk clearly teaches that it may not!? **A:** It may be that leaving the fats over on Yom Tov carries a lo saasei as well as the usual assei of all year round.
 - **Q:** There is another pasuk which teaches that there is a lo saasei!? **A:** The Torah wanted this prohibition to carry two laavim.
 - We learn that "chag" refers to a korbon from a gezeirah shava from a pasuk in Amos. The reason we consider this to be "hanging by a hair" is because we don't typically learn the meaning of words in the Torah from a pasuk in the Nevi'im.

ME'ILOS

- **Q:** The concept of me'ilah is stated in the Torah!? **A:** **Rami bar Chama** said, what is referred to here is the Halacha that when one makes a shaliach, and that shaliach commits me'ilah, if he did so in the execution of his shelichus, the sender is chayuv, but if it was not in the execution of the shelichus, the shaliach is chayuv. This Halacha is not explicitly stated, and is therefore like "hanging by a hair".
 - **Q:** **Rava** asked, maybe we learn out me'ilah from terumah through a gezeirah shava, and learn that just as a shaliach is treated as the principle for terumah, the same is for me'ilah!? **A:** Rather, **Rava** said, the Halacha of me'ilah that is "hanging by a hair" is that if the principle sends hekdesch money with a shaliach (not realizing it is hekdesch), and before the money is spent the principle realizes that he mistakenly sent hekdesch money, the Halacha is that only the shaliach is over me'ilah.
 - **Q:** **R' Ashi** asked, why is that so difficult to understand (to the point that it is considered to be hanging by a hair)? Why is that different than any other person who unknowingly spends money of hekdesch, and thereby becomes chayuv for me'ilah? **A:** Rather **R' Ashi** said, the Halacha that is considered to be "hanging by a hair" is the Halacha of a Mishna, that if one merely takes a stone or beam from hekdesch, he is not chayuv for me'ilah. However, if he takes it and gives it to his friend, he is chayuv for me'ilah. There seems to be no difference if he takes it for himself or someone else, so why should the resulting Halacha be different!? This is what is meant that the Halacha is "hanging by a hair".
 - **Q:** Maybe the case is discussing like **Shmuel** said, that the person discussed is the hekdesch treasurer. Therefore, as long as it is still in his possession, it is considered to be in the possession of hekdesch and he has not committed me'ilah!? **A:** The Halacha is from the end of that Mishna. The Mishna says, that if one takes a beam from hekdesch and builds it into his house, he is not chayuv for me'ilah until he sits underneath it. It would seem that he should be chayuv as soon as he makes the change to the beam by building it into his house, and yet he is not chayuv until he sits underneath it. This is what is meant that it "hangs by a hair".
 - **Q:** Maybe the case is discussing like **Rav** said, that the beam was placed over a hole in the roof, but not affixed into place.

Therefore, he is only chayuv once he sits underneath it and benefits from it!? **A:** We must say, that the Halacha that is difficult to understand and is therefore considered to be “hanging by a hair” is the one we mentioned earlier from **Rava** (that if the principle sent money with a shaliach, and before the money was spent the principle realized that he mistakenly sent money of hekdesch, the principle is not chayuv for me’ilah, rather the shaliach is chayuv). Although we asked, why should this be different than one who mistakenly took hekdesch money, in truth there is a big difference. In that case, the person knew he had some hekdesch money, but didn’t realize that he took that particular money. In the case with the shaliach, the shaliach had no way of even knowing that the principle had hekdesch money in his possession. Therefore, we would think that the shaliach should not be chayuv. This is the Halacha that seems difficult to understand and is therefore said to be “hanging by a hair”.